



White Paper on Scholarly Activity

April 30, 2009



Federation of Post-Secondary Educators

400-550 West 6th Avenue, Vancouver, BC V5Z 1A1
ph 604.873.8988, fx 604.873.8865 www.fpse.ca

Introduction & summary

Like faculty elsewhere, many FPSE members have become interested and involved in the ongoing debate about the meaning, purpose and applicability of “scholarly activity”. The debate is challenging faculty to re-evaluate and reflect upon their work as scholars and to re-consider previous priorities. The increased interest is related to changes in the post-secondary system which include new demands on faculty, changes in institutional structure and governance, and changes in government policy and funding. Unfortunately, many of the changes are having a negative impact by raising new barriers to full faculty engagement in scholarly activity.

Given the growing interest in this area, FPSE sponsored and organized a scholarly activity conference in 2008.¹ The conference brought together interested members and experts in the field from across the province. A common theme that emerged at the conference was the need for a comprehensive understanding about scholarly activity at all levels in BC’s public post-secondary system. A greater understanding of the concept by administrators, government and faculty members in general is the first step toward challenging the status quo and opening the door to more faculty participation in scholarly activity. It is this paper’s contention that the removal of barriers to faculty scholarly activity is a necessary step in order for BC’s post-secondary institutions to achieve their full potential and fulfill their public purpose and mission.

One important purpose of this paper is to encourage debate about the meaning and importance of scholarly activity which, it is hoped, will assist us in refining and strengthening our strategy for dealing with scholarly activity. This paper begins by defining what is meant by scholarly activity, including some of the areas of continuing debate and change. The centrality of faculty scholarship to the purpose of public post-secondary institutions is discussed. The current level and form of faculty scholarly activity is reviewed, which includes an analysis of the barriers. Finally, the paper discusses strategies to help faculty overcome those barriers to create new opportunities to pursue scholarly activity.

1 FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference, March 29, 2008, New Westminster, BC

Scholarly activity: An evolving concept

Much of the current debate over what constitutes scholarly activity began in the early 1990s with the release of Ernest Boyer's Carnegie-funded study, *Scholarship Reconsidered*.² Boyer said the purpose of his work was:

*[to] move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research' debate and give a familiar and honourable term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work.*³

Whether this work is acknowledged by administrators or not, all faculty engage in scholarly activity. The definition of scholarship needs to be broadened to incorporate a more realistic and inclusive account of what faculty do.

Conceptually, scholarly activity is also being challenged by changes in academia. New disciplines and forms of academic work, as well as innovations in teaching and collaborative methods, have opened up a variety of new ways to pursue and disseminate knowledge. It is important to re-examine and re-define scholarship in a manner that is relevant and applicable to different disciplines and faculty members. Many disciplines are re-considering the meaning of scholarship and scholarly activities, which in turn is influencing changes in faculty expectations and needs.

Scholarly activity is distinct from professional development (PD). PD contributes to faculty members' personal growth, including strengthening or broadening professional skills. PD includes enhancing and maintaining individual faculty member's currency in their respective areas of expertise. Scholarly activity, as will be seen below, is about contributing externally to one's discipline, institution or community.

While scholarly activity and PD are both necessary and crucial components of faculty work, PD is accepted by administrators and faculty alike as a right as well as a responsibility for faculty. Consequently, FPSE Collective Agreements and institutional policies assign resources and faculty workload toward fulfilling PD. Scholarly activity does not have the same level of recognition or support. In fact, many collective agreements do not differentiate between PD and scholarly activity.

2 Boyer, E.L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Menlo Park, Calif; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990b

3 Boyer, p. 16

Defining scholarly activity

Scholarship, as articulated by Boyer, is a demonstration of academic excellence in the areas of discovery, teaching and learning, application, and integration. Since Boyer, others have built upon his work. The scholarship of learning, service, creative artistry, judgement (assessment and evaluation) management/administration and public dissemination, have all been identified as being part of scholarly activity. All faculty engage in scholarship, though such engagement may differ in form and content and at different moments of their career or even over an academic year.

At the 2007 AGM, FPSE members adopted the following policy definition of scholarly activity:

7.22 SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

FPSE recognizes that scholarly activity is integral to effective student learning and is a component of all faculty work. FPSE supports and advocates for workplace environments that enable faculty engagement in scholarly activity.

