



2013


Enabling Faculty to Write; a Short Course on Successful Scholarly Publication for Faculty at a Liberal Arts College

Carolyn Richie
Butler University, crichie@butler.edu

David Mason
Butler University

Michael Zimmerman

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers

 Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Richie, Carolyn; Mason, David; and Zimmerman, Michael, "Enabling Faculty to Write; a Short Course on Successful Scholarly Publication for Faculty at a Liberal Arts College" / (2013): 1-25.
Available at https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers/271

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

**Enabling Faculty to Write; a Short Course on Successful Scholarly Publication for Faculty
at a Liberal Arts College**

Carolyn Richie^a, David Mason^a, and Michael Zimmerman^b

^aButler University

^bThe Evergreen State College

Author notes

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Carolyn Richie, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Butler University, 4600 Sunset Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46208.

E-mail: crichie@butler.edu

Abstract

This paper describes a course on scholarly publication that was offered to faculty at a liberal arts college. The course was designed to increase scholarly productivity by offering information and resources, developing a sense of community, and showing how teaching and research can co-exist for faculty with heavy teaching loads. The course was innovative because faculty who differed in terms of discipline and experience orchestrated it, and the participants comprised a similarly diverse group. Lessons learned from implementation of the course are shared, as well as the results of a survey administered to participants on its conclusion.

Introduction

There are several reasons why the academy should offer coursework for faculty on scholarly publication. Such coursework is supportive of new faculty members who find themselves working under different circumstances than they were in graduate school; it is supportive of more experienced faculty members by providing opportunities for them to become mentors for their less experienced colleagues, it helps build a shared sense of community among faculty, and there is reason to believe that scholarly productivity goes hand in hand with good teaching. Additionally, it was our experience that many faculty members wanted such a course made available to them. Further rationale for offering the course that we created is given below, as well as a description of what set it apart from coursework offered at other institutions. Next, a description of the course itself is provided, so that others may utilize those methods as needed. It was our experience that it was difficult to find concrete examples of how to design such a course and how to lead it successfully. The purpose of our paper, therefore, is to outline our course in sufficient detail that others may use it as a template or starting point. Finally, the results of a survey administered to participants and lessons learned from implementation of the course will be shared.

Rationale

While much institutional support for teaching exists, across teaching-oriented institutions and research-oriented institutions alike, the academy is lagging in institutional support for research productivity. One of the reasons for this might be that the assumption, implicit or explicit, is made that since new faculty members have successfully completed a doctoral degree, they must have the requisite skills necessary to be successful in their new positions. Indeed, as Eodice and Cramer (2001) noted, academic writing ability is a presumed prerequisite to

obtaining and maintaining academic employment. The reality, however, may be very different. While some recent graduate students entering the professorate received training on how to publish as part of their graduate school training, that is not true for all graduate students. Further, the training offered to graduate students prepares them to publish under circumstances that are not necessarily pertinent when the student transitions to the role of junior faculty member. The graduate student typically has access to one or more mentors with closely aligned interests, a schedule that permits productivity, and few, if any, teaching commitments. Junior faculty members may find themselves without disciplinary mentors at their new institution, few large blocks of time to devote to research activities, and with heavy teaching commitments. Publishing productively - that is, effectively and efficiently - can become a tremendous challenge under those circumstances. As Gainen (1993) wrote, "... many newly hired faculty find that the conditions for scholarly productivity are new and surprisingly demanding" (p. 91).

We take the position that there is need for coursework on scholarly publication, even at, or perhaps we should say, especially at, smaller, teaching-oriented institutions. As Faery (1993) noted, "...providing a forum for faculty to focus on themselves as writers is richly productive in a number of ways: encouraging and supporting scholarly activity among participants; helping to create a sense of community among faculty engaged together in the common activities of teaching and scholarship; and increasing participants' willingness to include more writing in their courses" (p. 33).

We believe that a course on publication can benefit not just new faculty, but experienced faculty, too. Zimmerman (1990) argued that faculty members who act as members of the broad intellectual community, through actively pursuing research, are apt to serve as good role models to colleagues. Those faculty members demonstrate that meaningful scholarship is a lifelong

pursuit and that it is both possible and rewarding to engage and shape the scholarly community beyond the local campus. Actions of this sort are powerful examples of appropriate behavior to other faculty as well as students.

Teaching and research, rather than exclusive pursuits, should be seen as activities that complement and can improve one another (this is comparable to the “spill-over” effect described by Faia, 1976). The notion of the teacher as scholar is certainly not a new one, but it is especially challenging for faculty at primarily teaching institutions to maintain an active publication record. As Kuh, Chen, and Laird (2007), noted “When they collaborate with faculty on research, students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve practical problems; their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning” (p. 40).

