

Scholarship in Student Affairs Revisited: The Summit on Scholarship, March 2006

Margaret A. Jablonski

Salvador B. Mena

Kathleen Manning

Stan Carpenter

Kari Lee Siko



Over the past 5 years, ACPA and NASPA have promoted conversations about an exploration of scholarship in the field through dedicated special issues of their journals (2001 and 2002 respectively) to the topic. The leadership of NASPA called a “summit” in 2006 for scholars and practitioners to gather and discuss the state of scholarship in the field of student affairs. The purpose of the summit

Margaret A. Jablonski is the vice chancellor for student affairs at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill in Chapel Hill, North Carolina and the current editor of the NASPA Journal. Salvador B. Mena is the associate dean for community living and multicultural affairs at Goucher College in Baltimore, Maryland and a third-year doctoral student in the College Student Personnel Program at the University of Maryland, College Park. Kathleen Manning is an associate professor of higher education and student affairs administration at University of Vermont in Burlington, Vermont. Stan Carpenter is professor and chair of the Educational Administration and Psychological Services Department at Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas. Kari Lee Siko is a doctoral student at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill in Chapel Hill, North Carolina and serves as the editorial assistant for the NASPA Journal.

was to make recommendations for the future production and dissemination of scholarship. This article provides an overview of the summit, the questions asked and answered, and future directions to take as a community of scholars and practitioners.

Over the past 5 years, student affairs has engaged in conversations at national conferences and in the leading journals about the need to explore all aspects of the scholarship related to the student affairs field (*Journal of College Student Development* [JCSD], Volume 42, Issue 2; and the *NASPA Journal*, Volume 39, Issue 2). Topics addressed in these forums included the foundational scholarship, seminal and emerging theories, application, preparation programs, and publication. Several authors in the JCSD and *NASPA Journal* special issues on scholarship cited Boyer's work on types of scholarship as crucial for student affairs practitioners to understand and use in their daily work with students. Of note is Carpenter's (2001) article, which calls for a "scholarship of practice" in keeping with Boyer's types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Theory and scholarship are directly related and essential for practitioners who employ these in their daily interactions with students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

McEwen (2003) argued that student affairs professionals understand and use theory for several reasons:

First and perhaps most important, a theoretical basis for knowledge, expertise, and practice serves as a foundation for a profession, which student affairs is and has been for almost a century. Second, knowing and understanding theory provides a medium of communication and understanding among student affairs professionals. Third, theory can serve as a "common language" within a community of scholars. (p. 154)

McEwen (2003) summarized the families of theories related to student affairs related to student development, learning, environmental impact, and culture. She argued that student affairs theories are inter-related, with subsets that form a complex model. Developmental, organizational, and environmental theories as well as typologies were

identified as areas of research that scholars and practitioners can use to affect good practice. Indeed, Carpenter (2001) argued that good practice in student affairs entails the use of the best theories in an intentional manner. In the *NASPA Journal's* issue on "Scholarship in Student Affairs," Fried (2002) stated that student affairs would be well-served by developing a scholarship of integration: "the review of knowledge, typically across disciplines, in order to discern or create meaning" (p. 121).

The need for scholarship in student affairs has been argued in places other than the two leading journals in the field. *Learning Reconsidered* in 2004 and the updated *Learning Reconsidered 2* in 2006 advocated for the entire institution to join in the education of students. Learning in this context is defined as "a complex, holistic, multicentric activity that occurs throughout and across the college experience" (Keeling, 2004, p. 5). Whether couched in the language of development, environmental management, or organizational development, learning is at the center of our practice within student affairs. Partnerships and collaborative efforts across the institution positively impact the learning process by increasing the opportunities and contexts for learning. The provision of many programs and services in divisions of student affairs requires an integrated approach that bridges theory and application.

The Summit on Scholarship in Student Affairs

Against this backdrop of discussion about student affairs scholarship within JCSD and the *NASPA Journal*, the idea for a "summit" was born. The purpose of the summit, held during the NASPA national conference in March 2006 was to spark conversation among faculty and practitioners about the past, present, and future state of scholarship. Within a diverse group of 100 faculty and practitioners invited to attend the summit, 19 were full-time faculty members, six were doctoral students, and the remaining number were senior student affairs officers with at least 20 years of experience.