Elements of scholarly activity include:

- scholarly teaching, the application of teaching or learning principles to the practice of teaching to enable more effective teaching strategies and learner outcomes;
- scholarly enquiry, discovery, integration, creativity, professional service and application;
- research in support of teaching and learning.⁵

It is important to recognize that the purpose of identifying different forms of scholarship is not to create divisions or new hierarchies. The purpose is to enable a more detailed description of the ways faculty do their scholarly work which, in turn, will enable faculty to recognize their own work as scholarship and encourage them to broaden their activities. Scholarship encapsulates and interweaves within it all forms identified. One form cannot be artificially separated from the others, as each form completes, starts and/or occurs simultaneously when faculty engage in their work.

5 *FPSE Policy and Procedures Manual*, September 2008; Section IV Policy: Education Policy, p. 72

Faculty scholarship is the collaborative and social character of academic work. It moves academia away from the isolated ‘ivory tower’ model and encourages collaboration and the active sharing of knowledge between academics and the larger community. Engagement is not simply service, but the reflection on and refinement of expertise and knowledge through its use in the institution and the larger community. Balbir Gurm argues that Boyer’s analysis stressed that “professional knowledge is not proprietary, but communal and dedicated to the welfare of society through the transmission and extension of knowledge”.⁶

Scholarly activity needs to be framed in terms of an integrated portfolio of practice⁷. That integrated portfolio will demonstrate what we do as faculty and articulate why it matters not only to the institution but also to students and the broader community. The integrated portfolio approach emphasizes disciplinary expertise and inspiration as well as creative arts and accomplishments. It also includes practical activities, such as curricular review and innovation. It is also argued that this approach should have measurable impacts that include changes in student learning, revision of program goals, re-evaluation of civic enterprises, and increases in aesthetic awareness.⁸

One goal of scholarly activity is to demonstrate a positive impact on the public dissemination of knowledge in the form of “proximal plus one”. By this measure, it is important to stress that it is not enough to show that teaching has directly influenced a student, but that the student, in turn, is sufficiently influenced to then take that experience and use it to influence others.

In order to provide some background of the concept, additional analysis of the following selected set of scholarship areas is presented below: (a) discovery, (b) teaching and learning, (c) application, (d) integration, and (e) creative artistry.

(a) Scholarship of discovery

The scholarship of discovery refers to the traditional notion of research and the creation of new knowledge. Research and publishing were once unquestioningly at the peak of the academic hierarchy and reward system. The recent discussions and new definitions of scholarly activity question their pre-eminence and argue for a more inclusive concept that includes the many other activities of faculty. The

6 Dr. Balbir Gurm, Panel: *Scholarly Activity: Definition and Purpose*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

7 Ibid

8 Dr. Richard Gale, Panel: *Scholarly Activity: Definition and Purpose*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

competing needs of these different roles, causes conflict for the scholar/teacher/researcher.⁹ Wilcox and Ebb in their work argue that:

*In responding to these problems, the scholar must balance individual with group realities and requirements: an important pedagogical concept to help achieve the balance in the learning community.*¹⁰

Legislative changes are creating new demands for expanding access to the scholarship of discovery. All BC public post-secondary institutions are able to grant applied degrees, and five post-secondary institutions (three university-colleges, one institute and one community college) were recently granted university status.

The scholarship of discovery is becoming more important throughout the sector. A 2006 national survey of community colleges found that institutions across the country, including many in BC, were engaged in applied research.¹¹ In fact, the scope of the survey had to be broadened to include social sciences and humanities research because of the institutions' involvement in those areas.¹² When the SSHRC conducted a national consultation exercise in 2004 on the state of research in Canada, they discovered that community colleges have "increased their involvement in social sciences and humanities research."¹³

The British Columbia College Presidents (BCCP) made support of applied research—which often entails discovery—and regional innovation at the colleges a key priority in both their 2006/07 and 2007/08 budget submissions to government. The BCCP's submission included proposals for policy changes and increased research funding to support the initiatives. In BCCP's submission for the 2006/07 academic year, they argued that the policy and funding changes sought were necessary to support "... appropriate innovation and applied research, particularly research that responds to economic, social and community development".¹⁴

9 B. Gurm, Panel: *Scholarly Activity: Definition and Purpose*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

10 As presented by B. Gurm, Panel: *Scholarly Activity: Definition and Purpose*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

11 *Applied Research at Canadian Colleges and Institutes*, Association of Canadian Community Colleges, May 2006

12 *Ibid*, p.1

13 *Report on the Consultation*, Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (March 3, 2005)

14 *Building Capacity in our Communities through Our Community Colleges and Institutes*, BCCP Submission to the Min. of Advanced Education, November 25, 2005, p. 9

(b) The scholarship of teaching and learning

The scholarship of teaching and learning involves the understanding, utilization of and inquiry into knowledge development theory. It expands the previous notion of the “expert”, hierarchically handing down packaged ideas from the teacher to the student.¹⁵ The scholarship of teaching and learning looks beyond this one-way model by recognizing the need to actively consider how students learn. It also includes what faculty realize and learn from the experience of teaching and from their students.

