

# SCHOLARSHIP AND THE MAL PROGRAM: BEST PRACTICES FOR SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Trinity Western University  
September 2004

## Introduction

The MAL program is committed to students developing new practical servant leadership knowledge and skills based on best practices. We are also setting our objective to advancing the learning experience and to include greater emphasis on developing new leadership knowledge and program scholarship.

This document has been drafted as a discussion paper. It begins by establishing rationale for a closer focus on scholarship. Objectives for the focus on scholarship are identified, followed by a plan to operationalize the objectives. Specific points for faculty consideration and feedback are highlighted.

## Rationale

The following rationale support our increasing attention to program scholarship:

- ❑ Achieving the vision of being a “world-class” program
- ❑ Meeting the mandate of the professoriate
- ❑ Supporting student learning

### Achieving the Vision

The MAL program carries the vision of being a “world-class program for the development of middle and senior level organization leaders” (website). Contributing to the development and dissemination of new and renewed knowledge regarding leadership is vital to achieving this vision.

### Scholarship and the Professoriate

The MAL vision to expand program scholarship is synchrony with the development of the role statement of the Christian university currently being undertaken within the larger TWU community. As outlined in the draft document “The Role of Trinity Western University” (Draft distributed May 26, 2004):

In order to fulfill its mission, Trinity Western University vigorously pursues excellence in the intellectual and creative tasks that define a university: teaching and learning, ***scholarship and research***, and service to the local and global communities. For us these endeavors are rooted in a Christian worldview that calls us to nurture development of all aspects of personhood and contribution to society as a whole.

Central then to the mandate of the professoriate is engagement in research and scholarship, in its many forms.

### Supporting Student Learning

A cohesive plan for scholarship across the MAL program incorporates a commitment to support student learning. A high standard of academic achievement, together with the program strength of applied knowledge and skill, will prepare graduates to stand as leaders in their respective fields.

Derived from these 3 reasons for the enhancement of program scholarship are 4 broad objectives around which the discussion is organized.

### **Objectives**

The objectives for **scholarship** outlined in this proposal stem from a broad vision for scholarship that encompasses the synthesis, application, and generation of knowledge by both faculty and students.

More specifically, the objectives giving direction to this initiative are to:

1. Foster a culture of scholarship and inquiry in the MAL program.
2. Generate and disseminate new servant leadership knowledge.
3. Facilitate knowledge translation around best servant leadership practices.
4. Support student scholarship.

## Operationalization of Objectives

Each of these objectives is presented in more detail in this section, with the aim of soliciting faculty input into the process of strengthening scholarship across the program.

### ***Objective #1: Foster a culture and community of scholarship in the MAL program.***

Foundational to fostering a culture of scholarship is clarification of the notion of scholarship itself. The first option for consideration here is the expansion of our definition of scholarship beyond traditional conceptions of research.

Traditionally, the triadic mandate of the university as the site of higher learning has been **education** (intellectual and moral development of students), **service** to the community (through an educated citizenry), and **advancement of knowledge** (through research). A longstanding debate has arisen from this mandate regarding the priorities of the professoriate, fueled in no small part by competitive and rigorous standards for tenure and promotion. Faculty are typically evaluated on the basis of teaching, service, and research, with a narrowing of standards for measuring academic excellence in most universities focusing on engagement in publishable research to achieve tenure and promotion.

Ernest L. Boyer, former President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, published the landmark report “Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate” in 1990. In this report he raised the question, “What activities of the professoriate are most highly prized?” Boyer proposed abandoning the old paradigm of research versus teaching for a new model that encompasses a much broader conception of scholarship. His model has been adopted internationally as an alternative that gives all aspects of academic work legitimacy.

Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students. Specifically, we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of **discovery**; the scholarship of **integration**; the scholarship of **application**; and the scholarship of **teaching** (Boyer, 1990, p. 16).