Three panelists and participants were invited to address the following questions:

1. What is the nature of scholarship in student affairs currently and for the next decade?

2. What research agendas need to be supported within the academy that relate to student affairs practice?
3. What can be done to enhance the production and dissemination of scholarship to practitioners? How should scholarship be produced and shared?
4. How do we effectively teach about writing and publication practice to our graduate students and to our practitioners?
5. What methods of collaboration can advance the creation of new knowledge about theory and practice related to student affairs work?
6. How does scholarship inform our practice?

Three student affairs educators representing different generations of student affairs education and practice set the stage for the discussion by presenting their perspectives on scholarship. An abbreviated version of their comments is reproduced below. After each panelist, the participants briefly wrote about the questions and ideas put forward by the panelist. These written reflections were collected by the lead author, analyzed, and compiled below in the discussion section.

Setting the Stage: Carpenter, Manning, and Mena

Stan Carpenter, professor and chair, Educational Administration and Psychological Services Department at Texas State University, San Marcos (representing the senior generation of student affairs educators)

“I think I am supposed to give a past perspective as the so-called senior of the trio. Of course, that really just means old. So I began with some old scholarship. . . . Principle 12 from Clothier, 1931, p.13 states:

The so-called extra-curricular activities should be recognized as potential agencies of character development and should be encouraged and directed by the college but without impairing the student’s initiative, leadership, organizing ability and sense of responsibility. They should be integrated so far as possible with the work of the curriculum.

I bring up these old sources to remind myself that scholarship and scholarly consideration of our work is at least as old as the field and is recognizable as such. Our forbearers read each other's work, advocated more and better research, used what research was available, even outside their own field, and generally behaved like the professionals they were. If their work was frequently prescriptive and descriptive (Schuh 2002), those things were valuable, reflecting a young field, and they advocated better research. Looking back, the work of such leaders as Lloyd-Jones and Cowley is remarkable.

...let me summarize [the current state]...

Student affairs has been responsive to the fads and flavors of the decade of the social sciences. We can readily trace major influences of scientific management, the rise of psychological measurement, humanistic management, organizational functionalism and conformity, acquiescence to student majority, the rise of student development theory, quality improvement, the new accountability-driven functionalism, and the current focus on student learning and seamless experience in our literature and in our practices. These, and many others that I did not mention, and their subfads and spin offs have been incorporated into our thinking as they became popular. It is not clear if we ever completely abandon them or if they simply accumulate, as Blimling suggests (2001).

We have always borrowed methods from other fields, as I have argued elsewhere. Major methodological influences come from psychology, counseling, sociology, anthropology, education, business, management, economics, statistics, psychometrics, and on and on. This is a good thing, but it is confusing to our students and makes proper preparation of practitioner scholars problematic. On the other hand, I don't see a way out. Our work is so multifaceted that it requires myriad approaches and disciplines for a broad understanding.

It is tempting to say that we have simply "aped" scholarship, but I suspect that the field has "found" or "created" the scholarship, in terms of discovery and application that it wanted, much like organizations create their leadership. Unfortunately, such transactions typically lag reality in a rapidly changing environment, and we may be getting further

and further behind unless we take steps to really pay attention to our environments and begin to value cutting edge scholarship. . . . Schroeder and Pike (2001) and Malaney (2002) have adequately treated the deficiencies in preparation of students in our preparation programs. They support my opinion that even students from some of our best programs are inadequately trained in research, evaluation, and assessment. Even when they are rudimentarily trained, they frequently lack a conception of the value of scholarship and their obligation to consume and contribute to research in the field. I think this is a historical problem, and I think we are making a terrific mistake by continuing to fail to address it. I am not talking only about statistics and other quantitative and rationalistic techniques and models, but also about constructivist and so-called qualitative methods and paradigms. It is my belief that our students by and large don't understand how to systematically gather, reduce, and analyze data in ways that allow guidance to practice. Further, my experience is that they don't recognize good research when they see it, confusing good writing with good information. . . .