For many FPSE faculty, the scholarship of teaching and learning is often an important focus of their work. This reflects the fact that the institutions where FPSE faculty work are primarily teaching institutions.

(c) The scholarship of application

The scholarship of application is the use of knowledge and practice, principally useful in areas in which standard procedures and practice are key. Law and medicine are two examples where the scholarship of application is the principle area of research. The scholarship of application includes the conscious application of theory when applying practical knowledge, with the goal of improvement and refinement of practice as a result of observation and analysis of its application and outcomes.

(d) The scholarship of integration

The scholarship of integration is the development of new perspectives through the synthesis of existing knowledge. Integration represents the broadening of thought by linking and incorporating knowledge across disciplinary fields and areas of knowledge. It encourages looking outside disciplines by considering and connecting with the larger world by resisting narrow margins of inquiry.

(e) The scholarship of creative artistry

The scholarship of creative artistry is the creation and interpretation of original works—an intellectual engagement through the arts. The definition of creative artistry, not surprisingly, captures the more familiar forms of artistic expression

15 Rice, *Beyond Scholarship Reconsidered*, p. 11

such as performance, photography, design and the fine arts. For many, the scope of creative artistry is not limited to “Art” with a capital A, however. When faculty at a scholarly activity workshop were asked what they thought creative artistry included the responses were wide-ranging, including: juried art shows; the creation of aesthetic objects in the trades; the creative use of knowledge and skills with clients in nursing; the need in the sciences to think creatively and “outside the box”. Creative artistry occupies the middle ground between the question and the answer. It demands taking chances.¹⁶

The purpose of public post-secondary education

The public post-secondary system was created to serve a variety of purposes, some more quantifiable than others. A primary purpose, easily quantifiable, is to make post-secondary education accessible to as many BC citizens as possible. An obvious measurement of this is the number of students enrolled and the number of graduates.

Two additional goals of the public post-secondary system are less quantifiable. A public system provides the means to ensure that the education provided is of the highest quality. Moreover, by being centres of open inquiry and free expression, public post-secondary institutions nurture the democratic process by encouraging and supporting an active and engaged citizenry. This goal is captured well in the introductory comments in the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ (CAUT) Policy Statement on Academic Freedom, which begins with a description of the purpose of post-secondary education:

(1) Post-secondary educational institutions serve the common good of society through searching for, and disseminating, knowledge, truth and understanding, and through fostering independent thinking and expression in academic staff and students. Robust democracies require no less ...¹⁷

While the post-secondary system alone is not and could not be solely responsible for the health of Canadian democracy, it is fair to say that it plays a central role in the support of it.

¹⁶ As Alice Macpherson described creative artistry at the Scholarly Activity Workshop, 2009 FPSE Spring Conference, February 14, 2009, Vancouver BC

¹⁷ Approved by the CAUT Council, November 2005

Scholarly activity and the institutional purpose

Faculty work—scholarship—is by definition what post-secondary institutions do. As such, the ability of post-secondary institutions to achieve their goals as outlined above, especially the latter two of providing quality education and being centres of creative free expression, depend upon the degree by which faculty are able to engage in scholarly activity. Faculty scholarship is what creates an enriched educational experience for students.

Selkirk College’s “Vision” document is a good illustration of the central role scholarship plays in public post-secondary institutions¹⁸. The document, in part, defines the college’s mandate as promoting citizenship by providing an engaged and quality educational experience:

Selkirk College will develop empowered, effective citizens through rewarding educational and life experiences that are built on our Region’s distinct identity.

and,

Our Vision is to be a Regional Community College that inspires, engages and enables learners to be valuable contributors to their communities and to society as a whole. Recognizing the value of mutually beneficial relationships, we will provide collaborative leadership in the communities we serve.

and the college commits to,

... inquire about the world and our place in it; address challenges with creative solutions; and inspire the imagination, spirit and mind.