Believing in the connectedness of all things, Boyer argued that the scholarship of discovery (i.e., research), though important, is inadequate by itself to fully understand either ourselves or the world as a whole.

Importantly, Boyer’s model provides a broad definition of scholarship that remains rigorous, yet can be applied to different educational and disciplinary contexts. As explained by Jacobson and Jacobsen: “The goal is not to water down the definition of scholarship so that everyone can claim to be a scholar but rather to acknowledge the diversity of tasks that are naturally and legitimately involved in good scholarship” (p. 120).

The following Table summarizes the 4 domains of scholarship.

<p><b>SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY</b>  “research; to narrow one’s focus to only one isolated part of reality in order to understand its intricate complexity”  (Boyer cited in Jacobsen &amp; Jacobsen, p. 51).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A traditional view of research</li> <li>- Contributes to the body of knowledge</li> <li>- Publications such as books, articles in scientific journals, presentations at academic meetings</li> <li>- Peer Reviewed</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCHOLARSHIP OF INTEGRATION</b>  “the attempt to arrange relevant bits of knowledge and insight from different disciplines into broader patterns that reflect the actual interconnectedness of the world” (Boyer cited in Jacobsen &amp; Jacobsen, p. 51)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Critical analysis and review of knowledge</li> <li>- Creative synthesis of views and insights</li> <li>- Interdisciplinary collaboration</li> <li>- Literature reviews, meta-analyses, books, book chapters, reports on interdisciplinary programs and service projects, policy presentations designed to influence other groups</li> <li>- Peer Reviewed</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION</b>  “the scholarship of engagement; seeking to close the gap between values in the academy and the needs of the larger world” (Boyer cited in Jacobsen &amp; Jacobsen, p. 51)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applying knowledge in the solution of societal needs and practice</li> <li>- Case studies, presentations related to practice, outcome analyses, programs and grants to expand practice</li> <li>- Peer Reviewed</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING</b>  “the scholarship of sharing knowledge”  (Boyer cited in Jacobsen &amp; Jacobsen, p. 51)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflective analysis of the knowledge about teaching and learning</li> <li>- More than just “good teaching”</li> <li>- Scholarship related to pedagogy, reports of teaching innovations, published textbooks, recognition as a master teacher</li> <li>- Peer Reviewed</li> </ul>

Boyer, a devout Christian himself, explained the ultimate purpose of Christian scholarship as to “celebrate the majesty, the integration, and the wholeness of God’s creation” (cited in Jacobsen & Jacobsen, 2004, p. 52). He emphasized that connected scholarship could not happen in isolation. Rather, Christian scholars need constantly to communicate with other scholars and work alongside them in the common human task of seeking to understand, nurture, and where necessary, mend the tough but delicate fabric of the world. In a life-affirming spirit, Boyer believed that the role of scholarship, whether Christian or not, is to help people discover a calling and purpose in life that draws them out of themselves and into constructive relationships with others. Boyer’s view of scholarship, his commitment to higher education as service to the public, and his visionary leadership makes for ready links to servant leadership.

➤ *An intentional focus on Boyer’s expanded conception of scholarship has been adopted as a framework for our scholarship in the MAL program.*

The advantages of this model include:

- ❑ A better “fit” with the mission, resources, and infrastructure of a primarily “teaching” university.
- ❑ An integrated model of scholarship in keeping with larger university community policies for tenure & promotion.
- ❑ Acknowledges the current emphases and strengths of the MAL program and faculty (e.g., application, integration). Much of our scholarship is more applied (e.g., teaching, consulting) than research-based.
- ❑ The emphasis on scholarship in the 4 domains calls for intentional peer reviewed processes that will foster excellence
- ❑ Fit with servant leadership philosophy
- ❑ It encompasses what MAL students are already doing in their projects

1. What are the merits of adopting Boyer’s model as a framework for the MAL program? The shortcomings?
2. In light of Boyer’s model, where do we stand with our MAL scholarship? Provide examples of each type of scholarship within the MAL program. What are our strengths? Areas of potential? What areas are priorities? How might we achieve excellence across all 4 domains?

