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Abstract

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE AND SUPPORT FOR FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP
IN A VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

An institution of higher education was studied to determine whether its culture supported faculty scholarship. The site selected for the study was John Tyler Community College (JTCC) in Virginia chosen because it is fairly representative of other colleges in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) and because its campuses were accessible to the researcher for the collection of study information. Ernest Boyer’s broadened definition of scholarship was used to define scholarship in this study.

The research question—"Is the culture in a two-year public institution in Virginia supportive of scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer?--was addressed through case study methodology using qualitative and quantitative data collection gathered through interviews and document review. One-third of JTCC full-time faculty, five academic administrators, and VCCS’s chancellor and director of professional development were interviewed using nineteen interview questions developed from Tierney’s framework for assessing institutional culture. College document review related to these questions was done to triangulate information gathered from interviews.

The study findings suggest that JTCC’s culture does not support faculty scholarship strongly or consistently. In Tierney’s elements of environment, mission, and socialization—most interview and document data show a consistent lack of support for scholarship: and in elements of information, leadership, and strategies there is limited, if
any, document support for interview responses indicating that scholarship is supported at JTCC.

Future research on community college scholarship should investigate model institutions for scholarship engagement as well as definitions and standards of scholarship that are most fitting for two-year institutions. Further study is needed on the benefits of scholarship to community college missions and a body of literature on community college scholarship should be established.

Sarah L. Etkin
Program in Higher Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia
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INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE
AND
SUPPORT FOR FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP
IN A VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Leaders in higher education are focusing increasingly on changing expectations for faculty and scholarship. In Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1990), Ernest Boyer defines a broadened definition of scholarship that includes the pursuit of knowledge: its discovery, integration, application, and relationship to teaching. Taking a cue from Boyer, community college leaders are advocating the inclusion of scholarship in two-year institutions of higher education (Templin, 1991; Palmer & Vaughan, 1992).

Engagement in scholarship at the community colleges is desirable for several reasons. On a personal level, engagement in research strengthens one’s teaching as well as learning in the classroom (Angelo, 1991; Angelo & Cross, 1993) and advances one’s knowledge and ability to retain discipline currency (Ratcliff, 1992). On an institutional level, faculty members who engage in scholarly activities are often identified by peers and administrators as ‘vital’ and highly contributing members of the academy (Baldwin, 1990). Moreover, community college leaders see scholarship as a means of enhancing the image of two-year colleges as credible institutions of higher education (Vaughan, 1988; Templin, 1991; Palmer & Vaughan, 1992).
The issue of faculty scholarship in the community colleges raises many questions. Is scholarship an appropriate role for faculty members in two-year institutions? To what extent does scholarship benefit the community college? To what degree do administrators value and support it? Do administrators at two-year colleges provide the needed resources for faculty scholarship? The dominant question that underlies and emerges from all of these questions is whether the culture of the community college is supportive of scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer.

Purpose of the Study

Recently, leaders in two-year institutions of higher education, recognizing the value of Boyer's broadened definition of scholarship (1990), are advocating the inclusion of scholarship in their institutions even though nearly all their faculty lack doctoral degrees or research backgrounds. Vaughan (1992) states that although scholarship has not been integrated into the culture of community colleges, their cultures are continually evolving beyond merely serving as teaching and community service institutions. Further, he believes that the organization's culture is a reflection of its leaders, many of whom now support scholarship as a role for faculty and administrators. Vaughan's views may imply that the community college culture may be changing in support of two-year faculty scholarship. The question that must still be answered is whether the present culture within community colleges supports Boyer's definition of faculty scholarship. This study will therefore assess whether or not the culture of a Virginia community college is supportive of faculty scholarship using Boyer's definition.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholarship in Higher Education

Faculty members view scholarship as an appropriate and desirable professional practice across diverse institutional settings in higher education, including two-year colleges (AACJC, 1988). This perspective represents a marked change in higher education. Research, predominately for new knowledge, was traditionally emphasized mainly in universities and a few highly selective liberal arts colleges. Until recently, the community college remained steadfast in its commitment to teaching and placed no emphasis on faculty scholarship or research.

When Ernest Boyer introduced a broadened concept of scholarship for not only the discovery of knowledge but also its integration, application, and its transformation and extension through teaching, scholarship more nearly described the interests and work of faculties in all types of higher education institutions. The issue of a scholarship role for community college faculty has strong supporters (Angelo & Cross, 1993; Templin, 1991; Palmer & Vaughan, 1992). If community college leaders advocate that their faculty engage in scholarship, an important question must be answered: Is the culture in a public two-year institution of higher education in Virginia supportive of faculty scholarship as...
defined by Ernest Boyer?

Traditional Scholarship

A scholar is considered to be a learned person. After World War II the definition of a scholar in higher education narrowed to one who systematically pursued new knowledge. Research that had taken place primarily in senior research institutions became a focus in many types of four-year colleges and universities in an attempt to emulate research practices that were highly rewarded by the provision of tenure, salary increases, and promotion based on research and publication. Teaching achievement was seldom considered as a basis for these rewards (Boyer, 1990).

R. Eugene Rice (1991), in his discussion of "The American Scholar," saw research as a central focus of a faculty member's professional activities. Research was a pursuit of knowledge for knowledge's sake. By engaging in research, the individual faculty member and the associated higher education institution received many tangible and intangible benefits. Is it any wonder then that basic research was valued and emulated widely in higher education after the mid-1900s?

History of Change in Scholarship

The earliest colleges in Colonial America were dominated by teacher-scholars responsible for the moral and intellectual development of young men from prominent families (Rudolph, 1962). With the passing of the Morrill Act of 1862 and the birth of land-grant universities, service became an additional role for faculty. Scholarship was
essentially synonymous with the search for new knowledge—defined as basic, pure, or theoretical research. This type of research appeared in the late 1800s in the United States and was influenced by the German model which was purist, non-utilitarian, empirically-based, and which led to publication. The Johns Hopkins University, borrowing ideas from the German model, served as the preeminent American research institution and provided graduate education to prepare empirical researchers (Veysey, 1965), rather than teachers. The federal influences of the post-World War II era, with its funding and research needs, fostered a significant expansion in basic research by American universities (Veysey, 1965). The influence of the land grant institutions served to create a derivative of basic research that solved everyday problems in such areas as agriculture or engineering. This derivative type of research is described as applied research (Veysey, 1965).

The Truman Commission Report of 1947 brought postsecondary education within the reach of most Americans with the proliferation of two-year colleges. Noted for their liberal admission requirements and lower costs that enabled an era of “mass education” to begin, the community college traditionally assigned a teaching role for its faculty. Community college goals provide for occupational-technical education, college transfer programs, developmental studies, and community-based education (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). Unlike senior institutions, the community colleges did not expect faculty members to engage in research. Teaching was viewed as the primary faculty role and was done for the most part as a “solo performance”. Little sharing of ideas or new applications was associated with teaching, rather teaching was primarily a process of transmitting the individual teacher’s knowledge and skills (Cohen & Brawer, 1991).
Many national leaders have become critical of higher education (Astin, 1991; Bennett, 1984; Boyer, 1987; Daly, 1994; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and a primary issue is the subordination of teaching to research in colleges and universities. While the community colleges have focused exclusively on teaching and not scholarship, Boyer (1990) suggested that the definition of scholarship should be changed in order that new meanings would include activities that improved teaching. The national condemnation of research at the exclusion of teaching served as the impetus for change in the definition of faculty roles in scholarship.

New Scholarship Roles

Diamond (1994) discussed research as an example of a paradox of academic life. While research is highly rewarded, the teaching role is at least as important and is seldom recognized. Boyer (1990) proposed that scholarship reflect what faculty actually do and he supported the triad of faculty roles: scholarship, service, and teaching. He suggested a new paradigm for scholarship consisting of four forms that describe involvements with knowledge—its discovery, integration, application, and use in teaching. According to Boyer, these forms interrelate, overlap, and complement one another.

Other shared characteristics of scholarship include seven standards that must be present (Boyer, 1990; Vaughan, 1992; Diamond, 1994; Magner, 1994):

1. A systematic process exists to obtain and/or use knowledge;
2. The work reflects a deep grounding in one’s field of knowledge or discipline;
3. Objective(s) are well-defined;
4. Suitable resources and appropriate procedures are used;
5. The work is communicated well;
6. The work is subject to peer review;
7. The work is significant in purpose and/or outcome.

Basic research, the scholarship of discovery, is concerned with the search for new knowledge. Integration is a synthesizing of knowledge which seeks connections and new contexts for knowledge. Knowledge application is a pragmatic use that attempts to solve problems such as those in real world settings. Teaching moves beyond the solitary act of transmitting an expert’s knowledge to extending and transforming knowledge and involving both a teacher and a learner interacting with knowledge (Boyer, 1990).

The Impetus for Scholarship in Community Colleges

The attention the higher education community gives to new scholarship roles has been noted by community college leaders (AACJC Report, 1988; Commonwealth of Virginia Report on The University of the 21st Century, 1988). Although a broadened definition of scholarship recently began to gain support in community colleges (Angelo, 1991; Duvall, 1992; Kroll, 1992; Palmer, 1992; Vaughan, 1991; VCCS Professional Development Task Force Report, 1993), leaders in two-year colleges still strongly support teaching as the "heart" of the community college mission (AACJC Report, 1988). Teaching scholarship, a primary emphasis for the community colleges, positively impacts the teacher and the student (Angelo, 1991).

Critics of community college outcomes such as Karabel (1986) viewed the two-
year institutions primarily as vocational schools and relegated them to the lowest level in the higher education hierarchy. However, other leaders in community colleges responded favorably to the need to change the negative community college image by encouraging and preparing faculty members to enter into a “community of scholars” (Templin, 1991; Vaughan, 1988). Research suggests that faculty members who engage in scholarship are more likely to be “vital”, contributing members of their institutions. Faculty vitality also contributes to organizational vitality (Baldwin, 1990; Bland & Schmitz, 1988). The impact of scholarship on a college’s human resources ideally serves not only the institution, but also the system of which the faculty member is a part. Most important, faculty and institutional vitality benefit the students. Scholarship, however, whether addressed in teaching or in the other forms identified by Boyer, will not be widespread without a supportive culture in the community colleges (Palmer & Vaughan, 1992).

Organizational Culture and the Community College

Institutional culture, a powerful internal influence on the values and behaviors of an organization’s members, helps to determine whether or not engagement in scholarship will become a central role for faculty. The climate for scholarship in community colleges has been influenced by their history and culture. The cultural influences are derived largely from community colleges’ close association with and their extension from secondary educational systems (Cohen & Brawer, 1991). This historic association established their strong commitment to teaching and the lack of faculty involvement with research or scholarship.
Masland (1985), in describing organizational culture notes its pervasiveness, its durability over time, and its wide array of impacts on group members’ behavior. According to Masland, culture is manifest in a group’s: a) values; b) beliefs and assumptions; c) traditions, norms, and sanctions; d) symbols and ceremonies; e) language and interactions; and f) chosen heros and leaders.

Pettigrew (1979) defines culture as a social system that provides for purpose and order, elicits member commitment, and results in a social cohesiveness within an organization. All of these characteristics prevent culture from being easily subjected to the influences that produce change.

Schein (1992) defines organizational culture as a pattern of basic assumptions that enables groups to adapt to their external environment’s problems. Masland (1985) explains the degree of impact that culture can have on an organization. He says that the strength of the cultural bond is positively correlated with the extent to which the birth disequilibrium is experienced by the organization. He also associates this bond strength to the organization’s age and cohesiveness. The bond is greatest with the increasing age of the organization and increased degree of organizational cohesiveness. The size of the organization is negatively correlated with the strength of the bond.

Vaughan (1992) views an institution’s culture as constantly evolving and as a reflection of the leader’s attitude. Based on these assumptions, it can be assumed that administrators do influence the climate for faculty scholarship in their institutions. However, Vaughan faults community college leaders for failing to articulate the value of faculty scholarship as it relates to a teaching and institutional mission. This failure puts
faculty scholarship at risk of not taking root within the community college context.

Kuh & Whitt (1988) describe institutional culture as both a process and a product in which leaders' behaviors are manifest. Tierney (1988), concerned with the significance of organizational culture in higher education, developed a framework that could be used to search for meanings in an institution's culture. These cultural manifestations and their meanings can then be used to help solve institutional problems, guide leadership toward successful ends, and support faculty scholarship.

Research on Community College Faculty Scholarship

The interest in community college scholarship is fairly recent. Although little research has been done on the subject, numerous articles exist on the topic, (Duvall, 1992; Kroll, 1992; Palmer, 1991; Parillo, 1991; Perkins, 1991; Templin, 1991; Vaughan, 1992). The culture of two-year institutions, emphasizing teaching and not research, helps explain why there are few research studies about faculty scholarship.

A study by James Palmer (1992) at George Mason University's Center for Community College Education randomly sampled 840 faculty members at 101 randomly selected two-year colleges throughout the United States. This survey sought information about faculty scholarship activities. Most notable is his finding that more than eighty-five percent of full- and part-time faculty felt they had engaged in scholarship in the most recent three years. Scholarship was defined in his study by seven broad categories consisting of the preparation, development, or presentation of conference papers, publications, instructional materials, research and technical reports, community-related
informational materials, fine and performing arts exhibits and new technology. Palmer’s research report suggests that the various activities faculty members performed are of “potential” scholarly value.

Palmer’s study identified areas of institutional support that enhanced or impeded faculty in their scholarship activities. Support tended to be primarily intangible in nature such as colleague or administrator encouragement of a faculty member’s scholarly efforts. Tangibles in the form of funds, release time, or computer access accounted for somewhat less support than the intangible forms.

Barriers identified in Palmer’s study consisted of inadequate time for scholarship due to heavy teaching loads, advising, college service, and personal responsibilities. Nearly two thirds of full-time faculty cited one or more of these barriers associated with inadequate time.

A weakness in Palmer’s 1992 study relates to the lack of a clear definition or criteria for what constitutes scholarship. There seems to be a consensus by certain leaders in higher education about the definition of and criteria for scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Vaughan, 1992; Diamond, 1994; Magner, 1994). These standards for scholarship allow for a broad array of activities while providing for a goal-directed process that is significant in purpose, is communicated to and reviewed by peers, and is deeply grounded in the scholar’s discipline. Vaughan (1992) adds to these scholarship standards the expectation that members commit themselves to “seeking truth and knowledge” as an integral part of the scholarship process.

Bowyer (1992) surveyed presidents of two-year colleges. Like Palmer, she
defined scholarship broadly, such as faculty contributions to either the teacher’s discipline or to pedagogy. The survey focused on faculty members’ scholarly activities, what recognition or rewards were available for scholarship, and whether or not scholarship was a component of the faculty evaluation process. All fifty-eight of the respondents cited examples of faculty scholarship engagements such as preparing articles for presentation or publication, holding exhibits, giving performances, or developing computer software. While nearly all respondents had formal mechanisms in place for scholarly recognition or rewards, only thirty-five colleges had a faculty evaluation system that included an expectation for scholarship.