Selkirk College’s vision shares these positive aims with other BC post-secondary institutions. Selkirk recognizes in their statement of strategic directions that “employees are key to success”, but nowhere in the mission, values or strategic directions do we see the word faculty or the need to provide opportunities for scholarly activity. Who, if not the faculty engaged in scholarly activity, will shape the vision, offer creativity and leadership, and inspire the students?

It needs to be recognized that faculty and their scholarly work enable an institution to provide a proper and enriching educational experience. It is the scholarly work that

¹⁸ Selkirk College Renewed Vision Document; approved by Selkirk College Board of Governors, February 2005

faculty do which enables the institutions to fulfill their mandate of providing the quality educational experiences necessary to support an active and engaged citizenry. As Eugene Rice argues, scholarly activity “goes to the heart of the academic enterprise ... to the definition of scholarship and to what faculty members are rewarded for doing.”¹⁹ In essence, the purpose and reason for public post-secondary institutions is intimately linked to the scholarly work of faculty.

If the goal of increasing enrolment and the number of graduates at all levels is prioritized alone, without proper regard for what type or quality of education is provided, students’ educational experience and the overall quality of the post-secondary system will inevitably be harmed. This is not to say that equal and easy access to post-secondary education for all BC citizens is of less importance—only that the quality of that education must also be prioritized if BC’s public post-secondary system is to achieve its fullest potential.

Public policy and scholarly activity

Unfortunately, the policy and funding strategies of the provincial government are, in part, challenging and reducing faculty engagement with scholarly activity.

The policy and funding strategies of the provincial government have put increased pressure on post-secondary institutions. Over the last seven years, real per-student operating grants from the provincial government have dropped by eight per cent, forcing most institutions to cut back either on programs, course options, student support services and/or faculty activities that take away from direct classroom teaching. As well, the provincial government has tilted the governance structures of public post-secondary institutions in ways that give greater voice and preference to business representatives and consequently less input from faculty.

These changes have contributed to a working atmosphere in which resources and support for faculty are increasingly scarce. Scholarly activity is not prioritized and is considered an exclusive activity for some and an unnecessary luxury for most. These conditions, along with softening enrolment, have put greater pressure on departments and faculty members to defend their programs and the scholarly activities that enhance and enrich the institutions.

19 R.E. Rice, “Beyond Scholarship Reconsidered: Toward an Enlarged Vision of the Scholarly Work of Faculty Members”, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 90, Summer 2002, p. 11

Faculty members feel less secure about their role as post-secondary faculty. Their institutions often struggle to maintain the current mix of courses and programs, a situation that makes every faculty member feel more vulnerable about their career in post-secondary education. At a professional level, they are concerned that their work as faculty is being reduced to very narrow measures of institutional and academic success—such as “bums in seats”.

These conditions—both the pressures on funding and the shift in institutional governance—have also supported a more aggressive approach by senior administrators when it comes to working with faculty and their departments. In some cases, this more aggressive approach takes the form of increased litigation and a top-down unilateral exercise of management rights. Collegial governance and activities—which allow the free flow of ideas and collaboration, essential elements for a culture of scholarship—are restricted and disregarded within such environments. Collegial governance is being replaced by more corporate models.

More recently, the announcement by the provincial government to designate five existing post-secondary institutions as universities has put increased pressure on those institutions to have faculty produce more scholarly work. Although the legislated goal of these new institutions is that of a “teaching university”, the administrations of these institutions are showing signs of wanting to be traditional universities. These universities are starting to push faculty to become more accountable for scholarly activity, predominantly the scholarship of discovery.

Unfortunately, the government has mandated that the new universities cannot negotiate any workload decrease to facilitate faculty participation in scholarly activity. As a result, the universities are seeking methods of forcing faculty to be more active in the scholarship of discovery in ways that do not violate the government’s mandate. For instance, faculty members at Vancouver Island University, who are teaching upper level courses and are asked to teach an overload, are expected to bank that overload to self-fund a sabbatical. Faculty are then expected to use that sabbatical to do research.²⁰

Clearly, the approach at Vancouver Island University is not sustainable. Others of the new universities will no doubt try to find creative ways of pushing faculty to be more active in the scholarship of discovery without providing additional resources to support the new activity. Regardless of which approach is taken, the reality is that,

²⁰ Personal communication with Dominique Roelants, Chief Steward, Vancouver Island University Faculty Association and FPSE Second Vice-President

because of the government mandate to not reduce workloads, faculty will be expected to do more with (if we are lucky) the same.