I have tried to discuss at some length how we got where we are and a little bit about why we got where we are. The next natural question, then, is "where are we?" I am satisfied that one can find some significant, research-based guidance, including historical comparisons and context, in the following broad areas to guide thinking, policy, and practice in student affairs work:

1. Descriptions of students' behavior and careful analyses of same, including the impact of college on students and the power of involvement and engagement, to nominate only a few critical categories. We know that college does impact students (which is a big deal, in itself).
2. Research and theorizing about the psychosocial, developmental, and community behavior of students, including some, but not enough, attention to marginalized or underrepresented populations
3. Some, but not nearly enough on the cognitive development of students, including learning theories of various stripes and their interaction(s) with experiential education

4. The effects of several intentional interventions and environmental strategies on students' development, such as residence halls, some kinds of programming, and so forth
5. Legal issues including the role of the institution in terms of special relationship to students, liability, duty of care, due process, contract theory, and several other salient areas
6. Financial aspects of higher education, especially their impact on students in terms of career earning differential, likelihood of attendance, borrowing behaviors, choice of institution, and money available for student affairs endeavors "besides" enrollment management
7. Economic issues such as the impact of investments in higher education, in terms of diversification, training of workforce, technology transfer, and, to a lesser extent, quality of life
8. Societal issues including the importance of higher education, higher education's failure/role in the P-12 crisis, conceptions and misconceptions of academic freedom, diversity of thought on campus, what students *should be* learning and *are* learning, the presence and importance of international students, and the nature of the tension between research and teaching, among many others
9. Social justice issues including access, the nature of and need for developmental education, inclusiveness (or not so much) of campus environments, higher education's responsibility for change, including impacts on local communities, and specific populations and subpopulations
10. The ever-popular self-contemplation of our field, such as the stultifying dull stuff on professionalism, the roles of student affairs workers, whether they are to be controllers, service providers, developers of students, facilitators of learning, assessors of just about everything, or my favorite, milieu managers

This is not a comprehensive list, but let me move on to some things we don't know, but should:

1. We need to know a lot more about how to reconcile our institu-

tional environments and processes with the needs of the diverse populations that are beginning to make up our institutions or worse are not entering our institutions because of low probability of success or poor fit. If we used to educate 30% of a much smaller high school graduation cohort and now we educate nearly 70%, it is logical to expect that some changes need to be made in our cultures. And while we are at it, let's do some aptitude-treatment interaction work on various kinds of students and venues and teaching modalities. What kinds of students should not be attending community colleges or be involved in distance learning? I don't know the answer to these and other questions, but I do know that Texas, for example, will either raise its college going rate among the fastest growing segment of the population or slip backward into an economic quagmire. We can lead in this research.

2. We need to know a lot more about the micro impacts of college on students in a systematic way. We know in a more global or general way that retention and success are enhanced by involvement and engagement, but what about the cognitive and socioemotional effects on individuals and subpopulations? We need to measure some things, and we need to do some more ethnographic and constructivist studies. What are patterns of effects? How much involvement is too much? How can we tell?
3. We need to redefine the whole notion of outcome "measures." Again, much of this work should be constructivist, but we can't be afraid of using psychometric tools. What we need to do is put something in place that will supplant the move to high stakes testing for higher education, which will hasten the worrisome trend toward education being seen as information for dollars.
4. We need way more longitudinal studies of all kinds, including with students, but also student affairs careers, training, and professional development (you knew I would get there, right?). Some work has been done, but we don't even have the right measures embedded in the large databases.

5. We need more and better ways of demonstrating our importance in enrollment management and quality of life and education on campus. And on and on.
6. We need to argue for moral, sane, and appropriately complex assessment, research, and evaluation. We can argue the case most readily and convincingly if we are actively engaged in such and are using it to inform practice every day.

In sum, let's be about doing what we know we need to do, what we know how to do, and what perhaps *only* we can do properly. Thank you."

Kathleen Manning, associate professor of higher education and student affairs administration, University of Vermont:

"I'm a practitioner turned faculty member. I still include myself in the 'us' when I talk with my students about how 'we' administrators operate. . . . Most of the work that I do on my campus with faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion uses Boyer's categories of scholarship of discovery, integration, teaching, and application. I believe these categories have a great deal to contribute to the scholarship of student affairs.