Vaughan (1991) reports in his study focused on the publication dimension of scholarship that he surveyed administrators of two-year colleges—presidents and deans and those administrators who reported to them. At question was how these administrators would rank the production of scholarly publications as evidence of a successful administrator’s skills. Nearly all ranked this skill as the last of seventeen skills necessary for professional success.

Templin (1991) did similar research with his publication counts in ERIC. He found that more than seventy-five percent of the fifty-one community college presidents cited as authors in the ERIC database were also ranked by administrative peers as the most effective and successful presidents. Templin’s results on the importance of publishing in administrator success, are in contrast to Vaughan’s earlier study in which the perception of administrators showed that publishing was least important as an administrative skill.
In summary, the historic roots of the community colleges derived from the culture of the secondary educational systems served as a barrier to the influence of scholarship (Vaughan, 1992), while promoting a mission focused on teaching, vocational-technical education, and community service. With a changing climate in higher education, leaders in higher education now accept a broader definition of scholarship to include teaching, which makes scholarship an appropriate role in which community college faculty should engage.

Tierney’s Model of Organizational Culture: A Conceptual Framework

The study of an educational institution’s culture and its effect on faculty scholarship was viewed through the framework developed by William Tierney (1988). This conceptual framework includes the elements of environment, mission, socialization, information, leadership, and strategy.

Environment

The institutional environment provides a climate that supports what the organization’s values. Faculty scholarship requires a supportive climate or environment that ideally must consist of enablers, incentives, resources, and the absence of scholarship barriers.

Mission

The institutional mission explicitly articulates the philosophy and highest values of the institution in relation to its internal and external environments. All institutional goals, structures, and processes evolve from these statements of mission. The influences of culture on the institution can be inferred by assessing the mission and goal statements.
which give credibility, priority, and commitment to what the institution values. Therefore, if faculty scholarship is identified in an institutional mission or goal statements it increases the likelihood that institutional support or resources will be provided for these activities.

**Socialization**

The socialization of faculty members is the process by which the members take on the values and customs associated with their faculty roles and the institution where they work. Scholarship role behaviors are initially developed particularly during the process of doctoral level preparation where the ability and motivation to engage in scholarly activities are tested and nurtured. Most community college faculty members have terminated their education with a master’s degree thereby omitting this critical socialization process that prepares them for engaging in a scholarship role. This can represent a major barrier to the implementation of scholarship in the community college setting.

**Information**

The nature of information and its dissemination are affected by the institutional culture. Scholarship is an important type of faculty activity that requires widespread information dissemination to promote its achievements. Knowledge of scholarly achievements can help to increase faculty member involvement and expand the faculty member’s knowledge base.

**Leadership**

The values and actions of organization’s leaders influence faculty acceptance of and engagement in scholarship. Vaughan (1988, 1991) emphasizes the effect that leadership has on organizations in their promotion and role modeling of scholarship. He
urges present community college leaders to support faculty scholarship and to shed their perceptions that teaching is a non-scholarly pursuit.

**Strategy**

Strategies are the specific mechanisms that effectively support, promote, or give direction to scholarship activities and strategies must take into account the organization's culture with regard to scholarship. The community colleges value teaching as a central focus of their mission. A successful community college strategy would be one in which the organization fosters scholarly activities that center, not exclusively however, around the teaching role. Forms of scholarship other than teaching, while important in other higher education institutions, may not be as suitable in the two-year colleges and could result in "cultural dissonance" or a tension between what the institution's members value and the presence of conflicting values. Professional development can support scholarship through faculty training and scholarship socialization opportunities.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to assess whether the culture of a Virginia community college is supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer (1990). The study employed Tierney's model of organizational culture as a conceptual framework. This exploratory study used case study methodology in order to describe in as much detail as possible the complexity of a two-year institution of higher education and the phenomenon of faculty scholarship. The case study method yields contextual, heuristic, and holistic results (Merriam, 1991).

Tierney's Model of Organizational Culture

The Tierney model consists of six elements (environment, mission, socialization, information, leadership, and strategies) that influence an educational institution. These elements frame this study's major research question and all subsidiary questions that follow relating to faculty scholarship and organizational culture.

Major Research Question

The major research question--Is the culture in a public two-year institution of higher
education in Virginia supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer—is clarified by the following operational definitions:

1. Culture is defined as the holistic, contextual-based, and subjective set of attitudes, values, beliefs, and assumptions held by members of a group. This culture is manifested by institutional symbols, ceremonies, sanctions, leadership, history, saga, language, myths or stories, architecture, or socialization patterns (Kuh & Whitt, 1988);

2. The public two-year institution of higher education in Virginia selected for this study is John Tyler Community College (JTCC);

3. All references to faculty in this project are to full-time teaching faculty, not administrative faculty, unless stated otherwise;

4. Scholarship is defined by Ernest Boyer as the discovery, integration, or application of knowledge or its transmission, transformation, and extension in teaching; and;

5. This activity of scholarship is done as a systematic, goal-oriented process that is subjected to peer-review, communicated widely, uses resources appropriately, has significant purpose or outcomes that results in a product, and requires an in-depth knowledge of a discipline.

Data Collection

Sixteen subsidiary and nineteen open-ended interview questions were developed from Tierney’s framework of organizational culture to examine a community college’s culture.
Subsidiary and Interview Questions

Fourteen subsidiary questions emerged from Tierney’s elements of environment, mission, socialization, information, leadership, and strategies: From the list of subsidiary questions nineteen interview questions were developed. The subsidiary and interview questions appear in Table 3.1. Data were collected by the researcher from both interview and document sources at JTCC and the Virginia Community College System. (At the onset of the interviews, the faculty and administrator respondents received information about Boyer’s scholarship standards and roles used to define scholarship in this study).¹

¹(Note to interviewee): Please take a minute or two to read the following brief description of scholarship roles and scholarship standards as defined by Ernest Boyer. Standards indicate that scholarship: 1) is a systematic process; 2) is deeply grounded in a discipline knowledge base that reflects current thinking in the field; 3) has well-defined objective(s); 4) uses suitable resources and methods; 5) is communicated (to peers); 6) is subject to peer review; and 7) has a significant purpose or outcome resulting in a product. Scholarship is practiced by following the above set of standards for each of the four scholarship roles: 1) teaching scholarship; 2) application scholarship; 3) integration scholarship; and 4) discovery scholarship. Scholarship types: discovery, integration, application, teaching, and examples given for each type from Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. 1990.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidiary Questions:</th>
<th>Interview Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How does the institution define its larger environment?</td>
<td>1. How would you describe JTCC’s external environment? Probes: Its key elements and constituencies, service areas and the public it serves, and its external agencies—Virginia Community College System (VCCS), State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV), state legislators, state and local community college boards, professional accrediting bodies, and the loose national alliance of community colleges. (respondents: JTCC faculty, administrators, VCCS’s chancellor, and VCCS’s director of professional development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How does the larger community college environment perceive scholarship as a faculty role for the community college?</td>
<td>2. Given the existence of JTCC's external environment, how do you think these external constituencies perceive scholarship within the community college? (JTCC faculty and administrators, VCCS chancellor and director of professional development) Probes: see #1 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the institution's mission statement identify scholarship as a major institutional and faculty role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there widespread agreement that scholarship is a major faculty role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are scholarship roles as described by Ernest Boyer defined and differentiated within this institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the roles you identified as commonly practiced at JTCC implemented according to Boyer's seven standards for scholarship? (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Socialization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How are community college faculty socialized into scholarship roles as defined by Ernest Boyer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When new faculty join this college, now are they introduced to scholarship? (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What do veteran faculty at JTCC communicate to you about scholarship as an important role? (respondents: JTCC faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do academic leaders communicate the importance of faculty scholarship?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How is information on scholarship disseminated to faculty?</td>
<td>1. How is information about the college’s expectation for scholarship disseminated to faculty? (JTCC faculty &amp; administrators, VCCS chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is information about support for scholarship disseminated to faculty at JTCC? (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do official college documents emphasize the importance of faculty scholarship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are faculty informed that scholarship is related to performance outcomes and faculty evaluation process?</td>
<td>4. How are faculty at JTCC made aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation? (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What role do leaders play in promoting scholarship within the college?</td>
<td>1. What do leaders of this college do to promote scholarship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who are the individuals who have been the most effective in promoting scholarship?</td>
<td>2. What person(s) at JTCC is/are the most effective in promoting scholarship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary and Interview Questions: Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What policies exist in support of faculty scholarship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What resources exist to support faculty scholarship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What professional development opportunities support faculty scholarship at JTCC? (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What resources, other than professional development opportunities, support scholarship at JTCC? (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How does the institution recognize faculty scholarship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How is scholarship recognized and rewarded at JTCC? (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Study Sample

The community college selected for this study was John Tyler Community College (JTCC) in Chesterfield County, Virginia. JTCC was chosen as the study site because it is fairly representative of other colleges in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS)—member colleges share central leadership from the system’s chancellor, a common mission, and like policies that affect each college’s funding and personnel policies that affect faculty work, pay, and promotion. In addition, the selection of JTCC was based on its accessibility to the researcher.

The sample used for this study consisted of twenty-one of the college’s sixty-four
full-time teaching faculty (Table 3.2) and all of the academic administrators at the college (Table 3.3). The chancellor of the Virginia Community College System and the system's director of professional development were also interviewed because both play an important role in influencing system policies and allocating the system's resources for the scholarship activities at JTCC (Table 3.4). In addition, the college and VCCS's documents that related to the study purpose were analyzed.

JTCC is a two-year institution of higher education established as part of a statewide system of twenty-three community colleges in Virginia. The college's first students were admitted in October 1967. JTCC operates under the policies established by the VCCS. The system is headed by a chancellor, the college by a president, and like all Virginia community colleges, JTCC is financed primarily by state-appropriated funds which are supplemented by student tuition and the contributions from the localities in its region.

JTCC serves the residents of ten localities comprised of three local cities and towns and seven surrounding counties. The college offers technical education, curricula for student transfer to senior institutions, and adult education.

The increasing demand for JTCC offerings has resulted in the plan to create a second campus in northern Chesterfield County. The original and largest campus, Chester, is located in the southern part of Chesterfield County. During the 1994-1995 academic year, the college served 9,094 credit and 10,044 non-credit students (1994-1995 John Tyler Community College Catalog)
Faculty

The faculty members were selected on the basis of their ability to answer the interview questions, regardless of their actual involvement in scholarship, and to insure a broad representation of academic fields. A larger percentage of associate professors and professors were interviewed because they could bring a longer historical perspective to their responses since most had more years of college service than instructors or assistant professors.

The study gathered information on participants’ rank, gender, years of service at JTCC, academic field, and campus assignment (Table 3.2). The faculty sample included two faculty members at the instructor level, two members at the assistant professor level, nine members at the associate professor level, and eight members at the professor level.

The faculty sample was composed of nine females and twelve males whose years of service at the college ranged from one year to twenty-nine years. Twenty-nine percent of the twenty-one faculty had five years or less of service and nineteen percent had between six and fifteen years of service. The largest percentage of the interviewed faculty members had between sixteen and twenty-five years of service and the smallest percentage had twenty-six to twenty-nine years of service at the college.

The total number of faculty members at each campus included nine full-time faculty members at the Midlothian Campus and fifty-five faculty members at the Chester Campus. Of that total number eighteen faculty were interviewed at the Chester Campus and three were interviewed at the Midlothian Campus. The number of interviewees at each campus represented thirty-three percent of each campus’s full-time faculty.
Two faculty members were interviewed from each of the following academic fields: accounting, biological and natural sciences, business, drafting and engineering technologies, math, nursing, physical therapy assisting, and psychology. Three faculty members were interviewed from English and only one each from architecture and history. Only one history and one architecture faculty member was employed at the college and each had no counterpart in a similar discipline to interview.

The faculty member in architecture has a degree in architectural engineering: his counterpart’s degree is in engineering. The selection of two faculty members from a discipline were deliberately selected, whenever possible, to enable the researcher to corroborate data that may have been influenced by a disciplinary perspective.

Five faculty members who were asked to participate refused for one of the following reasons. a) retirement was imminent; b) would give no reason; or c) was too busy to be interviewed. The demographics of the five faculty members who were unwilling to participate were three females and two males in the disciplines of English, reading, mathematics, and history.

Administrators

All of the five academic administrators at JTCC were interviewed (Table 3.3). These administrators included the college’s president, the dean of academic and student services, and the three associate deans, each of whom was assigned to one of the three academic divisions. The two academic divisions at the Chester Campus were the allied health, business and technologies division and the arts and sciences and public services division. Only one division, the arts and sciences and business division, existed at the
Midlothian Campus.

The gender of the administrators consisted of two females and three males. The five administrators had fifteen or fewer years of college service with the range extending from two to fifteen years. Two were hired for their roles within the past two years.

In addition to the JTCC administrators, the chancellor and the director of professional development of the VCCS were interviewed (Table 3.4) because, as members of the college’s external environment, each plays an important role in influencing scholarship.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank:</th>
<th>Sample Number:</th>
<th>Percent of Sample:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Field</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and Natural Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy Assisting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total full-time Faculty by Campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty sample size by Campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3

**John Tyler Community College Administrator Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator sample:</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Titles:

- President of John Tyler Community College
- Dean of Academic and Student Services
- Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences, Public Services - Chester Campus
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John Tyler Community College Administrator Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Allied Health, Business and Technologies - Chester Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences, Business - Midlothian Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of John Tyler Community College Service:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4

Virginia Community College System Administrator Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator sample size:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Development for the Virginia Community College System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Qualitative data from interview questions were organized into categories which emerged from the responses of JTCC faculty and administrators, the VCCS chancellor and the director of professional development. Interview responses were subsequently
tabulated as quantitative data and presented in eighteen tables using numbers and percentages to represent the frequency counts for interview responses. Data from the first interview question are discussed, but the data are not shown in a table because of the many and varied responses that this question elicited. Triangulation of data was achieved by comparing data from faculty and administrator interviews with data from college documents.

**Delimitations of Present Study**

Delimitations in this study relate to the interview data and document data. Interview data were gathered from college and system respondents to assess the perceptions of JTCC's constituencies-at-large and their view of community college scholarship rather than interviewing the actual constituencies. The large number of external constituencies and the inaccessibility of these external constituencies served as a barrier to eliciting their direct responses.

Minutes of the JTCC standing committees from 1990-1995 for the Administrative Council, Academic & Student Services, Academic Divisions, and the Faculty Association do not appear to contain a complete set of entries for all of the committees' purported meeting schedules, if in fact, the committees did meet as scheduled.
CHAPTER FOUR: INTERVIEWS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

The purpose of this qualitative and quantitative, exploratory study is to assess whether the culture of a Virginia community college is supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer (1990). The community college selected for this study is John Tyler Community College (JTCC) in Chesterfield County, Virginia.