But are research productivity and publication really related to good teaching? As Centra (1983) noted there is certainly controversy surrounding this longstanding issue¹. However, there is reason to believe that scholarly productivity and good teaching can complement one another. A subset of the data analyzed by Baughman and Goldman (1999), for 14 Baccalaureate Institutions ranked *Most Competitive* according to the *Barron’s Profiles of American Colleges*, suggested that good teaching and research productivity support one another. As Astin and Chang (1995) noted, in the American post-secondary education system there is a longstanding issue of research *versus* teaching, but that some institutions (granted, a small number of them) manage to maintain a strong research orientation as well as a strong student orientation. If this point is valid - if research productivity is indeed related to teaching quality and effectiveness - then faculty at teaching-oriented institutions should be encouraged to be

¹ While some believe strongly that research productivity and good teaching go hand-in-hand, others believe that time spent on research or teaching detracts from performance on the other. Faia (1976) published a summary of previous studies showing a positive relation, and others showing no relation, between research and teaching proficiency; the number of studies being approximately equal. It should also be noted that the ways in which research productivity and teaching effectiveness can be quantified are anything but straightforward.

productive. And as Blackburn, Behymer and Hall (1978) noted, those faculty who will be productive their whole career are those who “take on the habit of regular output”. Blackburn et al. also noted that informal networks correlate highly with productivity.

Holt (1988) commented² that it isn’t surprising that most publishing occurs at major research institutions (p. 3). Within this reality, the first meaningful question is whether faculty at smaller, teaching-oriented institutions can be encouraged to increase their scholarly productivity. That question needs to be followed by whether or not such increases, if they occur, yield improvements in teaching effectiveness. Data from Faia (1976) suggest that “... teaching and research tend to be mutually supportive, especially at schools where research is not emphasized”, per se (p. 235). It was our belief, in creating a course, that faculty at a teaching college can and should be encouraged to increase their scholarly productivity. What follows is a brief review of the published descriptions of coursework on publication aimed at graduate students and faculty that were used to shape the course that we offered.

Courses on publication for graduate students

Some institutions offer coursework on writing for publication to doctoral students as part of their graduate program. Both Lumsden (1984) and Figgins and Burbach (1989) outlined such courses. Lumsden (1984) described a graduate course on scholarly publishing offered to doctoral students across different fields of study at North Texas State University. The course was of the “how-to” variety and students were required to write two book reviews and a journal article, as well as submit something for publication. In terms of content, the course included lectures on library resources, grammar, copyright issues, converting papers such as theses into articles and books, how to handle rejection, and how to write letters to an editor, among other topics. Guest

² Blackburn, Behymer, and Hall (1978) also noted the circularity of the situation – one must be a high producer to work in a highly productive environment, and so on.

lecturers such as journal editors regularly visited the class. Students read from a packet of readings and textbooks. A sample of 56 students who had taken the course (out of 186 students in total) was surveyed to determine how many of them had published something. Of the 52 respondents, 87% reported having published since taking the course. The majority of the publications reported were book reviews (60%), but 37% of respondents also reported having published journal articles.

Figgins and Burbach (1989) described a graduate seminar on writing for publication to doctoral students in education at the University of Virginia. The seminar was composed of classroom discussion and a workshop part. Some of the students made submissions for publication. The authors noted that they learned several important lessons, including their belief that the process of writing is as important as any outcome-related goal such as publication and that once-weekly meetings were successful. They concluded that the seminar was worthwhile, as evidenced by positive student reaction to it, the quality of student writing, and the acceptance rate for student papers.

Courses on publication for faculty

Entes and Ispahany (1992) noted "... the scarcity of faculty development programs on faculty publishing" (p. 137). However, faculty at most academic institutions are expected to publish, that is, to produce and disseminate their intellectual and/or artistic work, irrespective of institutional support for those activities. Eodice and Cramer (2001) also noted that while many campuses added faculty development centers in recent years, the focus of most of those centers is on teaching and evaluation. They also noted that while there is need for faculty programs dedicated to enhancing publication, such programs are still relatively rare. "In many cases, institutional support for scholarship may be limited to admonitions, or words of

encouragement... many individuals find they must seek out support and resources to enhance specific goals, such as publication, on their own” (Eodice & Cramer, 2001, p. 114).

Further, there is a paucity of literature on those few programs that have been created in the past. Interestingly, many institutions offer some sort of support for teaching development and Entes and Ispahany (1992) also noted that while there seems to be a wealth of literature (books, etc.) on authorship, there are relatively few published articles on scholarly publication. It seems that the situation has not changed greatly in the two decades or so since Entes and Ispahany wrote their piece. Nonetheless, there are some descriptions of courses for faculty such as those that follow. The courses for faculty can be described as short-term workshops (e.g., a few hours, or one-two days in duration) versus long-term seminars or courses (e.g., those that met over a period of weeks, months, or years). Courses can also be described as tutorial in nature such that faculty participants were enabled to learn about publication, versus supportive in nature such that faculty participants read and revised each other’s’ writing (e.g., writing support circles).

Bydder, Packer, and Semmens (2006) described a short-term course (three hours in duration) offered to ten conference participants. Seven medical professionals and one trainee completed a survey prior to the conference and 6-8 weeks after the conference. The results of the survey showed that even a brief tutorial course could lead to benefits such as improved writing skills and increased motivation to write. The participants said that they would recommend such a course to peers.

