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Introduction
The four types of scholarship in the Boyer framework are relevant to teaching or training at any level of post-secondary education, both directly in terms of knowledge and indirectly through the impact of enthusiasm [2,9]. This outline is a simplified introduction to the salient features of the system, with some general examples of what each type could mean in practice. The boundaries of the types are fluid and can overlap in theory and in practice [4,6].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOVERY</th>
<th>INTEGRATION</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>TEACHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Traditional research</td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary collaboration</td>
<td>• Industry collaboration</td>
<td>• Instructional materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building new knowledge from new insights into existing problems; e.g.,
- Traditional research
- New light from literature review

Interpreting the use of knowledge across disciplines; e.g.,
- Collaborative teamwork
- Cross-degree cooperation

Achieving optimal student learning through the study of teaching models & practice; e.g.,
- Interactive presentations
- Mentoring roles

Applying knowledge to address problems in society and the professions; e.g.,
- Industry problem-solving
- Consultation activity

Difficulties
It is clear from the way academics are completing their continuing professional development plans that they generally seem to view the four categories of the Boyer model as discrete and distinct, rather
than possibly overlapping. In practice, these categories can have much in common in pairs or collectively. This suggests that a Venn diagram may better represent actual practice, particularly in tertiary education where professional applications are part of the teaching as are the results of research. The one presented here is similar to Figure 2 in Kern et al [8] but preserves Boyer’s original classifications.

The overlapping specifics can be illustrated from Collins [5] though that was not his original intention:

- **The scholarship of discovery:**
  - original research;
  - generation of new knowledge;
  - peer-reviewed publishing;
  - original empirical study

- **The scholarship of integration:**
  - seeing connections across disciplines;
  - integrating new discoveries into a broader body of knowledge

- **The scholarship of application:**
  - the solution of problems both within the academic community, and
  - the wider social context

- **The scholarship of teaching:**
  - keeping abreast with developments in the field,
  - engagement in pedagogic research,
  - disseminating good practice in one’s specialist field,
  - ongoing reflective evaluation of own practice

Integration across a range of issues is very important and can lead to good expository writing, which is difficult to accomplish at any time, but particularly at a time when curiosity driven research seems to be undervalued in the research ranking games. Good expository skills require a finely tuned and deep understanding of the topical and key critical issues in a field combined with the ability to write concisely and precisely in clear and unambiguous prose.
There are also parts of each of the categories which are in a sense “pure” in that they are not developed to be applied anywhere, even though they may obtain their tools from other domains.

### The Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals</td>
<td>Authority is constructed &amp; Contextual</td>
<td>Embark &amp; Clarify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Preparation</td>
<td>Information Creation as a Process</td>
<td>Find &amp; Generate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Methods</td>
<td>Information has Value</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Reflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Results</td>
<td>Research as Inquiry</td>
<td>Organise &amp; Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Presentation</td>
<td>Scholarship as Conversation</td>
<td>Analyse &amp; Synthesise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Critique</td>
<td>Searching as Strategic Exploration</td>
<td>Communicate &amp; Apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four dimensions of Boyer

### Fitting one’s work into the Boyer Framework

The first difficulty can be one of classification, but it is necessary if the scholarly activity is to be evaluated fairly. Some of the categories are satisfied semi-automatically through active membership of a relevant professional society, in accountancy or education for example. This is further enhanced if continuing membership or professional registration requires the completion of pertinent continuing professional development.

- This may seem tedious but the Boyer Model (or variations of it) are becoming expected knowledge for academics in Higher Education Providers.
- At the end of an appraisal period there has to be some evidence of accomplishing the goals set.
- “Teaching at its best shapes both research and practice” (Boyer)
Not all categories have to be addressed in any particular teaching period. These are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOYER MODEL</th>
<th>Suggestions for related scholarly activities</th>
<th>Suggested scope of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCOVERY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A hypothetical example could have the form as set out in the following table (with electronic evidence either in the form of a teaching portfolio [12] or professional journal [13]). The example is on the ambitious side, but it is put this way so that there are examples of possible activity. Of course, the extent of activities depends on the employment status.
Classifying and measuring scholarly activity

In many ways traditional scholars will balk at the idea of the quantitative measurement of scholarship (and this writer feels that way too), but the mantra in the current academic world is often “if it cannot be measured, then it cannot be managed”. The following table is intended to be a compromise to fit the current world in which many of the CESA members will be involved as teachers or students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship of</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Impact [optional]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Paper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Doctor Degree Candidate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Research Master Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other External Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Conference Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Towards a possible Boyer measure guide of some activities
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