Organization of the Study Findings

The findings from the interview questions and documents are organized by their relation to elements in Tierney’s model of organizational culture. The six elements in Tierney’s model are: environment, mission, socialization, information, leadership, and strategies. The data obtained from faculty and administrator sources for each interview question, except for the first question, are shown in separate tables. Each table with data from each interview question is discussed separately and includes the related document analysis and summary.

Data displayed in tables are listed by the number and percent of faculty or administrator respondents who gave a selected response to each question. A percentage in a table that exceeds 100 percent indicates that one or more of the faculty or administrator group members gave more than one response for the specific interview.
Tierney's Element of Organizational Culture: Environment

The internal environment of JTCC, as it relates to faculty scholarship, is analyzed through Tierney's framework for viewing an organization's culture—a culture that consists of mission, socialization, information, leadership, and strategies. The external environment is viewed through the interview responses to questions one and two and the documents related to those questions.

The faculty and administrators were asked the following questions to assess their perception of the external environment of JTCC: (a) How would you describe JTCC's external environment? and (b) Given the existence of JTCC's external environment, how do you think these external constituencies perceive scholarship as a faculty role within the community college? By asking these two questions the study gives consideration to the importance of the relationship that external environments have upon the internal operations of an institution of higher education.

The Geography and the Service Area

JTCC faculty and administrator respondents were asked to give their impressions of the college's external environment. The focus of their responses included both the external environment's geography and service area.

Faculty

In response to the first question—"How would you describe JTCC's external environment?"—faculty members described the service region's geography, the
demographics of the community-at-large, and the college’s students. Faculty members also gave details about many of the constituencies in the community-at-large.

The diverse geography surrounding JTCC varies from urban to suburban to rural areas. The region is extensive and includes seven counties. One faculty member perceived the college as having a service region with “the greatest diversity of all the community colleges in Virginia” (faculty respondent #15). Another faculty member described the college’s service region as principally rural, multi-cultural, and, especially, socioeconomically diverse (faculty respondent #2). Faculty respondents note that the Midlothian area of northern Chesterfield expects to break ground soon for a permanent campus and is a region that is experiencing very rapid growth.

Administrators

The geography of JTCC’s service area, as described by administrators, is rich in its diversity, is one of the three largest of the twenty-three community colleges in the state system, and encompasses eleven different political jurisdictions. (However, within several weeks after the completion of these administrative interviews, the VCCS reassigned a portion of the JTCC service area, the portion of the city of Richmond that is south of the James River, to another community college thus reducing this college’s political jurisdictions to ten.)

The Students

JTCC faculty and administrator respondents discussed the external college environment in relation to the students that the college serves.
Faculty

Faculty members were able to describe many details about the college's student population. Like the service regions they represent, the students are diverse in age, socioeconomic levels, and cultural backgrounds, and have diverse educational needs. The minority population was described as consisting primarily of indigenous minorities with very few immigrants, in contrast to the majority population which is primarily Caucasian. This student diversity at JTCC, one professor noted, "creates many educational challenges for the college such as the need for developmental studies [to eliminate high school deficiencies]" (faculty respondent #17).

The statistical profile of the students at JTCC supports the faculty members' descriptions of student demographic diversity. The college's student body is more than 60% female, the average student age is thirty-one, and the student body consists of 75% Caucasian with 20% African-American and 5% other minorities (John Tyler Community College Annual Unduplicated Student Enrollment Booklet for 1994-1995).

Administrators

Administrators are concerned about student enrollments. One administrator talked about the competition between the college and the five neighboring educational institutions for the same student population pool at a time when student enrollments are declining (administrator respondent #2). Another administrator talked about the increasing number of college transfer students at the Midlothian Campus (administrator respondent #4).
The Community-at-large and its Representatives

The college’s community-at-large includes a broad group of constituencies consisting of all of the service area populations. Also considered to be a part of the community-at-large are groups that exist outside the college’s service area and influence the educational entity that is JTCC.

Faculty

The various constituencies discussed by faculty that compose JTCC’s community-at-large consisted of the entire population of 460,000 residents in the college’s service region in 1995. Faculty describe the constituencies as: 1) a diverse group of private citizens, 2) agencies that include business and industry and health care agencies, and 3) political entities representing state and local government. Other educationally related entities from the college’s greater external community include the Virginia Community College System (VCCS), the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV), the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the secondary school systems, other institutions of higher education, and professional accreditation agencies for the college’s occupational-technical programs.

Two state educational entities serve JTCC in varying roles. The VCCS is the governing body for the twenty-three community colleges in the two-year college system in Virginia. The VCCS provides external support to the college in many ways, and with regard to scholarship, particularly through its Professional Development Initiative which includes VCCS Faculty Research Grants and other professional development opportunities that are available to all Virginia community colleges.
SCHEV serves as the coordinating body for private and public colleges of higher education in Virginia, including VCCS and its subunits. Both organizations, VCCS and SCHEV, derive their governing authority from the Virginia legislature.

Accreditation of colleges is done by SACS, a regional accrediting organization for higher education which has institutional quality control as a focus. Accreditation of curricula and specific programs is provided by private professional organizations such as the National League of Nursing. Accreditation of agencies and programs confers legitimacy to colleges and to programs and ensures the quality of educational outcomes. Conflicts existed, at times, between occupational-technical accreditation standards and SAC’s accreditation standards, according to faculty respondents.

Faculty talked about the relationship of the college and its staff to some of the external constituencies that the JTCC serves. One faculty member described the generosity of an acute care health agency that “provided $50,000 in funds to outfit a health program’s school laboratory at JTCC and also provided students with scholarships” (faculty respondent #8).

Other faculty members were not as complimentary about the college’s relationships with the local business communities. One faculty member said that “our discipline is isolated from the business community we serve and we do not draw upon its expertise” (faculty respondent #20). This same faculty member talked about the relationship between the members of the college’s academic faculty in the business division and the Center for Business, Industry and Government (BIGS) at JTCC as an example of a “splintered community, not a family.” In support of the college’s
relationship with its business constituents, another faculty member perceived this relationship to be a positive one in which the community is “receptive” to JTCC because, for example, industry needs skilled employees [which the college can provide]” (faculty respondent #16).

Finally, one faculty member asserted that, at least with regard to college business offerings, JTCC needed to “explore new ways to fund our efforts to deliver instruction and engage in retraining. . . . and to expand our Weekend College, to work more cooperatively with high schools and senior educational institutions [to create a more seamless educational process for students], and to integrate more technology into the classroom” (faculty respondent #13). One faculty respondent expressed a “disappointment” with the college’s working relationship with the local high schools (faculty respondent #18).

Administrators

Administrators described the relationship between JTCC and the VCCS as one in which the VCCS has the rights of governance over the college and for which the VCCS represents a fairly centralized system. This relationship with VCCS is viewed by the college as a supportive one in which the system provides JTCC with the resources that it would otherwise not have, such as access to research data and assistance with the college’s requests for help on capital outlay projects, curriculum, funding, and technology.

SCHEV is considered to be necessary to the college because it provides indirect support from grant funding and special programs’ funding, but administrator respondents
indicate that SCHEV is also intrusive. One administrator was critical of SCHEV’s community college funding and enrollment projection models and asserted that new models were needed (administrator respondent #4). SACS received high praise from JTCC’s president. His strong support of SACS relates, in part, to the “proactive” role SACS plays in implementing institutional effectiveness in higher education.

The role of discipline-accrediting bodies for occupational-technical programs such as nursing and physical therapy assisting is seen by at least one administrator as exhibiting “tunnel vision.” Their narrow discipline focus and exclusivity, which the college views as a “mixed blessing,” was cited as the reason for the administrator’s perception of discipline accreditors (administrator respondent #5).

One administrator viewed the power of the local board for JTCC as less than the power of the college’s foundation board which consists of influential business and community leaders. The local board members serve only to advise the president of JTCC, while the foundation board is instrumental in raising funds that directly support the college and its mission.

A senior administrator described the segment of the community-at-large consisting of the areas of business, industry, and health care as very diverse (administrator respondent #5). The business ranges from light business to heavy industry, and also has a large degree of retail businesses. An administrator, who was somewhat critical of the relationship between the JTCC and its business community, said that while the service area at the “Chester Campus is highly industrialized, more involvement with progressive, new businesses is needed” (administrator respondent #1).
Summary

The faculty and administrators discussed many of the same constituencies in the college’s community-at-large with the exception of the college’s local board, which only one senior administrator addressed. Respondents gave mixed reviews consisting of criticism and praise for each of the external constituencies such as SCHEV, VCCS, professional accrediting bodies in occupational-technical disciplines, and business and industry served by the college.

Faculty and administrators did not consistently agree about the value of the professional accrediting bodies. Faculty saw the professional accrediting bodies as valuable, while at least one senior administrator stated that the college and the programs’ accreditors have differed, at times, in their priorities about the use and availability of JTCC resources that should be provided for the programs (administrator respondent #5).

The external environment of JTCC was discussed broadly by faculty and administrators with a variety of comments. Faculty and administrator respondents expressed concern about meeting the needs of business and industry, a concern derived from the college’s recognition that it needs more resources to acquire more up-to-date college program equipment and technology and to enable the college’s faculty to remain current in their disciplines.

In summary, the responses that the faculty members and administrators focused on are: a) the diversity of the community-at-large, the community’s students and its businesses and industries; b) the competition that exists between JTCC and other local two- and four-year colleges for a similar student pool; c) the increasing demand by
students for college transfer courses; d) the strong continuing demand for allied health programs; e) the support provided by the VCCS through its initiatives for faculty in professional development and research grants and; f) the increasing reliance of JTCC on external resources other than that supplied by the state legislature (e.g., the JTCC Foundation fund).

The internal institutional support and climate for faculty scholarship at JTCC is, in part, dependent upon the college's constituencies (private citizens, political entities, educational entities, business and industry) in the external environment. These constituencies play an important part in influencing the college's mission, priorities, and culture, and in providing the college with financial resources, and leadership. This external support enables JTCC to carry out its mission and, in effect, to indirectly influence faculty scholarship at JTCC.
Findings in Table 4.1

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #2 - Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Scholarship is valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Scholarship is not valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Scholarship view is neutral or unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Some faculty members identified one or more constituencies and whether or not the cited constituency (ies) valued scholarship. In some cases a faculty member stated that one constituency, such as the VCCS, valued scholarship, while indicating that other external constituencies did not value scholarship (faculty respondent #6, 8). Slightly less than half of the JTCC faculty members interviewed thought that one or more of the college’s external constituencies did value scholarship as a faculty role in the community college (47%). Another 26% of faculty respondents differed from previous faculty respondents and indicated that external constituencies did not value faculty scholarship in the community college. The remaining 42% of faculty respondents said that the external constituencies had either a neutral or uncertain view of scholarship as a community college.
faculty role. The faculty respondents give a mixed view with no clear majority answer as to whether the college’s external constituencies perceive scholarship as a faculty role in the community college.

The faculty discussed the perceptions of the external constituencies’ views in several ways. For example, nine of the nineteen faculty respondents indicated that the community-at-large considered teaching, faculty currency in their discipline, or technology to be important at the community college irrespective of their views about the importance of scholarship (faculty respondents #1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 18, 20, 21). Five faculty members stated that the VCCS supported scholarship and provided resources and encouragement for faculty to engage in it (faculty respondents # 6, 10, 12, 13, 17). Except for the VCCS’s support for scholarship, faculty cited little other external support for scholarship by the various external constituencies.

Administrators

Administrators gave opposing responses about the external constituencies’ views of faculty scholarship in the community college. Three respondents (60%) said that the external groups valued scholarship (administrator respondents #3, 4, 5). Two (40%) indicated that these constituencies had either a neutral or an uncertain view about scholarship as a faculty role in the community college (administrator respondents # 1, 2).

A senior administrator indicated that the external constituencies’ perceptions varied by group. He stated, “The perception of scholarship as a faculty role at JTCC is a reflection of the level of sophistication of the specific constituency . . . and is more valued in [one county service area than others served by the college]” (administrator respondent
A second administrator indicated that the constituencies had an uncertain view or neutral view of scholarship. "I'm not sure the constituencies even consider scholarship, an exception might be the students in [one specific occupational-technical discipline]" (administrator respondent #1).

A third administrator presented a somewhat critical view of faculty scholarship from the perspective of the external agency, the VCCS. This administrator stated that, "The chancellor touts professional development and scholarship as important. He provides action and support for [it]; but by the time it filters down to us [at the college], it is only modest [support]" (administrator respondent #4). Still another administrator saw the system's view of scholarship in a more benevolent way and stated that, "The VCCS encourages, applauds, and supports [scholarship], but considers it to be voluntary" (administrator respondent #3).

Virginia Community College System Administrators

Two important members of JTCC's external environment, the system's chancellor and the director of professional development, gave their views about scholarship at JTCC system-wide. The chancellor of the VCCS described scholarship as "an incumbent role for all faculty members in the community colleges." "Professional development is in a healthy state at JTCC. The college's president and dean value it, and if professional development is a litmus test for faculty scholarship, then scholarship at JTCC is healthy also" (system administrator respondent #1).

The VCCS's director of professional development agreed with the chancellor and
stated, "Their president indicates a commitment to it [professional development] and the college (community) is actively engaged in our [professional development] initiatives . . . [and] I view professional development as a very similar framework to that of scholarship" (system administrator respondent #2).

The chancellor discussed scholarship and professional development in relation to the system and community colleges nationally. "Like professional development, scholarship is an individual's responsibility. The national system of community colleges tends not to want to invest in it, but does give it 'lip service.' There is even a segment of that community that could be characterized as anti-intellectual" (system administrator respondent #1).

The chancellor stated that the entire community college milieu is responsible for the status of scholarship and explained that community colleges nationally do not support scholarship—that these colleges are too enrollment-focused, and that the many community colleges lack an awareness of the value of scholarship. Other reasons included the fact that community colleges have experienced a decline in funding, and some in the college community view the teaching mission and scholarship as a dichotomy. The chancellor, in speculating about the future of scholarship in the system, asserted that, "Five years from now there will be a much greater and clearer sense of faculty scholarship in the VCCS and we will talk about it more! But the first step was to initiate a professional development process and we've done that." The chancellor concluded his view of scholarship by adding, "Our culture and history are responsible for our views on scholarship."
The comment by the system's director of professional development, that the framework for professional development and scholarship are similar, was not explained or clear. Further, the director of professional development seemed to prefer the use of other words or phrases associating faculty with learners or professional development rather than scholarship. When scholarship was discussed, neither system administrator associated scholarship with a clear definition such as that used by Ernest Boyer, which addresses scholarship roles and standards.