### **Implementation Issues and Plan**

Anticipated issues that may arise in the adoption and implementation of Boyer’s scholarship model include:

- ❑ Achieving a shared understanding of what scholarship looks like in the 4 domains
- ❑ Embedding the model within the philosophy and curriculum of the program (i.e., making it known & utilized; “buy in” from faculty & students)

Other implementation issues pertain more generally to the challenge of building community of scholars across a large, diverse interdisciplinary program:

- ❑ Part-time, off-campus faculty who may not feel connected to the program and/or who carry substantial workloads elsewhere.
- ❑ Full-time university faculty who carry responsibilities in their “home” departments/faculties (MAL may be just a small part of their teaching load). Their programs of research/scholarship may only indirectly touch on leadership.
- ❑ Students are only on-campus for a small portion of their academic program, therefore less available for expanded scholarship opportunities (e.g., Research or Teaching Assistantships).
- ❑ Workload and demands of teaching and administration duties limit engagement in scholarship.

The following table suggests a plan to foster a culture and community of scholarship in the MAL program. Some of the initiatives focus on the adoption of Boyer’s model, others speak more generally to fostering a culture of scholarship.

<b>Objective #1: Foster a culture and community of scholarship in the MAL program. (what)</b>	
Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To build excellence into the program and the university;</li> <li>○ To meet the mandates of the university and professoriate, and in the process bring balance and fulfillment in our roles;</li> <li>○ To provide servant leadership in scholarship to TWU community &amp; affiliates</li> <li>○ Scholarship happens best within community (Boyer)</li> </ul>
How?	<p><u>In Process:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Profile faculty &amp; student scholarship (e.g., website, community leadership forums)</li> <li>○ Articulate a vision of servant leadership scholarship through MAL (include foci of scholarship, areas of expertise)</li> <li>○ Appoint a Scholarship “Champion”</li> </ul> <p><u>Possibilities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prepare a document outlining Boyer’s model to post on the website.</li> <li>○ Provide orientation to Boyer’s model to all faculty &amp; students (as part of introduction to research course)</li> <li>○ Deliberate inclusion of 4 domains of scholarship across curriculum.</li> <li>○ Collate a catalogue of MAL faculty scholarship pertaining to leadership</li> <li>○ Expand easily accessible library of servant leadership resources</li> <li>○ Distribute research-based articles on servant leadership (and related topics) regularly to faculty to assist them in building their resources for practices for servant leadership.</li> <li>○ Establish formalized links with practitioners of servant leadership and servant leadership organizations</li> <li>○ Encourage faculty and students to publish co-authored papers/presentations based on major projects.</li> </ul>

## ***Objective #2. Generate and disseminate new servant leadership knowledge***

A brief overview of the state of knowledge within leadership research presented here serves as further background to be considered in the development of an action plan for servant leadership scholarship in the MAL program.

The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory has published a useful overview of the history of leadership research. They trace the evolution of leadership research through various stages, beginning with early research from the 1900s – 1950s focusing on characteristics of leaders and followers. The document goes on to explain:

Finding that no single trait or combination of traits fully explained leaders' abilities, researchers then began to examine the influence of the situation on leaders' skills and behaviors. Subsequent leadership studies attempted to distinguish effective from non-effective leaders. These studies attempted to determine which leadership behaviors were exemplified by effective leaders. To understand what contributed to making leaders effective, researchers used the contingency model in examining the connection between personal traits, situational variables, and leader effectiveness. Leadership studies of the 1970s and 1980s once again focused on the individual characteristics of leaders which influence their effectiveness and the success of their organizations. The investigations led to the conclusion that leaders and leadership are crucial but complex components of organizations.