The pressure to be more active in the scholarship of discovery, while at the same time maintaining teaching loads that were not designed to include time for the scholarship of discovery, if not other forms of scholarship, is a recipe for disaster. The faculty will not meet the expectations for scholarly activity, the faculty will neglect their students, or the faculty will neglect their personal life. The expectation to participate in scholarly activity and the nature of what constitutes scholarly activity should be articulated in a manner that recognizes the constraints faced by the faculty at these new universities.

The debate about scholarly activity at the new universities must recognize that the role of faculty at the colleges is not that different. The benefit to students, for example, of having faculty actively engaged in their field, or in the scholarship of teaching and learning, is not something that should be limited to the universities. Unfortunately, in the absence of a change in public policy to allow the institutions to recognize the workload associated with participation in scholarly activity, the students will be short-changed.

Scholarly activity barriers

The pressures outlined above have resulted in numerous barriers to faculty engagement in scholarly activity, including limited time away from teaching, lack of adequate funding, lack of research facilities, and lack of support from administration.²¹ In a 2008 survey of the FPSE Professional and Scholarly Development Committee, it was found that more than 80 per cent of respondents cited lack of resources, funding and available time as barriers to faculty participation in scholarly activity. Nearly 70 per cent said lack of institutional support was also a barrier. About 55 per cent felt that the opportunities for scholarly activity at their institutions were inadequate.

Although these barriers exist to varying degrees at all BC public post-secondary institutions, a more serious problem is the absence of a culture of scholarly activity in some institutions or in specific parts of most institutions. If we want to see a general shift towards greater engagement in scholarly activity, our institutions, our faculty associations and we as individuals will have to nurture a culture of scholarship. A culture of scholarship is difficult without a broad understanding of what scholarly

21 Steven Earle, Panel: *Barriers and Limitations to Faculty Participation in Scholarly Activity*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

activity means. In the 2008 survey of the FPSE Professional and Scholarly Development Committee referenced above, the majority of respondents (64 per cent) said over half of their faculty members understood the meaning. Respondents were a lot less confident that their administrators understood the concept: about 55 per cent said that either “a few” or “almost none” of their administrators understood the meaning of scholarly activity.

Many of these concerns were echoed in additional survey comments. Faculty members, it seems, struggle to find the resources, funding and time needed to engage in scholarly activity. Many are frustrated by their administrators who either don't understand or under-value scholarly activity in their institutions.

Many of the observations recorded in the FPSE survey were reflected and, in part, explained in Cheryl Jeffs's PhD research on scholarly activity in BC.²² Her research was based on interviews with senior administrators at 12 community colleges throughout the province. Jeffs maintains that part of the challenge is that senior administrators do not have a clear understanding of what constitutes scholarly activity. Often their perspective is affected by immediate funding pressures and, as a result, they are unable to develop a more progressive, inclusive and longer-term approach to supporting scholarly activity in their institutions.

Coping with the barriers

Much of the scholarly work currently done at BC's public colleges, institutes and new universities is not the result of policy or institutional driven plans but through faculty initiative, often on their own time. The high quality of education provided relies heavily on faculty's professional drive and the efforts of their faculty associations.

At North Island College, for instance, and without adequate support from the institution, faculty member Bill McConnell merged his research interest in communities' fear and perceptions of crime with the challenge of making a research methods course interesting and engaging for students.²³ The result was a very successful survey project in the local community, conducted by students, which measured both the perceptions and incidence of crime in the Courtenay/Comox

22 Cheryl Jeffs, Panel: *Barriers and Limitations to Faculty Participation in Scholarly Activity*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

23 Bill McConnell, Panel: *Current Level of Access and Utilization of Scholarly Activity in BC's Public Post-Secondary System*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference

region. The research compiled from the project was presented and well-received at an international conference on the issue of crime and communities.

At Thompson Rivers University, it was through negotiations and the collective agreement that advances were made to support scholarly activity.²⁴ As the University College of the Cariboo, scholarly activity was often interwoven with PD. Once the institution was granted university status, the distinction between PD and scholarly activity became clearer as the push for external funding increased.

The Faculty Association had earlier negotiated provisions in their collective agreement to deal with some aspects of scholarly activity. Those provisions, however, still faced several challenges. There were systemic problems in terms of access. In some respects, gender biases were evident in terms of which faculties got access to scholarly activity support. Even within departments there was often a divide between those who taught third and fourth year courses and others because scholarly activity was more often viewed as something only “upper level” faculty could legitimately access.