**Documents**

Three external agency policies or documents in the VCCS exist in support of faculty scholarship at JTCC. These documents are education and sabbatical leaves and the Chancellor's Fellowship (1994); the VCCS's policy document on faculty qualifications for rank; and the VCCS's Professional Development Initiative: Faculty Research Grants (1994). VCCS policies apply to each community college in Virginia.

The policy document that exists in the VCCS for faculty qualifications in rank describes several ways of engaging in professional activities. One example given is to engage in classroom or discipline-based research or to publish (VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.2.0.2). The VCCS also has a document, titled Professional Development Initiative, that contains grant support for faculty research. One specific program, the Faculty Research Grant, does appear to be related to scholarship. These research grants are available for faculty system-wide. The criteria for engaging in this grant process are similar, if not the same as, Boyer's criteria or standards for scholarship used in this study. It could, therefore, be considered scholarship by this study's definition.
The nature of the research for these VCCS faculty grants could also include, but is not limited to, any of Boyer’s four types of scholarship for teaching, application, integration, or discovery. In addition, the system in partnership with JTCC does provide funds and leaves of absence for graduate study and personal renewal during which scholarship may take place (VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.7.8.1 Chancellor’s Fellowship; Policy 3.7.8.2 Sabbatical Leave; Policy 3.9.1 Educational Leave).

In 1995 one hundred leaders from the JTCC service areas were surveyed by the college’s foundation, and the survey results strongly indicate that professional development should be one of the top three priorities for foundation fund-raising use. The survey results indicate that members of the college’s community-at-large do value the professional development activities of faculty. The JTCC Foundation, a private and tax-exempt entity, exists to provide support for college needs. Two areas of foundation funding for JTCC faculty include professional development opportunities and faculty grant support (for minigrants). Uses of the minigrants are to develop curricula and to fund professional development activities such as workshop attendance. There is no documentation that verifies if these foundation-funded activities constitute scholarship, but this source of funding could help support scholarship, if scholarship was expected and defined at the college within the structure of professional development and minigrants.

Professional development differs from scholarship in purpose and performance criteria. Professional development is the acquisition of knowledge and skills to benefit the person who engages in it and for which the faculty member’s institution may indirectly derive benefits. Scholarship is the quest for knowledge in which something significant to
the discipline(s) is produced and shared with peers. Scholarship has criteria that define it and can serve to assess its quality. Professional development opportunities may, at times, support scholarship, and like scholarship, may have similar outcomes that benefit an individual, an agency, or society. Documents do not exist that specifically discuss the distinction between professional development activities and faculty scholarship at JTCC.

Summary

The majority of administrator respondents did state that JTCC's external constituencies value scholarship, but that majority is represented by only one administrator (i.e., 3 of 5 respondents). The faculty respondents gave a mixed response about whether scholarship is valued by the college's external constituencies: responses suggested that scholarship is valued (47%), not valued (26%), and the constituencies' view of scholarship is unknown or uncertain (42%).

The system's chancellor and its director of professional development focused on the status of professional development in the VCCS and at JTCC. The chancellor speculated that scholarship may become an incumbent role in the future, but "needs further understanding" because faculty would, he suspects, resist a scholarship role now. VCCS appears to value scholarship somewhat because it states as one of its examples of professional activities for faculty that classroom or discipline research may take place; but the VCCS does not give it any priority over the other twelve listed activities that includes, among others, conference attendance. VCCS does provide resources through its faculty research grants, grants which appear to be similar to Boyer's definition of and standards for scholarship.
These findings seem to indicate that scholarship is valued to some degree by at least one external agency, the VCCS. It is not evident, however, that the college's external constituencies value scholarship as a major faculty role in the community college.
Tierney's Element of Institutional Culture: Mission

Findings in Table 4.2 and 4.3

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 3 - Mission</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is scholarship a major role of faculty at this institution?</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Yes</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 No</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 4 - Mission</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On what do you base your conclusions in Question # 3?</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Extrinsic Motivators are missing</td>
<td>13 (93%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Intrinsic Motivators are missing</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Two-thirds of the interviewed faculty said that scholarship is not a major role of JTCC faculty. The vast majority of faculty cited the absence of extrinsic motivators as the primary reason (93%). Missing external motivators included a reward system, scholarship
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expectations, leadership and resources to support scholarship. Only four faculty stated that the lack of internal motivation explained why scholarship is not a major role of faculty at JTCC (faculty respondents #9, 10, 14, 17).

Thirty-three percent of faculty did feel that scholarship is a major faculty role. Two respondents who supported this viewpoint gave reasons for their 'yes' response—they explained that their discipline or professions expected it and the college expected it with regard to the use of technology (faculty respondents #2, 13).

Another faculty member stated that the college's mission was currently under review and that faculty scholarship was being given more emphasis (faculty respondent #11). This same respondent also said that, "The college should make clear to both its internal and external constituencies that JTCC expects its faculty to engage in scholarship."

**Administrators**

Most administrators agreed that faculty engagement in scholarship was not a major role at JTCC (80%) because external motivators are lacking. They identified several such missing factors that included adequate resources, a reward system, and an expectation of scholarship that is evident in the evaluation process. The only administrator who stated that scholarship is a major role based this response on the fact that the college's mission is focused on teaching, and the emphasis for faculty is teaching improvement (administrator respondent #2). However, it is unclear how this respondent saw teaching as evidence of scholarship.
JTCC’s Long Range Plan for 1990-1996 contains mission, goals, and objectives that address resource planning. Three areas of college commitment in this mission statement have relevance to JTCC’s intent to provide support for faculty needs. The college’s mission statements indicate: that learning occurs in every segment of the college’s community; that JTCC is responsive to ongoing innovation in curriculum and instruction; and that the institution’s environment fosters professionalism (JTCC Long Range Goals & Objectives: Goal #1/Objectives 1.1, 1.4 and Goal #2/Objectives 2.9, 2.10).

If these goal statements specifically addressed scholarship, then it is likely that scholarship could emerge as a major role of faculty at JTCC. The omission of faculty scholarship in the mission and goal statements leaves unclear the extent to which faculty scholarship is valued by the institution.

By contrast, the mission and goal statements do address professional development for faculty, and while professional development and faculty scholarship are related in some respects, they are not the same. Scholarship is a pursuit to advance knowledge, while the intent of professional development is to revitalize faculty.

One reference to scholarship is found in the VCCS policy manual which describes faculty qualifications for rank and lists examples of possible professional activities and contributions in which a faculty member may engage. One such activity listed is “engaging in classroom-based research to improve teaching or in discipline-based research and publication” (VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.2.0.2, 1994). This is one of thirteen examples in which faculty may choose to engage as evidence of professional performance,
and the only one which can be associated clearly with scholarship.

Summary

In interviews, 67% of faculty respondents and 80% of administrator respondents did not consider scholarship to be a major role of faculty at JTCC. The primary reason given by respondents is that extrinsic motivators—a reward system, expectations for scholarship, and resources—are missing. Faculty, but not administrators, cited the lack of leadership on an external level as a reason why scholarship is not a major faculty role.

The resources that both faculty and administrators identified as lacking were inadequate faculty time to engage in scholarship and inadequate funding for the pursuit of scholarship. No administrators and only a small percentage of faculty (31%) cited the absence of intrinsic motivators, or faculty motivation, as the reason why scholarship engagement at JTCC is not a major role for faculty.

Furthermore, the JTCC mission, goal statements, and related objectives do not use the word “scholarship.” The mission statement document does confer importance on professional development by its inclusion in this document. Because scholarship is not the same as professional development and because scholarship is not identified in the mission document, the college does not appear to confer importance upon scholarship as a faculty role. Therefore, the mission seems consistent with the reality described by faculty and administrators who said that scholarship is not a major role of faculty at JTCC.
Findings in Table 4.4

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 5 - Mission</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the types of scholarship roles defined by Ernest Boyer are commonly practiced at John Tyler Community College?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Teaching</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Application</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Integration</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 Discovery</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 No roles practiced</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The largest percentages of interviewed faculty stated that two types of scholarship roles identified by Ernest Boyer—teaching (75%) and application (60%) scholarship—were commonly practiced at JTCC. The two types of scholarship that were cited as least commonly practiced were the scholarship of integration (15%) and of discovery (10%). Two faculty (10%) said that none of the four types of scholarship were commonly practiced at JTCC (faculty respondents # 17, 18).

Administrators

Similarly, most administrators said that only two types, teaching scholarship (80%) and application scholarship (80%), were commonly practiced at the college. One
administrator indicated that the scholarship of integration was commonly practiced and all agreed that the scholarship of discovery was not commonly practiced at JTCC (administrator #3).

**Documents**

No documents were found that indicated that JTCC does commonly practice any form of scholarship. The policy and procedure manual of the VCCS describes the responsibilities of the teaching faculty member throughout the system including JTCC. This description that does not include a stated, required scholarship role. The professional role example that is given, classroom- and discipline-based research and publication, is just one of thirteen activities identified in which faculty may engage to meet professional responsibilities and the only one which is associated with scholarship (*VCCS Policy Manual*, Policy 3.4.2.0.2, 1994). This example, however, does not include any scholarship standards like those used in this study.

**Summary**

The majority of faculty and administrators agreed that teaching and application scholarship were the most commonly practiced and that the scholarship of integration and discovery were the least frequently practiced types of scholarship at JTCC. The responses of faculty and administrators, that some forms of scholarship were frequently practiced, seems to contradict a response to an earlier question in which faculty and administrators said that scholarship was not a major role of faculty at the college.

Further, the major college document, the *John Tyler Community College Mission and Long Range Goals: 1990-1996*, because it contains no reference to scholarship helps
explain why scholarship is not a priority, and therefore, not a major role at the college.

Document findings provide no evidence that scholarship as defined by Boyer is commonly practiced at JTCC despite interview findings that indicate that scholarship is commonly practiced at JTCC.

**Findings in Table 4.5**

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 6 - Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the scholarship roles identified as commonly practiced at John Tyler Community College, implemented according to Ernest Boyer's seven standards?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Yes</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 No</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty**

Two-thirds of the faculty members (67%) said that when scholarship is commonly practiced at JTCC not all of the seven standards identified by Ernest Boyer are implemented. Peer review was most frequently cited as absent or, at best, informal and infrequent. This might be explained in part by the unwillingness of faculty “to expose themselves to others’ values or critiques” (faculty respondent #17). Only one-third of the faculty respondents state that scholarship engagement at JTCC was implemented using the seven standards listed by Boyer.
Administrators

Most administrators (80%) responded that five of Boyer's standards were not followed when faculty engaged in scholarship roles at the college. The missing standards are that scholarship:

1. is a systematic process;
2. contains (a) well defined objective(s);
3. is implemented using suitable resources and methods;
4. is communicated to peers; and
5. is subject to peer review.

The two Boyer standards—that scholarship is deeply grounded in a discipline knowledge base, and that scholarship is significant in purpose or outcome—administrator respondents cited as always implemented when scholarship is commonly practiced at JTCC. Only one administrator respondent stated that when scholarship at the college is practiced all of Boyer’s standards are met (administrator respondent #4).

Documents

Two documents exist in the VCCS and one at JTCC that address faculty roles. The documents focus on the qualifications for faculty rank and the job description of a faculty member (VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.2.0.2, Professional Activities and Contributions; Policy 3.6 Faculty Responsibilities; and JTCC Policy Manual, Policy 3.72 Individual Responsibilities of [Teaching] Faculty). All VCCS policies apply to JTCC. Only a single reference in the system document for professional contributions lists an activity as an example for faculty that is encouraged in order for them to meet their
professional responsibilities. This activity, one of thirteen and the only one that could be clearly construed as scholarship, is classroom- or discipline-based research with publication. No standards like Boyer’s for scholarship engagement are included in the VCCS policies for faculty.

JTCC faculty have received seven VCCS Faculty Research Grants since the grant initiatives began in 1994 (system administrator respondent #2). These grants do appear to resemble closely Boyer’s definition and criteria for scholarship. Samples of these grants were not reviewed.

The JTCC Foundation awards summer minigrants to five faculty per academic year. Partial records available for 1994 to 1996 (JTCC memo: “Foundation Minigrants”, April 1996) show that grant topics included course and discipline projects. The foundation grant’s outline does not appear to require the set of seven standards by Boyer that are considered in this study to define scholarship.

Summary

The majority of faculty (67%) and administrator (80%) respondents said that the scholarship roles that are commonly practiced at JTCC are not implemented according to all seven standards of scholarship identified by Ernest Boyer. This omission of standards raises serious doubts as to whether the activities that respondents refer to as scholarship are actually scholarship with the possible exception of the VCCS Faculty Research Grants. These appear to meet Boyer’s criteria. To date, seven college faculty members have completed VCCS Faculty Research Grants.

Faculty respondents most often cited the absence of a formal peer review of
scholarship activities as the standard that was not met at JTCC. Faculty and administrators gave reasons for the lack of a formal peer review process: many disciplines consisted of only one or two full-time faculty members within the college and some faculty prefer not to be critiqued by colleagues.

A forum, the VCCS Peer Group meetings, exists that could serve to encourage formal peer review process for faculty scholarship. This forum, the meetings of statewide discipline peer groups in the VCCS, does encourage the presentation of faculty research and “strongly recommends that issues related to discipline currency, technology advances, retention strategies, and innovative teaching methodologies be addressed [at peer group meetings]” (VCCS Professional Development Initiative: Peer Group Meetings, 1994). Scholarship, unfortunately, is not specifically identified as an aspect of these peer group meetings. Informal peer interaction does seem to take place at JTCC primarily within disciplines and less frequently among different disciplines within a division according to respondents. However, this study suggests that peer interaction related to scholarship takes place infrequently and informally at JTCC.

Faculty and administrators agreed about which standards were most often met when JTCC faculty engage in scholarship. The standards include scholarship that: (1) is deeply grounded in a discipline that reflects current thinking in the field; and that (2) is significant in purpose or outcome.
Tierney’s Element of Institutional Culture: Socialization

Findings in Table 4.6

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 7 - Socialization</th>
<th>Faculty (N) (%)</th>
<th>Administrators (N) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the faculty are socialized at John Tyler Community College, what do they learn about the professor’s role in scholarship?</td>
<td>Faculty (N) (%)</td>
<td>Administrators (N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Scholarship learning occurs</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 No formal scholarship learning occurs</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

More than half of the faculty (62%) stated that there was no formal learning about a professor’s role in scholarship at JTCC. Eight of the faculty members (38%) did indicate that some learning related to faculty scholarship had taken place (faculty respondents #5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 21). Faculty respondents also indicated that when socialization occurred faculty became aware of the importance of scholarship, how to engage in it, and what resources were available, including professional development activities that could foster scholarship.

Administrators

Three administrators (60%) said that faculty members were not socialized in scholarship (administrator respondents #1, 2, 3). One administrator indicated that
"scholarship is implicitly learned in graduate school or largely through the [individual’s] own inquiry" (administrator respondent # 3). The remaining administrators (40%) did state that faculty at JTCC are socialized in scholarship, and, as one administrator put it, "hopefully they [faculty] learn that it [scholarship] is important, that students benefit, and better teaching results" (administrator respondent # 4).