In preparation for this talk, I read the NASPA and JCSD issues on scholarship in student affairs. While I won't spend a lot of time defining the differences between scholarship, research, and practice, I hope that those distinctions will become more clear through our discussions today. I will say that research, for me, has a distinct method while scholarship need not have. The latter can be a result of insight, original thought, and creativity. The former has that as well but in addition has a methodology that is qualitatively or qualitatively based and clearly identified.

As the midcareer faculty member on this panel, my role is to situate us in the present. I'll do that by reflecting a bit on my 30 years of consuming and using scholarship in the field. When I became a faculty member, my students complained that the books and literature used in class were 'thin.' My response to them was, 'yes, and that's all there

is out there.’ There was very little to choose from in 1989 when I started teaching... A few years ago, I celebrated the arrival of Hamrick, Evans, and Schuh’s, *Foundations of Student Affairs Practice* (2002). This book marked a watershed for me—the field had enough scholarship and literature that it could be compiled in a significantly sized book. There were chapters about racial identity development, student development, democratic citizenship, service learning, and other topics...The Hamrick et al book reflects some of the giants in our field. We have certainly benefited from the likes of Kuh, Hurtado, Baxter-Magolda, Astin, and Pascarella. This brings me to my next topic, vexing issues.

Where Will the Next Generation of Major Theorists Come From? Meaning no disrespect to my fellow faculty colleagues, but I wonder where the next George Kuh will come from? Who will be the next Astin? Who will pick up Hurtado’s work when she retires? I don’t mean that people aren’t publishing or creating scholarship (research- and nonresearch-based). I mean, who is going after the major Lumina Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, or Pew Charitable Trust money to construct scholarship that changes the face of our profession—which keeps our profession alive in terms of scholarship. We probably have had too few of these folks in the past, and I worry that we have not instituted what Carpenter calls regeneration to assure that this major scholarship continues. . . .

I wonder what it would be like if our association created a structure to assist faculty with their research agendas? Agendas that are mandatory if you want to achieve tenure and promotion. In an article I read by Blimling, he talks about a ‘community of practice’ in student affairs. I propose that today we think about forming a ‘community of scholarship.’

The Faculty/Practitioner Divide

I worry about the faculty/practitioner divide in our field. Read anything about the scholarship of student affairs and you will discover this disconnect. Faculty and practitioners have very different ideas about what should be taught, how it should be taught, and when it should be taught . . . I would like to suggest that we start to think about a continuum of scholars through practitioners. On the left, we have the pure scholars. I would put someone like Ernie Pascarella and

Marcia Baxter Magolda in this category. Ernie certainly considers practice; but he's out there crunching the numbers, writing the articles, and producing original research. The next place on the continuum is occupied by scholar/practitioners. In this category, I would put people like myself. Many of us in this group were administrators in the past: the John Schuhs, Liz Whitts. Our scholarship is a combination of original research but often includes reflective pieces about practice in the field. The next group is the practitioner/scholars (notice that I reversed the order from the last grouping). These folks are out in the field as administrators and educators. But, they write and make contributions to the field in terms of reflection and research. I think of Peggy Barr as someone who filled this position for years. Charles Schroeder is another person that I would put in this category. The last group is the practitioners. These folks neither produce research or scholarship but use theory and scholarship in their work. A bit further to the right although, I wasn't able to come with an appropriate name, is the last group. They are the pure practitioners. They eschew scholarship as meaningless and of little value . . . I propose this continuum so that we get out of the either/or thinking of faculty or practitioners. . . . Scholarship is a highly labor-intensive endeavor. Not all of us want to do it. Not all of us should do it. There is a place for the creation and consumption of scholarship.

I want to finish my talk with a nod to some of the recent streams of scholarship that I believe have great currency for student affairs. The first is

1. **Student engagement** by George Kuh. The DEEP research team studied 20 colleges and universities to discover how these institutions achieved higher than predicted graduation rates and higher than predicted engagement scores on NSSE. There's much more to know about student engagement and Kuh's research model is a great one to consider for student affairs scholarship.
2. **Transgender issues**, the social construction of gender, and ideas about gender expression are a second area that I think is ripe for student affairs scholarship. The scholarship in this area is edgy and intellectual in a social justice kind of way. It can appeal to our propensity for advocacy and service to students. People like Kristen Renn and Patrick Dilley are doing great work in this area.