Researchers have since expanded their work to look at the impact of setting on leadership (situational leadership, contingency models), and organizational leadership in the sense that leadership does not rest solely with individuals. More recent research has distinguished between management and leadership, and highlighted the importance of visionary leadership and shared vision. These shifts speak to the development of transformational leadership by which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation" (Burns, cited by SEDL). The motivation for transformational leadership focuses on the advancement of the organization, which is what distinguishes transformational leadership from servant leadership (Don Page, personal communication, Sept. 7, 2004).

As evidenced in the SEDL overview, the field of leadership studies is still very much in a state of ferment. Much has been published in the last two decades, both in the popular and academic literatures. Levy et al. (2002) suggest that such proliferation is indicative of the elusive nature of the concept of leadership:

.....One may wonder how scientific studies could possibly apply to so broad and nebulous a subject, one with literally hundreds of definitions.... Furthermore, the functions of leadership may overlap with those of management to such a degree that any distinction between the two concepts is lost. Nonetheless, scholars have given leadership a general shape, speculated on its elements, and offered perspectives on how to achieve and retain effective leadership. (p. 69).

Leadership studies also face the challenge of integrating theory, research, and practice. Zaccaro and Horn (2003) analyze the current state of academic, practice, and popular leadership literature, noting that many theories have been developed without regard for the practice

problems of leadership posed in many organizations; instead, they seek, in the tradition of basic research, to explain and understand the social influence dynamics of leadership in a theoretical sense. In turn, leadership practice literature is

riddled with trial and error applications that are grounded more in the anecdotes of key policymakers, sponsoring stakeholders, and targeted constituencies than in scientific data and models. The popular literature offers... leadership wisdom and principles, again reflecting single case studies, anecdotal evidence, and common sense reflections upon actual experiences. (Zaccaro & Horn, p. 770).

They go on to acknowledge the contributions of popular literature, but note they should serve as complement to and instigator of scientific and theoretical inquiry, not its replacement. Other concerns reported in the literature regarding the state of leadership scholarship include the primary focus on interpersonal level of leadership; a limited set of explanatory variables; nonprogrammatic past research; lack of policy relevance; and little attention to conceptual dynamics of applied questions (Zaccaro & Horn, 2003). Integrative models of practice, research, and theory (as illustrated in Boyer's Model) stand as solution, in part, to these concerns.

This background discussion of the terrain of leadership research, and some of the challenges embedded in it, underscores the need for thoughtful approach to a model for scholarship within the MAL program, and take us to our immediate interest: servant leadership scholarship.

While rooted in New Testament theology, the development of servant leadership is most often attributed to Robert Greenleaf in the 1970s. Page and Wong (2000) note that the "concept of servant leadership is so complex as to defy definition – it is multi-dimensional, rich in hues and wide-ranging in its meanings" (p. 1). They go on to offer the following definition: "A servant-leader may be defined as a leader whose primary purpose for leading is to serve others by investing in their development and well-being for the benefit of accomplishing tasks and goals for the common good" (p. 2).

Academic research in the *servant leadership* field is emerging as a significant and legitimate area of inquiry. Regent University's School of Leadership Studies (Virginia), hosts a Servant Leadership Research Roundtable to engage in interaction by scholars interested in the growing field of servant leadership studies. Papers and a list of doctoral dissertations on servant leadership are available on their website (<http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/>). Dr. Bruce Winston, Acting Dean of the School of Leadership Studies, is a leading scholar in the area of servant leadership. The Greenleaf Center's website has a list of servant-leadership dissertations published in the past few years (available at: <http://greenleaf.org/leadership/read-about-it/articles/Growth-of-Servant-Leadership-in-Educational-Institutions.htm>). Another academic center for scholarship in the area of servant leadership is Belmont University's Moench Center for Church Leadership (<http://www.belmont.edu/moench/>).

Diverse methods of research are being applied to servant leadership, although few measurement studies exist.