Documents

No document exists that identifies if or where scholarship learning takes place at JTCC. JTCC Professional Development Plan, (1995) could provide for some degree of learning about scholarship such as during faculty pursuit of advanced degrees supported by the VCCS. The VCCS Professional Development Initiative: “Commitment From the Individual” (1994) provides for holistic professional development of faculty and addresses job-related knowledge and skill improvement. This plan has four stated components for development of the faculty member (development in discipline, instruction, career, and organization). To achieve this type of improvement, faculty may attend a professional conference, complete discipline course work and advanced degrees, or undergo job retraining. Socialization in scholarship can take place in doctoral degree programs and other research programs, but this purpose is not stated in VCCS educational leave or Chancellor’s Fellowship policies, and no specific identification or association with scholarship is made in this faculty development plan.

Summary

More than half of faculty and administrator respondents agreed formal learning about engagement in a scholarship role does not occur at JTCC. A senior administrator
described scholarship at the college as in a state of “benign neglect” (administrator respondent # 5). One faculty member was more positive and stated that “we are beginning to emphasize a scholarship role, but more is needed if we are to fulfill our duty to our students” (faculty respondent #11).

The finding, that faculty are not socialized into learning about engagement in a scholarship role, is consistent with a previous finding of this study and helps to explain why scholarship is not a major role at JTCC. Faculty who have completed doctoral degrees may have engaged in scholarship in their programs of graduate study. Since only eleven of JTCC’s sixty-four full-time teaching faculty have doctoral degrees, and since no documents exist that indicate that scholarship socialization takes place, it would appear that socialization for the purpose of engaging in scholarship at JTCC is, at best, informal and minimal.

Findings in Table 4.7

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #8 - Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When new faculty join this college, how are they introduced to scholarship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Formal or informal introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 No introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty

Of the nineteen faculty that responded to the question, only slightly more than half (53%) stated that new faculty at JTCC received some degree of introduction to scholarship. In contrast, nearly one-half stated that new faculty were not introduced to scholarship. According to the faculty respondents, if a formal or informal introduction to scholarship takes place, the introduction occurs: a) in JTCC orientation sessions; b) during the JTCC Convocation Ceremony; c) in professional development meetings; d) through mentoring of new members by peers or administrators; and e) during discipline or division meetings. Faculty also indicated that an introduction to scholarship could be found in the JTCC Faculty Handbook.

Administrators

More administrators stated that new faculty did receive an introduction to scholarship (60%) than those who said the faculty did not receive an introduction (40%). Administrator respondents indicated that faculty are introduced to scholarship in the college’s orientation sessions.

Documents

No orientation manual for full-time faculty exists at JTCC. A college staff member indicated that the contents of the JTCC Adjunct Orientation Manual 1995-1996 are similar to the orientation that is given to full-time faculty. The table of contents in the manual listed primarily daily workplace activities such as the use of the college’s forms and the student grading process. If the orientation for full-time faculty at JTCC is similar to the process described in the JTCC Adjunct Faculty Orientation Manual then it is clear
that the orientation process does not address scholarship per se. New faculty do receive an orientation provided by the VCCS, but no evidence relating to scholarship is found in the outline of orientation activities.

Summary

Slightly more than half of faculty (53%) and administrator (60%) respondents agreed that when new full-time faculty join JTCC, they receive a formal or informal introduction to scholarship. Respondents said that the introduction is almost always related to some aspect of teaching scholarship. The other forms of scholarship, application scholarship, integration scholarship, and discovery scholarship, are not included in the new faculty member's orientation to JTCC.

A faculty member and an administrator, both of whom said that no introduction to scholarship is given at the college (faculty respondent #17, administrator respondent #5), felt that the reason for its omission was due, in part, to the fact that newly hired faculty members had extensive prior teaching experience. Faculty and administrators seem to equate teaching with teaching scholarship, which are not the same according to Boyer. Further, respondents seem to presume that an extensive teaching background by newly hired faculty is adequate preparation or socialization for the role of teaching scholarship. This finding, that newly hired faculty are introduced to scholarship, is not supported by document evidence since a full-time faculty orientation manual and other records about faculty orientation that address scholarship do not exist within the college or the system.

According to responses to an earlier question, faculty are not socialized into scholarship. Moreover, faculty respondents gave a somewhat mixed response about
whether or not new faculty are oriented to scholarship: It appears that responses to these two questions are answered consistently by faculty. Administrators, however, were inconsistent in responding to these two questions. Their responses indicated that faculty are not socialized into scholarship, but new faculty are oriented to it. This respondent group may not view an orientation as equivalent to socialization.

Findings in Table 4.8

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #9 - Socialization</th>
<th>What do the veteran faculty at John Tyler Community College communicate to you about scholarship as an important role?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Positive communication</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Little or no communication</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Mixed communication-positive and negative</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The veteran faculty at JTCC communicate little or nothing about scholarship as an important faculty role according to the majority of the twenty-one faculty members that were interviewed (67%). A few respondents described veteran faculty as a dichotomous group, either very negative about scholarship or positive and accepting of scholarship (24%).

Some of the reasons given by faculty why most veterans do not communicate that
scholarship is an important role are: a) faculty refusal to change or to embrace scholarship; b) the demands of an already full faculty workload; c) prior experiences of faculty related to their secondary school system background that focused only on teaching, and d) the close proximity to retirement of some faculty. Two faculty members described this group of veteran faculty who did not support scholarship as being in “ultra burnout” and “retired while on active duty” (faculty respondents #2, 14).

The faculty respondents indicated that veteran faculty peers who communicated positively that scholarship is an important role were a small minority (9%). Faculty respondents said that this small group of veteran faculty communicate by mentoring or integrating potential scholarly activities into their classrooms. A respondent gave an example of a scholarship activity done by veteran faculty, designing curriculum at JTCC to incorporate writing across the curriculum (faculty respondent #5). Another veteran faculty member described the veterans who do support scholarship as seeing scholarship as a means “to prevent stagnation” (faculty respondent #20).

Documents

The minutes of JTCC Faculty Association meetings include references to such daily workplace issues as faculty salaries and workload, but there are no entries about scholarship, only two references about available grants, and a reminder for faculty to submit their professional development plan requests to their administrators. The purpose of the faculty association at JTCC is to make recommendations to the college president and the Administrative Council on matters that affect faculty. The faculty association consists of all teaching faculty and interested counselors at the college.
Minutes of the college’s allied health, technologies, public services, and arts & sciences divisions’ meetings also contain no references to faculty scholarship. There are references about planned or attended conferences (8 entries), recognition of two faculty recipients of a sabbatical leave and a certificate completion, and announcements about grants received or available (6 entries). JTCC’s academic division meetings address matters related to the various discipline’s students, curricula, and teaching. The academic division includes all teaching faculty in the respective division and the associate dean.

Summary

Administrators were not interviewed about this question, “What do the veteran faculty at JTCC communicate to you about scholarship as an important role?” because faculty and administrators are not peers and communication concerning this issue is unlikely. According to the majority of the faculty members interviewed, the veteran faculty at JTCC communicate little or nothing about the importance of a scholarship role (67%). The respondent group of faculty consisted of twenty-one faculty of whom twelve veterans had fifteen or more years of teaching service at JTCC.

This question elicited a high level of negativity in the comments of the respondents. The respondents described veteran faculty in the following phrases and statements about what veteran faculty communicate regarding faculty scholarship.

Veteran faculty:

1. are “beaten down and negative” (faculty respondent #7);
2. “place too much emphasis on specializations and not enough on broader educational needs such as scholarship” (faculty respondent #12);
3. are given “few rewards . . . [for scholarship]” (faculty respondent # 15);

4. [engage in] . . . “little discussion” . . . [about scholarship] (faculty respondent # 9);

5. are resistant to change . . . (such as in scholarship)” (faculty respondent # 4);

6. [say] “let me alone so I can teach . . . some still using their ‘yellowed notes’” (faculty respondent # 17); and,

7. “scholarship is unnecessary, I teach and leave” (faculty respondent # 20).

Not only have the majority of faculty respondents indicated that veteran faculty do not communicate anything about faculty scholarship, but several expressed negative feelings in their comments about specific veteran colleagues related to scholarship. This response, that veteran faculty communicate little or nothing in support of scholarship, appears to be consistent with earlier findings that scholarship is not a major role of faculty at JTCC and that faculty are not socialized at the college to scholarship. The minutes of the college faculty organization also reveal no reference to scholarship, which is consistent with the interview findings.
Findings in Table 4.9

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 10 - Socialization</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Commitment to it</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Interest in it</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 No communication</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Most of the faculty (62%) stated that senior administrators fail to communicate anything to the college community about the role of scholarship. Other faculty stated that some senior administrators show an interest in faculty members’ engagement in scholarship by recognizing their achievements through college newsletters and other written acknowledgments (29%).

Faculty respondents who felt that senior administrators did not communicate to the JTCC community about the role of scholarship described this failure in communication in different ways. One faculty respondent said that senior administrators “discuss only day-to-day operations” (faculty respondent # 2), while another said “they communicate poorly, there is a communication gap and it is scary” (faculty respondent # 10). The third faculty respondent said, “[scholarship] is not a priority and with little or no exceptions”
Two faculty respondents indicated that senior administrators show a commitment to scholarship (faculty respondents #11,13) which includes providing faculty with resources and mentoring or role modeling scholarly behaviors. One faculty member considered a specific associate dean as a role model in scholarship (faculty respondent #13).

Those faculty respondents who indicated that senior administrators at JTCC communicate to the college community about scholarship referred to the communication in a variety of ways. One respondent described the communication as “indirect, but supportive when faculty are sent to seminars” (faculty respondent #11). Another said, “my division chair encouraged, informed, and helped faculty to explore new ideas . . . [related to scholarship]” (faculty respondent #14).

Administrators

Most administrators (60%) described senior administrators’ communications about scholarship at JTCC primarily as written or oral recognition of faculty members for their achievements in scholarship. One administrator indicated that senior administrators communicated little or nothing to the college community about a scholarship role (administrator respondent #1); while another felt some administrators do serve as role models in scholarship (administrator respondent # 5). Still another administrator said that encouragement is given and a climate is created [for scholarship] (administrator respondent # 2).
Documents

Minutes of the JTCC Administrative Council meetings include four entries of faculty recognition for grant awards given for math and science, social science, and JTCC Foundation minigrants. A lack of specific information about the grant implementation prevents an assessment as to whether the grant activities are scholarship as defined by Boyer. The minutes did not indicate which faculty received the grants or what was the focus of the grants.

The membership of the JTCC Administrative Council consists of eight individuals: the college's president, dean of financial and administrative services, the dean of academic and student services, the coordinators of public relations, of grants and development, and of student assessment, the faculty association president, and a classified staff member. The purpose of this council is to make recommendations regarding college policy, new curricula, and other college issues.

Summary

Faculty members and administrators differ in their perceptions about whether senior administrators at JTCC communicate about the role of scholarship to the college community. Most faculty members indicate that senior administrators communicate little or nothing to the college community about the role of scholarship, while most administrators stated that senior administrators demonstrate interest in scholarship through recognition of scholarship performed by faculty. This inconsistency between faculty and administrator responses is an indication of different perceptions about the role that administrators play in scholarship, with administrators seeing themselves as more active
than faculty see them as contributors to faculty engagement in scholarship roles.

Documents of meetings of senior administrators do not reveal any actual recognition of faculty for scholarship, but other types of faculty achievement are recognized (foundation minigrant grant awards) or announcements about the availability of grants and professional development awards. Document data are consistent with the faculty responses that senior administrators do not appear to communicate clear messages about the role of scholarship.

Findings in Table 4.10

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 11 -Socialization</th>
<th>Faculty (N) (%)</th>
<th>Administrators (N) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do academic leaders at John Tyler Community College communicate the importance of faculty scholarship?</td>
<td>Faculty Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Provide resources or facilitate it</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Role model it</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Acknowledge or encourage it</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 Do nothing or uncertain</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

More than half of the faculty indicated that academic leaders at JTCC communicated the importance of faculty scholarship by providing resources, role modeling scholarship, and acknowledging faculty achievements. However, eight faculty
respondents stated that academic leaders did not communicate anything about scholarship or were uncertain if the academic leaders did communicate about scholarship's importance (faculty respondents #2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 16, 18, 21).

Administrators

The majority of administrators felt that academic leaders at JTCC acknowledged faculty scholarship (60%). One administrator indicated that administrators serve as role models of scholarship (administrator respondent # 5). Another administrator stated that there is no communication by academic leaders about the importance of scholarship. This administrator stated, “we should use the word ‘scholarship’, [but] we omit it” (administrator respondent #2).

Documents

JTCC has an Academic and Student Services Committee whose membership consists of the college’s dean of academic and student services, the three associate deans for the academic divisions, the coordinator of JTCC Learning Resources Center, and the director of the Business, Industry and Government Services Center. The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to the dean regarding policy changes, new curricula approval, student services, planning and evaluation of academic and student services, and other academic or student issues.

Minutes from the Academic and Student Services Committee meetings contain twenty-five entries about faculty achievements for receipt of grants, for meeting presentations, for professional honors, publications, and an art award. At least one, a nationally publicized textbook, could be considered scholarship because the textbook was
known to be nationally reviewed by peers.

A review of the minutes of the Academic Divisions’ meetings for allied health &
technologies, business, arts & sciences, and public service revealed entries of recognition
for two faculty members, one of whom served at the VCCS as a faculty-in-residence
position for allied health and nursing and another who completed a certificate for
advanced training.

The academic divisions contain the specific disciplines, programs, and program
faculty and are responsible for the delivery of instruction. At JTCC, the academic division
is managed by an associate dean. It cannot be said with any degree of certainty that any
of the three committee’s documents contain references to scholarship as defined by Ernest
Boyer.

Summary

Document entries in the Academic and Student Services Committee meetings’
minutes and the Academic Divisions meetings’ minutes recognize faculty achievements
such as grant awards. However, it is uncertain if any of these activities, other than the
completion of VCCS Faculty Research Grants, are scholarly in nature.

While a majority of administrator respondents stated that academic leaders at
JTCC communicate the importance of scholarship by acknowledging or encouraging it,
the faculty respondents are less certain of this. Thirty-eight percent of faculty respondents
said that academic leaders communicate nothing concerning scholarship (or are uncertain
what academic leaders communicate). Thirty-eight percent of faculty respondents said
that academic leaders do communicate about scholarship. When respondents say that
academic leaders do communicate about the importance of scholarship through encouragement and recognition of it, they may be confusing professional development activities with scholarship activities.