3. The ideas about **learning** that are embodied in *Learning Reconsidered* is a third area that could be a multiyear research agenda.
4. Student affairs scholarship could make significant contributions to the **culture of evidence** currently being advanced on many of our campuses.
5. And, finally, **assessment**. My masters students continually amaze me by their high interest in this aspect of practice, which certainly overlaps with scholarship and research.

I'd like us to think of the following questions:

- Can Boyer's framework of the scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and teaching inform student affairs scholarship?
- How can we bridge theory and practice through scholarship? How do we build bridges between the scholars and practitioners—often two very different groups?
- What are some examples of scholarship that faculty and practitioners can agree on? Is this a place to start building that theory to practice bridge?

Salvador Mena, associate dean for community living and multicultural affairs, Goucher College (MD); and doctoral student, University of Maryland, College Park:

“My brief remarks here today will focus on my exposure to student affairs scholarship from 1995 when I started my master's program until now and what I perceive to be the state of student affairs scholarship and practice.

Like airplanes departing from different points of origin, racing across the sky, showing up on a radar screen as a bleep, heading towards a given destination, we all took different routes to the same airport—‘Student Affairs International.’ As you know, we all have unique stories for how we arrived in student affairs. My flight was one that originated in the Bronx with a long layover at the University of Maine

where I was exposed to both student affairs scholarship and practice . . . the same faculty committee that broke the news to me about having to complete another year brought to my attention an alternative option: the Student Development and Higher Education Program. . . . In speaking with the head of the program, I had no awareness or appreciation for the type of literature and research that I would eventually be exposed to. Up to that point in my college experience I had only taken the typical undergraduate requirements in areas such as economics, history, and psychology while fulfilling major requirements in political science. Books such as *Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession* (second edition) by Delworth, Hanson, and Associates (1998); the *ASHE Reader on College Students* edited by Kuh, Bean, Hossler, and Stage (1996); *How College Affects Students* by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005); *Intellectual and Ethical Development* by William Perry (1998); and of course *Education and Identity* by Chickering and Reisser (1993) were some of the books that quickly consumed my time as a graduate student. Though I don't recall every single piece of information that I read from those books, they continue to be relevant today as they were back in 1995 in light of their critique (e.g., samples comprised only of privileged White males from Harvard) or the abstractness of some of the readings and their applicability to practice; and of course everyone liked Chickering's Seven Vectors. These works as well as some of the other earlier foundational works continue to serve as reminders today of how student affairs scholarship has evolved while also serving to provide us with a framework or point of reference from which to understand the college experience and its effect on students. That is to say that I can still pick up any of those texts or articles as a practitioner and find applicability today (I would like to think so), while as a scholar, using solid empirical research methodology to identify continuing gaps or potential building blocks from which to advance an original work.

Similarly, in looking over my first copy ever of the *NASPA Journal*, winter 1996 issue, articles such as *Understanding Students' Intentions to Use Safety Precautions*; *The Influence of Price on Year to Year Persistence*; *Academic Misconduct: NASPA Institutional Members Views and a Pragmatic Model Policy*; *Using Statistics to Catch Cheaters: Methodological and Legal Issues for Student Personnel Administrators*; *The Proliferation of Legalized Gambling: Implications for Student Affairs*; and *Assessing the Political Ideology and Activism of College Students: Reactions to the Persian*

Gulf War continue to be relevant today. Last I looked we're still in the Middle East fighting 'a war,' playing poker and gambling online are very popular activities with college students today, and college cost is at an all-time high and still a major factor influencing whether certain students are able to attain a good college education. As an example, looking at college students who were exposed to the first Gulf War and college students today experiencing the War in Iraq, what differences and similarities would we find between the two generations (i.e., Generation X and the Millennial Generation)? So as you can see, the applicability of past research continues to be relevant as it informs our understanding of what is happening today and connects with what will happen in the future.