The Faculty Association has, over time and through bargaining, managed to address some of these systemic problems. Once the institution was granted university status and was established as Thompson Rivers University, the Faculty Association negotiated clearer distinctions between PD and scholarly activity, especially in response to the increased push for external research funding. The negotiated mechanisms for accessing scholarly activity support also became more transparent. However, chronic underfunding throughout the public post-secondary system means that the level of support is still very modest.

Strategies for overcoming barriers

A multi-pronged approach is needed to overcome the barriers and create new opportunities for faculty to engage fully in scholarly activity.

How we define scholarly activity ultimately determines how much we are able to support it, both through our lobbying efforts and at the bargaining table. A narrow, traditional definition will exclude members and diminish our ability to advance progressive alternatives. A broader definition will be more inclusive and support our efforts to encourage scholarly activity within our ranks. As outlined in the introduction,

²⁴ Donna Petri, Panel presentation: *Barriers and Limitations to Faculty Participation in Scholarly Activity*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference, March 29, 2008

the purpose of this paper is to encourage debate about the meaning and importance of “scholarly activity”.

Faculty should also attempt to use what resources are available at the institution level and lobby for more with specific initiatives in mind. For instance, faculty should lobby and work to identify and nurture “scholarly collegial learning communities”.²⁵ One method includes support for a “community of inquiry” in which faculty share and reflect on information and experiences. It also includes “communities of practice” where ideas and interests are “co-created” through participation and mutuality, as well as “communities of learning” which recognize that academic work requires ethical reflection on the transmission and extension of knowledge.

This approach has led to innovations at Kwantlen Polytechnic University where Peer Mentoring Alliances have been created that allow faculty to share information, concepts and experiences. The initiative also encourages greater collaboration amongst faculty members, a development that is key to supporting scholarly activity. It is also supported by the publication, starting in 2007, of an electronic journal, *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning*, which brings a peer review process to the reflections, discussions and research of practitioners into their teaching practices and the learning of their students.²⁶

Another important approach is through collective bargaining. At a minimum, what is required is contract language that guarantees transparency and balances input within the institutions when it comes to supporting scholarly activity. Bargaining should seek language that distinguishes between “Scholarly Activity” and “Professional Development”. Such a distinction should take into account separate (and potentially different) sources of funding. Additionally, scholarly activity needs to be recognized as a necessary and defining characteristic of faculty work, which will require that all barriers to faculty scholarly activity, including the lack of proper funding, need to be reduced and eventually eliminated.

Lobbying government at both the provincial and federal levels on this issue must be a major component of FPSE’s future strategy. Both levels of government provide funding support, either in the form of operating grants or research grants. Base budgets for institutions need to be strengthened and access to research funding needs to be broadened. Funding must provide equal opportunities for faculty at all

25 Alice Macpherson, Panel: *Current Level of Access and Utilization of Scholarly Activity in BC’s Public Post-Secondary System*, FPSE Scholarly Activity Conference, March 29, 2008

26 <http://kwantlen.ca/TD>

institutions, regardless of their geographic location. Both governments need to be pushed to make the changes needed to support these outcomes.

Similarly, guaranteed, adequate and separate periods of time must be set aside and determined at the local level. This should include time for scholarly activities, access to both short and long-term leaves, and sabbaticals.

It is clear that FPSE needs to continue to support a greater understanding of the meaning and purpose of scholarly activity. FPSE should keep working to increase scholarly activity opportunities for faculty, and to ensure that scholarly activity is not used to exclude or discourage some of the important work done by faculty members. FPSE should continue to provide support for forums for the exchange of ideas, organize conferences and, through all other means consistent with its role, further enhance faculty scholarship.

The FPSE Professional & Scholarly Development Committee should continue to promote a fuller awareness and understanding of scholarly activity amongst the membership, as well as throughout all sectors of the post-secondary system.

Conclusion

The engagement of faculty in scholarly activity is crucial for the ability of post-secondary institutions to fulfill their mandates. Faculty, administrators and the government must be brought into the discussion of scholarship and the need to encourage and support it if the system is to reach its fullest potential. The lack of adequate resources, which is linked to cuts in already inadequate budgets, as well as institutional ignorance of the central role of scholarly activity, is blocking faculty from fully exercising their professional responsibilities and makes teaching excellence that much harder to achieve. The increasingly corporate model of management experienced at many institutions restricts collegiality and the ability of faculty to engage in scholarly activity.

It is hoped that this paper makes a positive contribution to furthering the debate and expanding understanding and awareness throughout the post-secondary system.