Tierney's Element of Institutional Culture: Information

Findings in Table 4.11

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 12 - Information</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is information about the college's expectation for scholarship disseminated to faculty at John Tyler Community College?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Expectation disseminated in documents</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Expectation disseminated by individuals</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Expectation is not disseminated</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Most faculty responses indicate that information about an expectation for scholarship was disseminated at the college either through documents or by individuals (100%), while only twenty-five percent of responses indicated that no expectation was disseminated. Respondents stated that dissemination took place through formal JTCC or VCCS documents and expectations were discussed or announced in academic division meetings and faculty-administrator conferences.

Formal documents that faculty respondents said conveyed the expectation for
scholarship included documents related to hiring and promotion, teaching faculty job
descriptions, the faculty evaluation process, and individual faculty development plans.
One-fourth of the faculty respondents said that no information about the college's
expectation for scholarship was disseminated.

Administrators

The majority of administrators stated that the expectation for scholarship was
disseminated in formal documents (60%) and two administrators indicated that an
expectation for scholarship was communicated to faculty in meetings or in faculty-
administrator conferences (administrator respondents #4, 5). Another administrator said
that no communication was disseminated about an expectation for scholarship at JTCC
(administrator respondent #2). Still another administrator said, "There is no minimal level
of scholarship [expected], but there is a minimal level of professional development
[expected such as conference attendance] and as a manager and faculty evaluator, I do
make a distinction on evaluations in favor of scholarship" (administrator respondent #3).

Documents

The formal documents of JTCC and the VCCS that respondents said included an
expectation for scholarship are:

1. VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.8. Normal Minimum Criteria for Each Faculty
   Rank, 1994;

2. VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.6. Responsibilities of Teaching Faculty, 1994;

3. VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.2.0.2. Faculty Professional Activities and
   Contributions, 1994;

5. **JTCC Faculty Handbook**, “Faculty Evaluation Plan: Criteria”;


The content of the document containing qualifications for rank to which faculty respondents referred does specifically identify classroom and discipline research, a single and voluntary example for meeting the professional activities requirement. The JTCC Faculty Evaluation Plan, which includes the VCCS policy for rank, identifies additional faculty responsibilities, but the examples given include no reference to scholarship per se.

The VCCS document that describes the various initiatives for faculty includes one for grants for faculty research. This grant process has criteria that appear to be very similar, if not the same as Boyer’s standards. The other documents that respondents identified do not refer specifically to scholarship: what is addressed are faculty expectations related to the development of discipline knowledge and skills, pedagogy, and professional behaviors.

**Summary**

The responses of faculty and administrators to the question “How is information about the college’s expectation for scholarship disseminated?” were similar for each group. Both faculty and administrators indicated that communication was primarily through formal college or system documents and in discussions between faculty and
administrators during evaluation conferences. A smaller percentage of faculty (25%) and administrators (20%) agreed that an expectation for scholarship was not communicated.

VCCS documents that apply to JTCC contain references that have scholarship implications: VCCS Faculty Research Grants and the teaching faculty job description which requires professional behaviors and suggests such faculty activities as engaging in classroom or discipline research. While both of these activities are desirable, neither are expected and both lack performance criteria. No other documents address scholarship. Consequently, college and system documents do not seem to convey a consistent expectation for scholarship. Therefore, the document findings seem inconsistent with the interview findings in which faculty and administrator respondents said that an expectation for scholarship is disseminated at the college.

Also, the interview finding that an expectation for scholarship is disseminated at JTCC is not consistent with several other findings in which there is both respondent consensus and document support: a) scholarship is not a major role of faculty; b) scholarship is not rewarded; and c) scholarship is not specifically addressed in major college documents.
Findings in Table 4.12

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 13 - Information</th>
<th>How is information about the support for scholarship disseminated to the faculty at John Tyler Community College?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In written announcements</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In verbal announcements</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other methods</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Faculty members stated that information about support for scholarship is disseminated at JTCC by both written (90% respondents) and verbal (65% respondents) forms of communication. Announcements about support for scholarship are made in academic division meetings, college convocations, and at Administrative Council meetings.

Written forms of communication about scholarship include college memos and documents from external sources such as the VCCS and other external grant agencies. Other methods by which scholarship support is disseminated include information given to faculty by teleconferences, voice mail, and word-of-mouth. One faculty member, in describing the communication process about scholarship, said we get information “almost daily” (faculty respondent # 9), while another described the process as “unsystematic”.
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Administrators

Administrator respondents also indicated that both written announcements (60% respondents) and verbal announcements (60% respondents) about the support for scholarship were disseminated to the faculty at JTCC. One administrator described the method of information dissemination about scholarship support in the following way: "We have a decentralized method of providing support, and this system lacks clear communication about the what, the how, and the who for those seeking support for scholarship" (administrator respondent #1).

Documents

The most frequently cited documents that announce support for faculty scholarship at JTCC come either from the JTCC Foundation or the VCCS. The college foundation, a private entity, provides financial and other types of support for JTCC, including minigrants. The college grants office personnel also announce other sources of support from external agencies such as those that provide national grants. No standards exist that enable a comparison of the foundation minigrant process to that of the scholarship process and standards described by Boyer and used in this study. The formal document, VCCS Professional Development Initiative (1994), announces several programs, but only the faculty research grants program appears to resemble Boyer's definition of scholarship.

Announcements are also made about support for faculty development and grants in Administrative Council Committee meetings. The minutes of this group reveal only three entries about professional development opportunities and three entries about grants.
Summary

Faculty members and administrators agree that both verbal and written forms of communication about support for scholarship are commonly disseminated to the faculty at JTCC. Documents that announce VCCS Faculty Research Grants indicate a source of support for scholarship, while other professional development opportunities, grants, or educational leave, if communicated, may or may not result in or represent scholarship.

Findings in Table 4.13

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 14 - Information</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are the faculty at John Tyler Community College made aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation?</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 In division meetings</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 In JTCC Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 In evaluation process</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 During hiring or orientation interview</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 In professional development plan</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The faculty identified several ways in which they were made aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation. These included information given at academic division meetings (5% respondents), during hiring interviews (10%...
respondents), and in the evaluation process (75% respondents). Written information is communicated in the JTCC Faculty Handbook (25% respondents), in the college’s evaluation plan (75% respondents), and in the JTCC Professional Development Plan (10% respondents) according to faculty responses. The faculty often referred to professional development expectations when asked about scholarship expectations. Most of the faculty respondents indicated that the evaluation process is the means by which they are made aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation.

Administrators

JTCC administrators cited several sources by which information is given to the faculty about the relationship between scholarship and evaluation. The most commonly cited source was the college’s evaluation process (60% respondents). Administrators also cited other sources of information that made faculty aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation. These other sources are: a) the division meeting announcements (20% respondents); b) the JTCC Faculty Handbook (20% respondents); c) hiring or orientation interviews (20% respondents); and d) the college’s professional development plan (20% respondents). The JTCC Faculty Handbook does contain the college’s evaluation process which includes VCCS policies, one of which, classroom- and discipline-based research, meets professional role qualifications for rank, but for which no standards like Boyer’s for research or scholarship are given.

Virginia Community College System Administrators

The chancellor of the VCCS indicated that scholarship should be an expectation. However, in preparation for the inclusion of scholarship as a part of faculty evaluation,
added, “First, we must further the notion and understanding of scholarship, and how to do it, because I suspect that a majority of faculty would resist doing it (scholarship) now.”

**Documents**

The requirements for evaluation of the teaching faculty at JTCC are described in the VCCS and the JTCC evaluation policies which list job responsibilities for teaching faculty. The references in these documents to teaching performance, professional relationships, and discipline competency could be addressed through scholarship activities.

Only one example for meeting professional activities and contributions identifies a scholarly activity, “engaging in classroom-based research to improve teaching or in discipline-based research that may lead to publication” *(VCCS Policy Manual, Policy 3.4.2.0.2, 1994)*. This activity, a voluntary faculty function, implies that there is little, if any, relationship between faculty scholarship and faculty evaluation. Therefore, no clear relationship seems to exist between scholarship and evaluation at JTCC. No other reference to scholarship appears in any of the JTCC official documents for evaluation, hiring, orientation, or the college’s professional development plan.

Furthermore, no reference to scholarship or scholarship standards is found in the minutes of the college’s standing committees: Administrative Council, Academic and Student Services, Academic Divisions, or Faculty Association. Any entries in these documents are references to professional development and grants with no available information to determine that any constitute scholarship as defined by Boyer.
Summary

Faculty and administrators identified similar documents and college activities that they felt emphasized the relationship between scholarship and evaluation: the college’s faculty evaluation plan, faculty handbook, and professional development plan. Faculty and administrator respondents also indicated that faculty are made aware of the relationship between scholarship and evaluation in academic division meetings and hiring interviews of faculty at JTCC. However, these observations are not substantiated by document data.

Since “scholarship” as a word is not included in any of these policy documents or minutes of division meetings as indicated in interviews, and since only a single reference is made to classroom and discipline research (a voluntary activity), clear support is lacking to indicate that a relationship does exist between scholarship and faculty evaluation.

Tierney’s Element of Institutional Culture: Leadership

Findings in Table 4.14

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 15 - Leadership</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do leaders of this institution do to promote scholarship?</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Actively promote scholarship</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Passively promote scholarship</td>
<td>10 (48%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Do not promote scholarship</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty**

Most faculty respondents said that leaders at JTCC promote scholarship either by playing an active role (38% respondents) or a passive role (48% respondents). An active role consisted of providing resources, giving direct assistance to, or removing barriers for a faculty member. For example, one faculty member received direct assistance from an associate dean who edited the faculty member's manuscript prior to its publication. A passive role consisted of administrators offering encouragement or giving recognition to faculty who engage in scholarship. Thirty-three percent of the faculty said that leaders did not promote scholarship at JTCC.

**Administrators**

All administrator respondents indicated that leaders did promote scholarship at JTCC and most respondents stated that leaders played a passive role (100% respondents) rather than an active one (60% respondents). To administrators, an active role meant providing funds and release time for scholarship activities, and a passive role consisted of giving encouragement or recognition to faculty for their scholarship.

**Documents**

The system’s job descriptions for administrators and faculty apply to each Virginia community college. These job descriptions do not exclude, but neither do the descriptions make a specific reference to, scholarship as an expected role. No other documents exist at JTCC related to leadership and faculty scholarship.

**Summary**

The faculty and administrators agreed that most leaders at JTCC play either an
active or passive role in promoting scholarship at the college, while thirty-three percent of
the faculty stated that administrators play no role in promoting scholarship. Most faculty
and administrators agreed that leaders played primarily a passive role of encouragement
and recognition rather than an active role in promoting scholarship.

Previous and present findings about leaders (senior administrators, academic
leaders, and leaders) differed among faculty and administrators. Administrator
respondents consistently said that leaders showed an interest in or acknowledged faculty
scholarship at JTCC. Faculty respondents gave a mixed set of responses concerning the
role of leaders in supporting scholarship. Faculty respondents generally agreed that senior
administrators do not communicate about the roles of scholarship to the college
community. The faculty respondents had conflicting opinions concerning whether
academic leaders acknowledge or encourage scholarship or do nothing about scholarship.
These conflicting findings about leadership based on faculty and administrator interviews,
and the lack of documentary evidence seem to indicate that leadership does not do a great
deal to actively promote scholarship at JTCC. Further, college documents say virtually
nothing about the role of leaders in promoting scholarship at JTCC.
Findings in Table 4.15

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 16 - Leadership</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 College president</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Dean of Academic &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Associate Deans of Academic Divisions</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 Other personnel</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 No one</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

In noting specific individuals who are most effective in promoting scholarship at JTCC, most faculty identified the three associate deans (71% respondents). Associate deans were selected first in order of priority for their effectiveness followed by individual faculty members and a student services administrator (33% respondents), the college president (24% respondents), and the dean of academic and student services (14% respondents). No single faculty member was repeatedly identified as most effective. One faculty respondent said that no person at the college was effective in promoting scholarship (faculty respondent # 2).
Administrators

Three administrators identified the associate deans as the most effective leaders in promoting scholarship at JTCC because associate deans provide resources and praise, important enablers of scholarship (administrator respondents # 1, 3, 5). Two administrators said that the faculty were the most effective leaders in promoting scholarship based on their accomplishments such as textbook publications and classroom innovations (administrator respondents #2, 4).

Documents

Minutes of college’s standing committees (Administrative Council, Academic and Student Services, Academic Divisions, Faculty Association) include few, if any, entries about the role of JTCC leaders in promoting scholarship. The only announcements or acknowledgments that can be considered relevant to scholarship as defined by this study are those associated with the VCCS Faculty Research Grants. A weakness in the review of documents of standing committees is that minutes do not exist for every meeting; if in fact, the committees met on a regularly scheduled basis.

Summary

Faculty and administrators agreed when they selected the associate deans as the most effective persons in promoting scholarship at JTCC. But administrator respondents, unlike faculty respondents, did not identify the president as the next most effective leader in promoting scholarship, choosing instead other personnel that included faculty. College documents give no indication of which administrators, if any, effectively promote scholarship at JTCC. In conclusion, there is mixed evidence about who are the key
players, if any, in promoting scholarship at JTCC.

Tierney's Element of Institutional Culture: Strategies

Findings in Table 4.16

Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 17 - Strategies</th>
<th>Faculty (N) (%)</th>
<th>Administrators (N) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Internal resources</td>
<td>17 (81%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 External resources</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

Faculty members identified internal and external sources of support for faculty scholarship at the college with almost equal frequency. The internal source identified by most all respondents was the JTCC Foundation grants. These grants are described as summer minigrants funded by foundation contributions and available for approximately five faculty members each summer session. One faculty member described these foundation grants as "a good source [of professional development], but [these] have been decreased by the administration. The foundation used to be independent with no administration controls" (faculty respondent # 20). Occasionally JTCC provides internal professional development workshops for faculty on various topics such as facilitating
critical thinking in students and student learning styles.

External sources for professional development opportunities that support faculty scholarship at the college consisted of funding primarily from the VCCS in its professional development initiatives. This external source of professional development opportunities was cited by all but four of the twenty-one faculty respondents (faculty respondents # 12, 19, 20, 21).

Several of the programs included in these initiatives are system-wide discipline peer group meetings, technology conferences, faculty research grant awards, leadership seminars, teleconferences, Chancellor Commonwealth Professor awards for excellence in teaching, and Chancellor Fellowship awards for doctoral study. Of these VCCS professional development opportunities, the research grants and doctoral study research meet the guidelines for scholarship by Boyer used in this study.

Other external sources of professional development opportunities that received mention were VCCS workshops, New Horizon's technology conferences, private and government grants, master teachers seminars at senior academic institutions, tuition reimbursement, sabbaticals, and leaves of absences.

Administrators

Three administrators cited the college's foundation minigrants as an important internal source of support for professional development (administrator respondents # 3, 4, 5). Another stated that the college's money from the general fund budget granted by the legislature to the system's colleges was a poor source for professional development opportunities (administrator respondent # 5). This same senior administrator provided an
even more revealing perspective of the condition of legislative funding to the college when he stated that “we are under funded this year [1995-1996] based on our enrollments at a deficit of $1.1 million” (administrator respondent # 5).