While the descriptions of servant leadership abound, to our knowledge there are no quantitative measures of this construct. One of the main reasons for this gap in the literature is the fear that operationalizing servant-leadership runs the risk of reductionism and trivialization of the concept. (Page & Wong, 2000, p. 12)

Don Page and Paul Wong have done extensive work in concept development and data-based theory testing in servant leadership. Their research serves as example of the opportunity for research scholarship in this field, and provides invaluable groundwork for the development of further studies by the MAL program.

With the program itself well established (e.g., curriculum, market base, faculty), we are in a position to build on the practice excellence of the program through the generation of new leadership knowledge. As identified in the above review, the field of leadership research, and servant leadership in particular, demonstrates a rich opportunity for rigorous empirical and theoretical inquiry informed by leadership practice. As an interdisciplinary program we may carry various ideals of what equates rigorous research, and at an even more fundamental level, what evidence looks like. For example, what evidence is sufficient for Best Practices Leadership? The concern raised by scholars such as Zacarro and Horn (2003) cited earlier regarding the over-reliance on case studies as evidence underlines the need for a sound base of inquiry.

On a more pragmatic level, the establishment of the Office for Faculty Development and Research serves as indicator of the University's will to raise the profile of scholarship within the larger university community, and to build research capacity among faculty.

1. What does evidence look like? What is sufficient evidence to base decision-making on?
2. Is the MAL program interdisciplinary? If not, what core body of (disciplinary) knowledge serves as the foundation? If so, what disciplines? What are the implications of developing interdisciplinary knowledge?
3. Scholarship in the area of leadership has been criticized as weak on empirics. How do you respond to this critique?
4. What are the challenges faced by those who pursue research in this field?

### **Issues in Implementation and Plan**

Anticipated issues that may flow from a commitment to knowledge generation include:

- ❑ The need to build research capacity and research networks of scholars
- ❑ Workload. With an increased expectation for research productivity comes the need to re-evaluate faculty (teaching) workload.
- ❑ Funding & Grantsmanship.

The following table suggests various strategies for knowledge generation (research) and dissemination in the MAL program.

<b>Objective #2. Generate and disseminate new servant leadership knowledge</b>	
Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To meet University &amp; Faculty mandates</li> <li>- To meet a gap in knowledge regarding servant leadership</li> <li>- To establish balanced profile of integrated scholarship</li> <li>- To enhance our teaching and service</li> </ul>
How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Collaborate with TWU Office of Research to pursue opportunities for research.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pursue funding (grants) to support systematic research in the theory and practice of Servant-Leadership</li> <li>○ Work with the academic administration to negotiate terms of faculty “release time” when such grants are obtained.</li> <li>○ Build on smaller projects to develop larger funded studies (programmatic research)</li> <li>○ Identify resources currently at our disposal</li> <li>○ Collaborate with students in Major Projects to establish thematic research (encourage joint publications)</li> <li>○ Pursue funding for <u>endowed professorship(s)</u> in servant leadership studies.</li> <li>○ Leadership Research Roundtable (Virginia) (Dr. Page has presented at the 2003 and 2004 roundtables)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Once we have established a collective sense of where we are at with our scholarship, further benchmarks will be established for this objective, such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing numbers of faculty studies underway;</li> <li>- increasing amounts of research funding</li> <li>- graduates pursuing doctoral studies</li> <li>- # of peer-reviewed Faculty and student publications and Presentations</li> <li>- Sponsorship of a TWU scholarly conference (perhaps in conjunction with the biannual International Meaning Conference)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Objective #3: Facilitate knowledge translation around best servant leadership practices**

Even the most outstanding research is of limited value if it is not taken up in practice. Traditionally, there has been an ineffective application of research to change practitioner behaviour or implement research into policy in many fields. Jonathon Lomas, a noted Canadian expert in knowledge translation, explains:

Much of the failure to apply research more effectively is attributable to a lack of communication between researchers and policy makers and a poor understanding on the one hand, of the environment in which research is generated, and on the other, of the realities facing policy-makers trying to interpret and implement research findings. (1997, p. iii)

A shift is underway that sees significantly more emphasis being placed on the process of knowledge translation. Knowledge translation has been defined as:

...the exchange, synthesis and ethically-sound application of researcher findings within a complex system of relationships among researchers and knowledge users; a transformation of knowledge into use (CIHR)

Academicians are learning to be strategic in how they disperse research findings, recognizing that knowledge uptake occurs very differently depending on the stakeholder.