In light of the relevancy of student affairs scholarship yesterday, today, and in the future, practitioners will continue to struggle with connecting research to practice. The changing nature of students, a fast-paced society, unstable campus environments, and the abundance of scholarship now being produced contributes to a state in which practitioners barely have time to glance over an issue of *About Campus*, let alone go online to print an article from the *NASPA Journal*. This is a major problem for student affairs as institutions of higher education have to respond quicker to consumer demands, students checking the box no longer means just Black or White, and the volume of scholarship being produced within student affairs is probably at an all-time high. And the increase in knowledge being produced within student affairs, must also take into consideration how our understanding of students and the college experience is informed by the higher education literature as well as literature from other fields. A book such as *Hope in the Unseen* (Suskin, 1998), a story about an inner city African American and his journey to an Ivy League institution, informs our understanding of how students get to college and how they experience it once there. We cannot begin to fully appreciate Dr. Kris Renn's work on multiracial identity development nor Dr. Susan Komives's work on leadership identity development without having an informed context. Obviously, having an informed context means that we must be good consumers of knowledge in light of the abundance of information available to us today. . . . So I ask—do we have the time to go through it all? As doctoral students we regularly have to negotiate within ourselves and our cohort what we will read from week to week given the volume of what we're being asked to examine let alone a practitioner

that is putting in 60 hours plus a week and barely has time to read the campus paper.

In light of the obvious challenges between volume and time, we must figure a way to bridge the two so that scholarship is able to inform practice. And by no means am I suggesting that scholarship is not informing practice today as we can highlight many good examples of this, but at what price? Where are we with the value of scholarship informing practice, a value that we hold so dear in student affairs? Are we just experiencing the tip of the iceberg? And if so, for how long have we been at the tip? What will it take to explore the iceberg below the surface? How will we address time issues? Are we producing too much knowledge too quickly? Will the academy allow for change in order to accommodate what is being demanded of student affairs faculty in the production of knowledge and the time demands that are being placed upon practitioners? What would it mean with accommodations on time and volume for student affairs faculty and practitioners to spend quality time exploring how best to incorporate research into an action-oriented agenda? What would it mean for researchers across the country to regularly collaborate in the spirit of influencing real life issues affecting college students and not for getting one's name associated with a big grant in order to pass mustard at a tenure review process—what would it mean? Similarly for practitioners, connecting research to practice should be about principals of what constitutes good practice and not for justifying our existence and the value of our work within an environment that values scientific inquiry. Collaborative works such as *Learning Reconsidered* (2004) provide good insight and guidance as to how we can begin this process; but until we take that first step forward, the ongoing concerns will continue to be one of time, volume, and the need for change. The scholarship will continue to be produced because the academy demands it, practitioners will continue to serve long hours because the academy demands it (or because students need us), and creative and possibly radical change will allow us to go beyond just exploring the nexus of student affairs scholarship and practice.”

Discussion

Complex, lively, and passionate discussion ensued for several hours among panelists and participants. Although it is not possible to reproduce every comment made throughout the day, the following questions and concepts summarize the main concerns and issues raised during the summit.

Graduate Preparation Programs

The question of preparation programs brought forward conversation on the requirements of the programs: Should master's and doctoral requirements be similar? Should the master's programs focus solely on preparing our practitioners to work in the field, or should they be educated to conduct assessment and research? Some of our doctoral programs are research-based, and others are more practice-oriented. What should we expect in terms of knowledge and skill sets from a person who has completed a doctoral program? Methodological implications are embedded in this discussion, in that research question formulation, methods choice, and data analysis are all critical skills to be taught within preparation programs.

Inclination to Produce Scholarship

Time and inclination to conduct research and produce scholarship was discussed. Most practitioners do not have the time within their current positions to include research and writing. The "tyranny of the immediate" impedes the ability of student affairs educators to engage in scholarship. What skills and knowledge do practitioners need to develop a scholarship agenda? What support, coaching, and job modifications create environments for practitioners to be successful?

Student Learning

Student affairs professionals often take the lead in assisting their campuses to develop complex and comprehensive approaches to student learning. Discussion during the summit focused on using *Learning Reconsidered* and lessons from research projects such as DEEP project (see Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates, 2005) to understand student learning and engagement. By developing models of excellence in student learning and engagement, student affairs can more ade-

quately respond to the calls for externally imposed standards and measures.