Still another administrator described the college’s professional development opportunities in this way: “There are none [professional development opportunities] in place, the individual approach is used and that works. We have no formal plan or system so the individuals must be [internally] motivated and seek their own sources [of support]” (administrator respondent #1).

Documents

The JTCC Foundation has as one of its purposes the support of the professional development needs of the college’s faculty and staff. The summary of the annual reports of the college’s foundation gift-giving summary for professional development from 1991 to 1995 totals $124,205 (JTCC Memo: “Professional development,” 5/15/96). A more detailed summary of foundation records about the actual use of foundation funds for professional development and faculty minigrant awards from 1993 to 1996 is seen in Table 4.17.
Table 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Description Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>Minigrant (summer)</td>
<td>$5,897</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>$15,107</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>Minigrant (summer)</td>
<td>$3,760</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>$14,177</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>Minigrant (summer)</td>
<td>awards to be made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>no awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** examples of use: create academic support center, exercise trail, provide physical therapy

assisting training, develop a writer-in-residence program, create architectural CAI, write

microprocessor manual, create extended learning institute's English classes

*** examples of use: attend or participate in credit and non credit courses, attend professional

seminars or conferences, take educational tours, create an art show.

Summary

Two primary sources of professional development support cited by faculty and
administrators at JTCC include the college's foundation minigrants and the VCCS's professional development initiatives. Other grants from private and public sources are available, but faculty may apply for grants not offered by the foundation only if the college has the means to continue the grant activities and programs after grant funding ends which limits access to these grants.

The JTCC Foundation funds do support professional development activities such as attendance at professional meetings or enrollment in credit and non-credit course work or minigrant activities such as the creation of new courses. But, based on a lack of document support, it is difficult to determine whether any of the foundation activities support scholarship as defined by Boyer.

Of the types of professional development support available to JTCC faculty, only one type, the VCCS's Faculty Research Grants, seems to be consistent with the criteria by Boyer for defining scholarship. Only seven of the college's sixty-four faculty have been recipients of these VCCS Faculty Research Grants since 1994, the year when this grant process was initiated. The existence of only one type of professional development opportunity supporting scholarship, the VCCS Research Grants, does not seem to indicate that scholarship is well supported by professional development opportunities for faculty at JTCC.
Findings in Table 4.18

Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #18 - Strategies</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What resources, other than professional development opportunities, support faculty scholarship at John Tyler Community College?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td>(N) (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Human resources</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Technology and equipment resources</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Time accommodation</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The faculty identified three major types of resources, other than professional development opportunities, that support faculty scholarship at JTCC: human resources, technology and equipment resources, and time accommodation such as release time for scholarship.

Human resource support includes secretarial support and experts or consultants who assisted faculty with grant writing, with the use of technology and equipment, or with library on-line searches or inter-library loans. The uses of computer technology and video and audio equipment were cited by several faculty as other forms of support the college provided for faculty scholarship. Still other faculty members indicated that time accommodation (the removal of time barriers through released time, redistribution of faculty workload, or rearranged work hours) permitted faculty to do such things as attend
professional meetings and conferences or enroll in degree and non-credit course work.

Administrators

Administrators cited resources, other than professional development opportunities, in support of faculty scholarship at the college similar to those identified by the faculty: human resources such as assistance from library services personnel, the use of computer technology and audiovisual equipment, and time accommodations to allow faculty to engage in scholarship.

Documents

JTCC Foundation documents indicate that minigrant recipients do request such items of support as computer supplies and hardware, travel expenses, honoraria for consultants, and expenses for training (JTCC memo: “Foundation Minigrants,” April 24, 1996), (faculty recipients #1, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26). A review of several college minigrants does not reveal that scholarship criteria like Boyer’s are met by faculty engaging in this grant process. VCCS Faculty Research Grants completed by seven JTCC faculty were not available for review to determine if any support was received for activities other than professional development.

Summary

The faculty and administrator respondents selected similar resources, excluding professional development opportunities, that support faculty scholarship at JTCC. They most often selected the availability of human resources, followed in frequency by the use of technology and equipment resources, and time accommodation.

Documents indicate that the VCCS Faculty Research Grants—grants consistent
with Boyer’s definition of scholarship—can provide funding for human resource, technology and equipment, and time accommodation requests to support faculty scholarship at JTCC.

Findings in Table 4.19

Table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 19 - Strategies</th>
<th>Faculty (N) (%)</th>
<th>Administrators (N) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1 By verbal and written recognition</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Through extrinsic and intrinsic rewards</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The faculty at JTCC indicated that recognition, not rewards, was most often given for their scholarship achievements (86% respondents). Recognition was given by: a) verbal announcements at college meetings; b) casual acknowledgments; c) written memos or letters to the faculty member; and d) announcements in college newsletters. Faculty cited informal lauding, such as pats-on-the back of the achieving faculty member, as the least common form of recognition faculty received for scholarship.

When faculty respondents cited extrinsic rewards (38% responses) consisting of pay increases or promotions in rank which could be given, faculty also indicated that they were uncertain as to whether extrinsic rewards such as promotion in rank or pay were
actually given. Intrinsic reward is the personal satisfaction derived from accomplishments of engaging in scholarship.

Administrators

Administrators indicated that recognition, not rewards, is given for scholarship. All five interviewees cited that recognition at college meetings, at JTCC Convocation, or in letters of commendation are usually given to faculty for their scholarship achievement. One administrator said, “The institution values scholarship, [but the institution] still needs more teeth in it, the VCCS [Form] 29 [for determination of rank and promotion] should address it” (administrator respondent # 4). Another indicated that “institutional rewards are lacking and that includes money as well as other rewards” (administrator respondent # 4).

Documents

Faculty respondents said minutes of the college’s standing committees contained entries of recognition about faculty scholarship: the committees are the Administrative Council, the Academic and Student Services Committee, the Academic Divisions, and the Faculty Association. Minutes of these committees from 1990-1995 reveal few, if any, entries that indicate recognition of faculty scholarship. Less than ten entries were found that can be considered by this study as scholarship activities similar to Boyer’s; and these entries refer to VCCS Faculty Research Grants and faculty publications.

Rewards for scholarship are not discussed in the VCCS Form 29 (1994) which is the basis for assigning rank and promotion for faculty in the system and at JTCC. Scholarship can be included as an example for the requirement to meet professional
behaviors. However, it is a voluntary activity that is described as classroom- or
discipline-based research which does not include scholarship standards like Boyer’s.

Summary

Faculty and administrators agreed that recognition in the forms of formal verbal
and written acknowledgments and some informal lauding by administrators and peers was
the primary way a faculty member’s achievement in scholarship was acknowledged by the
college and that no reward for scholarship is given generally. Document reviews support
the interview findings—that rewards are not given for scholarship, that recognition is
infrequently given and then primarily for professional development activities and rarely for
receipt of VCCS Faculty Research Grants. Faculty and administrator respondents seem to
associate scholarship with the broad and varied references in the college and system
documents that address professional activities, professional development, and teaching
effectiveness.

The overall response by faculty and administrators to this interview question on
recognition and rewards for faculty scholarship at JTCC is consistent with the earlier
responses: that rewards for scholarship at JTCC are lacking, but recognition is given. The
absence of rewards for scholarship helps explain why scholarship is not a major role of
faculty at JTCC. It also helps to explain significant earlier findings: that scholarship is not
a major role of faculty; that faculty are not socialized in scholarship engagement; that
leaders play a passive role in promoting scholarship; and that veteran faculty and senior
administrators do not communicate the importance of scholarship.
Discussion Summary

The study’s primary research question asked, “Is the culture of JTCC, a two-year public institution of higher education in Virginia, supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer?” The responses to several interview questions will be discussed below in order to answer this research question.

Environment

The environment that supports scholarship includes the college’s external environment and constituencies. This study suggests that the various constituencies in the external environment of JTCC share a mixed view of the value and definition of faculty scholarship in the community college. The exception could be the influence of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS), primarily through its Professional Development Initiative or the college’s foundation, both of which offer research grant funds. Only VCCS Faculty Research Grants, however, resemble Boyer’s standards for scholarship. In contrast, the outline for several of the college’s foundation minigrants submitted by recipients does not have a formal process, peer communication, or peer review as criteria (JTCC minigrant recipients #1, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26).

Because the college is very dependent upon its external environment both for shaping the college’s mission and for resource provision, it is doubtful that the external environment serves as a strong stimulus to faculty scholarship. This is based on the strength of the administrator and faculty responses about whether scholarship is valued by the college’s external constituencies.
Mission

According to the faculty and administrator respondents, scholarship is not a major role of faculty at JTCC because there is lack of such external motivators as rewards, resource support, or an expectation for scholarship. Faculty also indicate that scholarship is not a major role for faculty because leadership plays no more than a passive role in promoting scholarship. Since the college’s mission and goal statements do not address scholarship, the finding that scholarship is not a major role of faculty at the college is consistent with the review of a major document, JTCC Long Range Goals & Objectives, which gives direction to the institution for planning and priority setting.

• A conflicting finding is that faculty and administrators state that teaching and application scholarship are commonly practiced at the college; but other interview evidence is inconsistent with this response about commonly practiced scholarship roles. If the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application are commonly practiced at JTCC, the majority of faculty and administrator respondents indicate that scholarship is not conducted according to the standards that Boyer outlined. Therefore, it is uncertain what the nature of scholarship is at JTCC since no clear standards seem to exist to define it.

College and system documents that describe faculty roles do address an activity—classroom and discipline research with publication—as one possible way that faculty can meet the system’s and college’s expectation for professional activities and contributions (VCCS Policy Manual: Policy 3.4.2.0.2, 1994). This reference to a voluntary and potential scholarly activity does not indicate an expectation for scholarship at any of the
system's colleges, including JTCC.

Socialization

According to faculty and administrator respondents, faculty at JTCC are not systematically socialized into a scholarship role. However, slightly more than half of all respondents indicated that new faculty are introduced to scholarship. This appearance of an inconsistency, that faculty are not socialized into scholarship at the college, but new faculty are introduced to it, may be explained in at least two ways. First, the introduction may be minimal, therefore the respondents do not consider this to be scholarship socialization. Another possible explanation may be the respondents' differing views about what constitutes scholarship.

The faculty interviews suggest that both veteran faculty and senior administrators communicate little or nothing about scholarship. This finding appears to be consistent with other faculty and administrator responses which indicate that scholarship is not a major role of faculty and a document finding that scholarship is not identified in the JTCC Long Range Goals & Objectives: 1990-1996.

In contrast to the faculty responses that veteran faculty and senior administrators communicate little or nothing about scholarship, the administrator respondents did state that they felt senior administrators showed an interest in faculty scholarship and that academic leaders acknowledge and encourage it. The contrast between faculty and administrators' responses on this question appears to show a difference in how administrators are perceived by faculty compared to their perceptions of themselves in communicating scholarship's importance at the college.
Faculty and administrator respondents did say that academic leaders communicate the importance of scholarship by the recognition of scholarship. Only a few faculty respondents, but no administrators, said that academic leaders provide resources for scholarship.

A key inconsistency appears in this study. Senior administrators do not communicate about scholarship, but academic leaders do. This discrepancy in responses could be related to the fact that respondents, who were asked separate questions about academic leaders and senior administrators, do not consider the two groups to be composed of the same members. Respondents, at least faculty respondents, may consider senior administrators to be the president and the dean of student and academic services and consider academic leaders to be the associate deans because faculty respondents did indicate that the associate deans were the most effective leaders in promoting scholarship.

Information

JTCC faculty and administrator respondents indicated that information is disseminated about scholarship including an expectation for scholarship, support for scholarship, and information about the relationship of scholarship to faculty evaluation. Document information in support of these responses is absent, however. The cited documents for the faculty job description, faculty evaluation, and professional development address teaching performance, peer relationships, discipline competency, and the need for professional development, but they make no specific reference to scholarship other than as a voluntary activity of faculty through classroom-based, discipline-based research, or VCCS research grant support.
The difference between faculty and administrator responses—that information is disseminated about a scholarship expectation, scholarship support, and an association between scholarship and faculty evaluation and the absence of document support—could be explained on the basis that the respondents blur the concepts of teaching and professional development with scholarship. Teaching and numerous examples of professional activities other than scholarship are included in the evaluation criteria for the system and the JTCC.

**Leadership**

Associate deans were identified by faculty and administrator respondents as the leaders who were most effective in actively promoting scholarship at JTCC by providing resources and removing time barriers. Faculty respondents were in less agreement when asked if academic leaders communicated information about the importance of scholarship. They gave almost equally weighted, mixed responses that ranged from no encouragement to encouragement about the role of academic leaders in scholarship. Administrators were consistent in their responses in stating that associate deans are the most effective leaders in promoting scholarship and that academic leaders encourage and acknowledge scholarship. Documents do not reveal that either associate deans or academic leaders promote scholarship.

A review of important college standing committees' minutes from the Administrative Council, Academic and Student Services, Academic Divisions, and Faculty Association, reveals that administrators encourage or acknowledge scholarship only to a very limited degree. Job descriptions of faculty and administrators do not address
scholarship expectations. Documents analysis, therefore, does not support administrator interview responses that leaders promote scholarship or that faculty, associate deans, or other administrators are expected to provide leadership in promoting or engaging in scholarship.

**Strategies**

Strategies are selected ways in which support for faculty scholarship is provided at JTCC. In this study, strategies include professional development opportunities, rewards and recognition, human resources, technology and equipment, and time accommodations. Faculty and administrator respondents said that all of these strategies, except rewards for scholarship, are used at JTCC. Respondents seem to associate these strategies with scholarship, but only one strategy, the VCCS Faculty Research Grants, are directly related to scholarship as defined by Boyer.

The finding, that scholarship is not rewarded, is consistent with an earlier finding in which respondents said the reason why scholarship at JTCC is not a major role of faculty is because rewards are not given.

**Summary**

On balance, the study findings yield a negative answer to the primary research question, “Is the culture of JTCC supportive of faculty scholarship?” Scholarship is not consistently or strongly supported at the college. The evidence suggests that: a) scholarship is not a major role of faculty; b) if scholarship is practiced by faculty it differs from Boyer’s definition and standards; c) faculty are not routinely socialized into a scholarship role; d) veteran faculty and senior administrators do not communicate to
faculty or the college community about the importance of scholarship; e) leaders only passively promote scholarship; f) rewards for scholarship are not provided; and g) documentary evidence indicates that it is usually other types of professional activities and not scholarship that are recognized. If scholarship is practiced at JTCC it is at best informal and not clearly defined.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study has been to determine whether the culture of a selected community college is supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer. In his book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (1990) Boyer focuses national attention on a broadened definition of scholarship to include the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching. Faculty scholarship, once viewed as being only within the purview of four-year institutions of higher education, is now considered by some national community college leaders as an important role for community college faculty (AACJC, 1988; Vaughan, 1990). Higher education scholars Angelo (1991), Angelo & Cross (1993), and Kroll (1992) have indicated that scholarship contributes to the quality of teaching and learning. Hence, involvement in scholarship seems consistent with the primary function of community college faculty.