Calls for evidence-based policy, evidence-based governance, and evidence-based management across many sectors, along with the knowledge translation movement, draw our attention to the importance of not only joining in the generation of servant-leadership knowledge, but also being proactive in ensuring that such knowledge reaches practitioners and decision-makers and is translated into evidence-based leadership.

Knowledge translation falls under Boyer's domains of Scholarship of Integration and Application.

- ***We have a unique opportunity in the MAL program to position ourselves for knowledge translation.***

The applied nature of the program fits well with knowledge translation. Through our teaching, and service to community stakeholders, servant leadership knowledge is demonstrated in leaders across the continent and around the world.

1. How are we currently involved in intentional knowledge translation?
2. What marketing and consulting strategies will support knowledge translation?
3. How can we build connections to best practitioners in the field plus alumni who are implementing servant leadership in their respective organizations?

**Issues in Implementation and Plan**

A commitment to knowledge translation around best servant leadership practices may face the following issues in implementation:

- ❑ Resources & Workload: Establishing a formalized structure for knowledge translation (e.g., consulting, presentations) requires resources and has workload implications.
- ❑ Practice Networks: Who is best positioned to network with community agencies, businesses, public sector to build the relationships and connections vital to knowledge translation?

The following table presents a plan for the implementation of this objective:

<b><i>Objective #3: Facilitate knowledge translation around best servant leadership practices.</i></b> (community focus)	
Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership practices need to be evidence-based.</li> <li>- We serve as resource and expertise regarding servant leadership for community stakeholders</li> <li>- Raises profile of MAL (marketing strategy)</li> </ul>
How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership forums for community stakeholders (e.g., present student research...).</li> <li>- Profile MAL alumnae</li> <li>- Develop a consulting arm of the MAL program (e.g., offering workshops, speakers' bureau)</li> </ul> <p>Workshops/Consulting, Speakers Bureau</p>

#### ***Objective #4: Support student scholarship***

An important set of options around the support of student scholarship lies within the improvement of course delivery methods, especially the online courses. Angie Mays has developed a series of related initiatives around this mandate. This discussion here focuses on the aspects of student scholarship related to the proposed Research Methods course, and Major Projects.

Experience has shown that the lack of a 'user-friendly' research methods course limits students' interest or opportunity to use the major project course to do their best scholarly work. This lack also limits the essential empowerment of the students and creates inefficient reliance on project advisors for direction in too many areas.

- ***A Research Methods Course (LDR 690; 1.5 credits) is being developed. Other resources are also being developed to support student scholarship across the program.***

The research methods needs to be easily accessible to the dual first year cohorts in the March – May 2005 timeframe. The course will be available early enough to benefit students in their work with course assignments and not too late to benefit them with the beginning work on major projects. We view the sequencing of the course to be very timely for use in developing a high quality major project proposal. This course will contribute significantly to even more rewarding learning and greater program excellence.

Format: Self-directed course (1.5 credits) delivered on-line. Evaluation of student learning will be accomplished by on-line quizzes. As well, students will be required to work closely with their project advisors during the course. At the completion of the course, students will be well positioned to write their major project (a solid draft of project proposal should be an outcome of the research course). Student evaluation will be Pass/Fail.

Including stream faculty as project supervisors will allow students to study with faculty who may carry disciplinary expertise in a particular area of leadership while offering expanded professional development opportunities for faculty to work with graduate students. This re-distribution of project supervision will also allow core faculty, including the Program Director, to focus on administrative duties.