Professional Association Involvement

Professional associations can promote cutting-edge, high-quality scholarship that challenges traditional theory and practice. These groups can combine with faculty and practitioners to identify a collective research agenda to which individuals and groups of scholars can connect. National organizations and foundations can be called upon to support these efforts. Collaborative research studies that involve faculty and practitioners working together across multiple sites can be encouraged. Student affairs professional associations can develop mechanisms to truly support research about student learning through funding and support mechanisms to enhance scholarship. These efforts include mentoring about research and writing and development of a model that supports lifelong learning and professional development.

Boyer's Scholarships

Boyer's four scholarships can frame discussions about the work of student affairs. His insights on the scholarships of discovery, integration, application, and teaching can be expanded to include a scholarship of practice. Student affairs educators rarely take the time to imagine how their practice is actually scholarship. Boyer's typology provides them with a common language across institutions and departments to enable practitioners to understand their connections to scholarship. Student affairs educators can expand our notion of staff development to include the integration of scholarship and practice. Scholarship can enhance professional learning concerning new theory and research as well as their application to practice.

Blended Roles

To bridge the worlds of scholars and practitioners, student affairs can consider interdisciplinary and interprofessional ways to blend roles across the academy. Many people have moved in and out of theory and practice roles. Their approaches provide models and possibilities for the ways to expand and utilize those roles differently than we do now.

We may need to change institutional structures, cultures, and practices to support movement across and through the boundaries that now exist between the roles of scholar and practitioner. How do we create spaces for collaboration between scholars and practitioners? A realistic step is to provide release time for practitioners for teaching and advising.

Final Thoughts

Many of the participants in the Summit on Scholarship in Student Affairs valued the opportunity to engage in open and in-depth dialog with fellow practitioners and faculty members in the field. Many left with a commitment to integrate scholarship into their practice, and enthusiasm to encourage others to do the same. Others referenced their role as leaders in student affairs to encourage others as “scholar-practitioners.” Still others wanted to pursue the idea of a research agenda for student affairs, perhaps based on Boyer’s model of scholarship. Another suggestion called for the use of technology to manage, organize, and disseminate scholarship in a variety of ways. Finally, participants said that they were comforted to know that others have been “pondering the same questions about scholarship” and are committed to continue to work together on the issues involved. The Summit on Scholarship was one venue that moved the discussion forward. Given the identified challenges of scholarship and practice, we propose many more such engaging opportunities be undertaken and made available to a wide variety of participants within the student affairs profession.

References

- Blimling, G. S. (2001). Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42 (4), 381–396.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Carpenter, S. (2001). Student affairs scholarship (re?)considered: Toward a scholarship of practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42 (4), 301–318.

- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clothier, R. C. (1931). College personnel principles and functions. *The Personnel Journal*, 10, 9–17.
- Delworth, U., & G. R. Hanson & Associates (Eds.). (1989). *Student Services: A handbook for the profession* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fried, J. (2002). The scholarship of student affairs: Integration and application. *NASPA Journal*, 39 (2), 120–131.
- Hamrick, F. A., Evans, N. J., & Schuh, J. H. (2002). *Foundations of Student Affairs Practice: How Philosophy, Theory, and Research Strengthen Educational Outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keeling, R. P. (Ed). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: ACPA, NASPA.
- Keeling, R. P. (Ed). (2006). *Learning reconsidered 2: A practical guide to implementing a campus-wide focus on the student experiences*. Washington, DC: ACPA, ACUHO-I, ACUI, NACA, NACADA, NASPA, and NIRSA.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J., Whitt, E., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McEwen, M. (2003). The Nature and Uses of Theory. In S. R. Komives et al. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed.) (pp. 147–163). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Malaney, G. D. (2002). Scholarship in student affairs through teaching and research. *NASPA Journal*, 39 (2), 132–146.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, W. G. (1998). *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schroeder, C. C., & Pike, G. R. (2001). The scholarship of application in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42 (4), 342–355.
- Schuh, J. H. (2002). Foundational scholarship in student affairs: A sampler. *NASPA Journal*, 39 (2), 107–119.
- Stage, F. K., et al. (Eds.). (1996). *College students: The evolving nature of research*. ASHE Reader Series. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Suskin, R. (1998). *A hope in the unseen: An American odyssey from the inner city to the Ivy League*. New York: Broadway Books.