**Literature Review**

Scholarship is no longer narrowly defined solely as pure research. According to Boyer's model, it now includes the discovery of new knowledge, knowledge integration, knowledge application, and the scholarship of teaching. While most community college faculty consider themselves scholars (Palmer 1992), their scholarship activities
demonstrate no clear or shared set of standards like Boyer’s. Moreover, engagement in teaching, rather than scholarship, is the most valued faculty activity in two-year colleges.

The culture of an educational institution and its values about teaching and learning define its mission and faculty roles. Schein (1992), Masland (1985), Pettigrew (1979), and Kuh & Whit (1988) recognize the strength of cultural influences on organizational behaviors. Until recently, the community college culture, with its roots in the system of secondary education, considered scholarship only as research, and teaching and research as mutually exclusive roles for faculty. For this reason scholarship engagement was generally not considered a high priority role for community college faculty. However, Vaughan (1992) indicated that community college culture is constantly evolving. Therefore, this study was done to determine whether the culture of community colleges is experiencing changes that affect support for faculty scholarship as Vaughan had indicated. Likewise, the study investigates to what extent faculty scholarship in the community colleges is modeled after Boyer’s four-part definition.

Method

This exploratory study used the case study method with John Tyler Community College (JTCC) in Virginia serving as the study site. Tierney’s (1988) model of organizational culture provided the framework for data collection. Qualitative data were collected through interviews and college document analysis and interview data were quantified using frequency counts for categories that emerged from the qualitative data. Twenty-one full-time teaching faculty and five academic administrators at JTCC were interviewed. The Virginia Community College System’s (VCCS) chancellor and director
of professional development were also interviewed.

Findings

The overall study findings indicate that the organizational culture at JTCC does not support faculty scholarship as defined by Boyer. Scholarship, if it is practiced at the college, is at best informal, is not highly valued or rewarded, and is not consistent with Boyer’s criteria for ensuring a rigorous, systematic, valuable, and peer-reviewed process.

Study Conclusions

For an in-depth discussion of the study’s findings refer to Chapter 4. For each of the six indicators of institutional culture described by Tierney, data from faculty and administrator interviews and document review show that support for faculty scholarship at JTCC is weak. Respondents interviewed indicate that scholarship is generally not practiced according to Boyer’s standards, and is not a major role of faculty. Likewise, scholarship is not addressed explicitly in any major college or system documents, including the JTCC Mission and Goal statements.

Environment

The research data suggest that JTCC’s external constituencies do not strongly value faculty scholarship in the community college. One institution, the VCCS, which provides support to the twenty-three community colleges in the form of research grants seems to give some support and recognition to scholarship as research.

The various types of respondents differed about the college’s external constituencies’ view of faculty scholarship in the community college: administrators stated
that scholarship is valued by the external constituencies, faculty disagree or are uncertain, and the chancellor sees scholarship as an ‘emerging’ role. Very little convincing evidence was found, other than VCCS Faculty Research Grants, to indicate that external constituencies value faculty scholarship in the community college. The existence of these grants may explain why at least JTCC administrator respondents stated that scholarship is valued by external college constituencies.

**Mission**

The mission and goal statements of an institution of higher education define the institution’s priorities and expectations. Scholarship is not a major role of faculty at JTCC, most respondents stated, because there is lack of such extrinsic factors as rewards for scholarship and an expectation for scholarship. This finding is supported by the absence of any references to scholarship in key college documents such as the JTCC Mission and Goal statements and faculty job description. If some types of scholarship, such as teaching or application scholarship, are practiced as some respondents indicated, it is at best informal and not consistent with Boyer’s standards.

**Socialization**

No formal socialization process addressing faculty scholarship takes place at the college. If new faculty are informally introduced to scholarship, as only administrator respondents indicated, this introduction is at best brief, reaches only a small number of faculty because few are recently hired, and has little impact on overall scholarship socialization at JTCC.

The perception of faculty and administrator respondents about whether key
members of the college community, both faculty and administrators, communicate to faculty the importance of scholarship differs. Only administrator respondents consistently said that administrators show an interest in or recognize faculty scholarship; faculty partially agreed that academic leaders may at least encourage scholarship. Faculty respondents do not feel that either veteran faculty or senior administrators communicate the importance of scholarship.

**Information**

Little information on scholarship at JTCC exists in documents, but interview responses suggest the following about faculty: a) Scholarship engagement is expected; b) An awareness of support for scholarship is present; and c) There is a relationship between scholarship and faculty evaluation. Documentary evidence of an expectation for scholarship or its relationship to evaluation is limited to a brief entry in the college (and system) faculty job description which indicates that faculty may voluntarily engage in classroom or discipline research as a means of meeting the requirement for demonstrating professional behavior.

**Leadership**

If leadership plays any role in promoting scholarship at JTCC, the promotion is primarily done by the associate deans who encourage and recognize faculty scholarship. Faculty and administrator respondents support this view, but documentary evidence of leadership related to scholarship is minimal.
Strategies

Institutional and system rewards consisting of increases in salary or rank are not given for scholarship at JTCC. But other strategies such as the use of professional development opportunities, access to college staff or consultant expertise, use of technology, or alterations in faculty work time are available and used according to faculty and administrator respondents. Available documents do not lend support to the interview findings on strategies that foster scholarship, although VCCS Faculty Research Grant recipients did receive funds or reassigned time to support activities that closely resemble scholarship which Boyer defines.

Conclusion

When Tierney’s model of organizational culture is applied to JTCC, no strong evidence is found for an affirmative answer to the research question, “Is the institutional culture of the college supportive of faculty scholarship as defined by Ernest Boyer?” This conclusion is due, in part, to the fact that there is no written evidence that addresses scholarship, per se. Likewise, respondents indicate that scholarship is not implemented at the college using Boyer’s standards for scholarship or that scholarship is a major role of faculty at JTCC. The absence of critical factors associated with scholarship (expectation of scholarship, reward structure, formal socialization process, doctorally-prepared faculty, active involvement of veteran faculty and senior administrators in promoting scholarship, clear concept of what constitutes scholarship) are a reflection of the institution’s culture and help to explain why scholarship is not a major role of faculty at the college.
Implications and Recommendations for Policy and Practice

The implications and recommendations for policy and practice related to faculty scholarship apply to the individual faculty member at JTCC, the institution of JTCC, and the VCCS. The individual faculty member provides a critical link in the successful implementation of scholarship.

The Virginia Community College System

VCCS faculty and administrators must first examine their values concerning scholarship to determine if scholarship should become a major role of faculty in the system. For this purpose, a period of open discussions and self-examination should take place over several months. During this time the faculty and administrators should address the following questions: a) Do we value scholarship?; b) If so, do we value scholarship to the extent that we will commit to engaging in it and supporting it?; and c) Should engagement in scholarship become a major faculty role in the community college?

Valuing scholarship is closely associated with feeling that it will directly benefit faculty and their colleges. Therefore, any discussions about scholarship should include what the VCCS will gain if faculty formally engage in scholarship. Strategies to assist system members in their self-examination about scholarship could include delivering a series of system-wide teleconferences of national leaders and system faculty who are successful in engaging in community college scholarship and publishing it.

If the VCCS, as an outcome of its self-examination about scholarship, determines that scholarship should become a major role of faculty, greater clarification about
engagement in the scholarship role is needed to differentiate scholarship from professional
development and teaching, and from other roles that comprise the faculty workload.
Scholarship in the community college context must be more clearly defined, standards for
assessing scholarship must be identified, and a plan for socializing community college
faculty into a scholarship role needs to be developed. Scholarship must be formally
recognized, celebrated, and achievements documented within and outside the system of
colleges through peer-reviewed journals which the system could establish. Furthermore,
faculty must insist that scholarship is rewarded through the structure for rank, promotion,
and pay.

Finally, if the VCCS decides to encourage more scholarship, resources must be
provided to support scholarship activities. These should include, but are not limited to
professional development related to scholarship, educational leaves for doctoral or
research studies, faculty release time, access to research consultants and editors, use of
equipment such as computers, printers and photocopiers, internet and ‘virtual’ library
access, and scholarship funding.

Scholarship, if practiced by a single college rather than as a system-wide initiative,
will have limited impact because each college is dependent upon the system. The college
is dependent upon the influences and support from system’s leadership, resources, and
policies related to faculty job descriptions, evaluation, and reward structures. Therefore,
a system-wide initiative in support of scholarship is the most likely alternative to support
scholarship success. If, however, selected colleges within the system are unwilling to
accept scholarship engagement as an important role for their faculty, the system should
consider providing incentives to help the colleges overcome their reluctance. Likewise, the system should consider providing substantial resources for those institutions that do embrace the role of scholarship. Most of the implications about scholarship for the VCCS are applicable to the discussions that follow about JTCC and vice versa.

John Tyler Community College

JTCC should engage in the same process of introspection about scholarship as that recommended for the VCCS. Like the system, if JTCC, after an assessment of the need for and value of scholarship, commits to providing the leadership and resources to support scholarship, many of the same implications apply as those stated for the community college system. Specific strategies to be added at JTCC include:

1. Developing a formal and comprehensive faculty scholarship plan based on a model of scholarship that is accepted and fitting for this institution. The plan could address whether or not faculty participation in scholarship should be voluntary or mandatory;

2. Creating an environment that promotes and supports scholarship engagement by: socializing faculty into scholarship roles and recognizing, rewarding, and providing incentives for faculty scholarship;

3. Addressing scholarship in key institutional documents that include the institution’s mission and goal statements, evaluation plan for faculty holding rank, and professional development plan;

4. Developing a formal socialization relationship for faculty that identifies leaders and role models of scholarship within the college who can assist faculty in the scholarship
socialization process;

5. Publishing and formally celebrating the act of scholarship and those who engage in it during the JTCC Convocation and special teaching scholarship recognition days;

6. Documenting the achievements and process of scholarship in a college journal of abstracts and manuscripts that is subject to peer review and serves to communicate scholarship throughout the system’s colleges;

7. Defining and using the word “scholarship” so that it is viewed separately from professional development, teaching and the other roles of faculty.

The Individual Faculty Member at JTCC

Ultimately, the key to successful implementation of scholarship lies with the individual faculty member. The faculty member’s interest in and ability to engage in scholarship will require individual reflection. If the faculty member is committed to scholarship, he/she can play an important role in influencing peers. In addition, the individual faculty member should:

1. Develop a familiarity with the literature on community college scholarship, particularly its value to teaching and learning which is the primary faculty responsibility in a community college;

2. Seek role models of scholarship;

3. Share results of his/her own scholarship with peers in conference presentations, peer group meetings, or publications;

4. Negotiate college and system support for scholarship, including external rewards through the mechanisms for faculty evaluation that affects pay and promotion.
It is important to recognize that the introduction and support for scholarship as a major faculty role in the community college would add additional demands upon a faculty member's time and workload which in the community college is recognized as an already heavy schedule. However, the benefits to be gained by engaging in scholarship for the faculty, the college, and the system of community colleges may outweigh any changes in faculty time and work load that will be needed.

Implications for the Future Study of Scholarship in the Community College

This exploratory study reveals information about one college and how its culture supports scholarship. Additional research studies should be done to expand the body of knowledge about scholarship in community colleges. Within five years this study at JTCC can be repeated to determine if scholarship at JTCC has become a major role of faculty, and if it is supported and rewarded. A similar study conducted at several distinctive Virginia community colleges should determine whether the findings of this study are generalizable to the VCCS as a whole. Moreover, future research should probe the inconsistent perceptions of faculty and administrators concerning support for scholarship in the community college.

Additional research on the effect of scholarship on teaching and learning in the community college should be done to validate whether scholarship supports the mission of community colleges. Model institutions for community college scholarship (in which many faculty engage in scholarship that is well-defined and evaluated) should be studied to
determine the most effective and appropriate definitions, standards, or model for two-year college scholarship.

A body of literature containing research abstracts and peer-reviewed manuscripts of scholarship produced by community college faculty should begin to be established since scholarship in the community colleges is a relatively new idea and little is known or published compared with the scholarship found in other colleges and universities.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO FACULTY MEMBERS & ADMINISTRATORS
TO REQUEST THEIR PARTICIPATION IN STUDY
Dear (College faculty member or administrator name):

I am conducting a study at John Tyler Community College on faculty scholarship. This study is for the partial fulfillment of my doctoral degree requirements at The College of William and Mary. I am requesting an interview with you to assist me in the completion of this project.

In consideration of your busy schedule, the interview process should not exceed one hour. I will call you during the week of _____________ to answer any of your questions you may have about the study and to arrange an appointment with you for an interview.

Your responses will be audio taped, but you and your responses will be both anonymous and confidential in any reports emerging from this research project. I will ask you to sign a "Consent to Participate in Human Subjects Research-Interview Form" at the time of the interview.

Your participation as a respondent is vitally important to my study and your willingness to be interviewed will be greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions prior to the scheduled interview, I can be reached at (phone number, e-mail address, mailing address).

Sincerely yours,

Sally Etkin
School of Education
The College of William and Mary
APPENDIX B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

(Interview Form)
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

(Interview Form)

I, _____________________________, agree to participate in the study titled, "The Effect of Institutional Culture in a Two-year Community College in Virginia on Faculty Scholarship," conducted by Sally Etkin. I understand that the interview itself will last for approximately one hour.

I understand that this method of investigation, (interview) carries little risk to my personal health and safety.

I understand that my interview may be audio taped but that these tapes will be used solely by the researcher and her doctoral committee for data analysis. They will not be shared with anyone else and will be destroyed at the conclusion of the research project.

I understand that the reports of this study's findings will not identify participants by name or position within the college unless separate written permission is given to me. Direct quotes attributed directly to me by name will not be included in the dissertation unless separate written permission is given by me.

I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in this study at any time by directly notifying the researcher. I understand that no negative consequences will result from my discontinuation.

___________________________
(Signature)

___________________________
(Date)
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO THANK STUDY PARTICIPANTS
Dear (name of College faculty member or administrator):

I would like to thank you for your assistance in the completion of my institutional study at John Tyler Community College in which I am assessing the effect of institutional culture on support for faculty scholarship. Your participation in this research process as a respondent has enabled me to obtain important data about faculty scholarship, a topic which is of great interest to me. Your participation, despite the heavy demands on your professional time, is greatly appreciated.

A summary of the study will be sent to you if you request it by returning the enclosed stamped postcard. Please return the postcard to me after adding your preferred mailing address so that I may forward a copy of the study summary to you when the study is complete.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Etkin
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