**Issues in Implementation and Plan**

The following issues may arise in the implementation of the research methods course and further supports for student scholarship:

- ❑ Building faculty capacity to supervise students in research methods course & major projects.
- ❑ Increasing overall credit hours of MAL program (e.g., from 36 hours to 37.5 hours) and associated costs to students.
- ❑ Establishing program standards for scholarly writing, including academic referencing (APA)

<b>Objective #4: Support student scholarship</b>	
Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students are the center of our scholarship mandate</li> <li>○ In order for them to excel in program requirements</li> <li>○ To offer support to faculty in their supervision of student projects</li> </ul>
How?	<p><u>In Process:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluate &amp; revise program (program evaluation completed Aug 04; Vern Storey)</li> <li>○ Build faculty capacity and improve quality of course delivery in on-line learning environments (On-line Instruction Program Enhancements; Angie’s mandate)</li> <li>○ New user-friendly website</li> <li>○ Develop Research Course (ALDR 690)</li> <li>○ Provide further supports for completion of Project (guidelines, APA).</li> <li>○ Writing guide for use across the program (e.g., how to craft an argument organization, APA, common mistakes)</li> <li>○ Make all resources available online</li> <li>○ Faculty orientation to &amp; mentorship in project supervision with annual meetings</li> <li>○ Support for ESL students</li> </ul> <p><u>Possibilities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Closer connections with Writing Center</li> </ul>

### **Action Plan: Development, Implementation, and Evaluation**

An action plan will be developed for the implementation of initiatives that support program scholarship. This document, and in particular faculty discussion of its content, will serve as the foundation for this action plan.

The plan will be reviewed on an annual basis as part of Faculty Review of the Program. As evidence of progression in the overall advancement of scholarship, benchmarks will be established for each objective. Individual initiatives will undergo their own evaluation processes (e.g., the implementation of LDR 690).

Prepared by: Sheryl Reimer Kirkham, PhD  
September 2004

## References

- Axelsson, R. (1998). Towards an evidence based health care management. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 13, 307-317.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). *Knowledge translation overview* [on-line]. Accessed September 6, 2004. Available at: [www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/7518.html](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/7518.html)
- Jacobsen, D., & Hustedt Jacobsen, R. (2004). *Scholarship & Christian faith: Enlarging the conversation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kovner, A., Elton, J., & Billings, J. (2000). Evidence-based management. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 16(4), 3 – 24.
- Levy, S., Hill, J., & Greene, B. (2002). *Leadership in health care and the leadership literature*. *Journal of Ambulatory Care Management*, 25(2), 68-74.
- Lomas, J. (1997). *Improving research dissemination and uptake in the health sector: Beyond the sound of one hand clapping*. McMaster University Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis/Policy Commentary c97-1. [on-line]. Accessed July 24, 2004. Available at: [http://chrsf.ca/knowledge\\_transfer](http://chrsf.ca/knowledge_transfer)
- Page, A. (Ed.) Transformational leadership and evidence-based management. In *Keeping patients safe: Transforming the work environment of nurses*. Committee on the Work Environment for Nurses and Patient Safety Board on Health Care Services. Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. Accessed on July 24, 2004. Available at: <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309090679/html/115.html#pagetop>
- Page, D. & Wong, P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership. In B. Senyo & S.K. Adjibolosoo (eds) *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. New York, NY: University Press of America. Available at: <http://www.twu.ca/leadership/ConceptualFrameworkforServantLeadership.pdf>
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. *The history of leadership research*. [on-line]. Accessed July 23, 2004. Available at <http://www.sedl.org/change/leadership/history.html>
- Storch, J., Gamroth, L., & Collaborative Partners (2002). Scholarship revisited: A collaborative nursing education program's journey. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 41(12)
- Zaccaro, S., & Horn, Z. (2003). Leadership, theory, and practice: Fostering an effective symbiosis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 769-806.