

**Literacy Department
Strategic Plan
2005-2010**

Goal 1: Have literacy programs and courses that make both faculty and Cortland College proud and are of national prominence.

Meets Academic Affairs Strategic Plan Goal I, Support and Enhance Academic Excellence, subgoal Increase full-time faculty and decrease adjunct faculty.

1. Graduate students will receive the greater part of their education from the most experienced faculty; therefore master's level students will be able to take eighty per cent of their courses from tenure track faculty.
2. Sixty per cent of undergraduate courses will be taught by tenure track faculty.
3. Increase faculty lines by 7, the number recommended in the Dean's Annual Report of 2007, to meet college goals for courses taught by full time faculty.

Goal 2: Continue active involvement in furthering the field

1. Faculty work in and with public schools (PDS and non-PDS).
2. Faculty engages in any of Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship (explanation follows).

Goal 3: Register B-12 Literacy Master's Program with the state.

Meets Academic Affairs Strategic Plan Goal I, Support and Enhance Academic Excellence; subgoal Enrollment Planning, Expand academic programs.

Goal 4: Pursue and obtain salary equity with the current job market

Meets Academic Affairs Strategic Plan Goal I, Support and Enhance Academic Excellence; Subgoal, Enhance Faculty Excellence; Promote Recruitment and retention of faculty.

Some historical context

The renewed discussion of tenure and promotion started with the publication of Scholarship Reconsidered by Ernest L. Boyer in 1990. This slim report, less than 150 pages, addressed the strains that were building in higher education about what was central to the scholarly work of faculty and what should be valued and rewarded. It was meant to generate fresh conceptions of faculty work that would reintegrate personal and institutional priorities and bring a new kind of wholeness to what it means to be a scholar while at the same time responding more adequately to the changing educational needs of society. He defined four domains of scholarship that more realistically described what faculty were actually doing.

E. L. Boyer's Domains of Scholarship

The Scholarship of Application/Engagement

application of knowledge and skill to help address important societal and institutional problems

The Scholarship of Discovery

acquire knowledge for its own sake and presentation/publication of that knowledge

The Scholarship of Integration

emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary research. Key question: What do the findings mean?

The Scholarship of Teaching

the process of disseminating and transforming knowledge for both the audience and the instructor

What was defining scholarship or scholarly priorities were the events leading up to WWII and the Cold War. Refugee scientists from Eastern Europe migrated to US and brought their traditions; GI bill bought the need for many more professors; Sputnik and losing that space race. There was funding and grants for that kind of scholarship, the kind of scholarship that works in the sciences

And eventually that kind of scholarship was the only kind that was rewarded. It became the Gold Standard of Scholarship:

Conception of Scholarly Work

1. Research is the central professional endeavor and focus of academic life.
2. Quality in the profession is maintained by peer review and professional autonomy.
3. Knowledge is pursued for its own sake.
4. The pursuit of knowledge is best organized by discipline (that is, by discipline-based departments).
5. Reputations are established in national and international professional associations.
6. Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who persistently accentuate their specializations.
7. The distinctive task of the academic professional is the pursuit of cognitive truth.

This kind of scholarship is the Discovery Domain according to Boyer.

In the 1970's concerns began to be raised

1. Questions by stakeholders, legislators, trustees, parents, students, others about the quality of undergraduate teaching
2. In the 1980's the extent to which the scholarly work professors engaged in as measured against the nation's critical societal issues was questioned. Faculty scholarship was seen as too narrowly specialized.

Discontent with neglect of undergraduate teaching, disconnect from large societal problems, lack of integration in highly specialized differentiated systems of higher education all cried out for a different way of looking at faculty scholarship. The sure way to engender change is to change the reward system, in other words the tenure and promotion process.

Since educators are by definition, change agents, we can help our institutions by using what we know to get what we want. Here is a chart of the issues I outlined and ideas from the literacy knowledge base that do two things. One, they teach us to look at our work in "gold standard" terms that will be amenable to promotion and tenure committees. Secondly,

reframing our work will help teach the academy the broader view of scholarship that is so realistic.