Ferguson and Tudiver (2008) described a short-term course (a half-day workshop) to teach medical residents to write for publication at East Tennessee State University. Twenty faculty-resident pairs were created such that inexperienced writers were purposely paired with experienced faculty writers, and those pairs continued to work together for months following the

workshop. The group discussed topics such as motivation and barriers to writing, the peer review process, grammar, how to select a journal for submission, and software to facilitate writing. The group also engaged in writing exercises such as the development of a manuscript outline.

Significantly, the authors tracked peer-reviewed publications for the workshop participants over time. In 2005, the year that the workshop was offered, two pieces were published by the group members. In 2006, the year following the workshop, nine pieces were published by the group members. In 2007, and again in 2008, seven pieces were published by the group members. The paper by Ferguson and Tudiver is one of only a few to include publication rate data, but the data are encouraging.

Entes and Ispahany (1992) described a long-term seminar in which they participated, which was offered to all full-time faculty at the City University of New York over the course of a year. Thirteen faculty members from a variety of academic disciplines opted to enroll in that course (the majority were female, untenured, and of junior status). The purpose of the course was for the faculty members to ‘learn about publishing’. Participants discussed the publication process from researching the journals in which they might publish to addressing criticism and rejection. Speakers experienced in publishing were also invited to address the group, such as authors, editors, and publishers. On a weekly basis, one participant shared a written manuscript with the other participants, who read the manuscript in advance of meeting and then responded to it both verbally and in writing. The authors gave the following specific recommendations on successfully implementing such a course: administrative support for the course such as release time for participants and funding for guest speakers; regularly scheduled meetings; a program leader who can serve as role model; varied guest speakers to provide an “insider’s view” on publishing; and limited group size (i.e., 15 participants at maximum).

McLeod and Emery (1988) described a weekly writing workshop for faculty in need of editorial help that was taught over three years at San Diego State University. They stressed, but did not require, regular participation in the workshop (they noted that this particular point required iteration throughout each semester; of the approximately 20 course members, five to ten participants attended any given session). The positive outcomes associated with the course included a high percentage of the papers being presented and published (though the specific rate was not given), positive comments from participants in response to the workshop, and the development of a sense of collegiality among workshop members. They wrote that the development of a writing community for faculty seemed to increase motivation and production. Common problems expressed by faculty in that workshop were procrastination and fears associated with certain aspects of writing. They argued that the inter-disciplinary group was productive because certain technical aspects of writing seemed to affect participants regardless of academic discipline (e.g., difficulty in expressing the focus of a paper).

Gainen (1993) described a long-term program designed to help new and junior women faculty to accomplish scholarly writing and to balance personal and professional activities. The program, offered at Santa Clara University, was composed of approximately 12 faculty members who met twice a month. The group discussed progress on scholarly writing projects, strategies for overcoming obstacles to writing progress, and plans for future writing. The group did not share in peer-review of manuscripts. The discussion themes usually included writer's block, fear of rejection, scheduled writing, and related professional issues. Gainen concluded that the group was successful in that it helped the majority of its participants to meet their writing-related goals, and to positively influence their self-perceptions. Interestingly, Gainen, reflecting on her experiences as the group facilitator, concluded the following: "the kinds of changes we seek to

induce (whether about writing habits or teaching styles) may require *several years* of sustained practice and support during periods of occasional backsliding” (p. 99; emphasis added).

Grzybowski et al. (2003) described a peer support writing group offered to physicians over the course of three years; the group met 23 times, and attendance ranged from three to ten participants. Members discussed each other’s writing through small group breakout sessions, and collegiality was encouraged. Publication rates, as evidenced by manuscripts published in indexed journals, showed that frequent attendees increased their publication record from the three years preceding the writing group to the three years they attended the writing group. A comparison of the publication record for the writing group attendees with non-attendees from the same academic department showed that attendees had greater publication success than non-attendee peers.

Hekelman, Gilchrist, Zyzanski, Glover, and Olness (1995) described a program offered to 40 medical faculty members at Case Western Reserve University, over the course of three years. The program included an all-day workshop, independent work, and a seminar. The independent work included the outline of a manuscript for publication, its writing, feedback from a senior faculty member, and submission for publication. Hekelman et al. noted that 42% of the course participants met the course goals in that they wrote and revised a manuscript and then submitted it for publication. In addition, 16 papers were published by 13 of the 40 faculty who participated in the course; this publication rate suggested improvement following course participation though the difference (from the time prior to course participation compared to the time after course participation) was not statistically significant.

Taken together, this past work suggests that coursework, even short-term workshops such as half-day seminars, can lead to a sense of collegiality, increased motivation to write and publish, and increased publication rates among dedicated faculty members.

**The Short Course on Successful Scholarly Publication for Faculty at a Liberal Arts
Institution**

Purpose

The goal of the course we designed was to enhance faculty success in scholarly publication by offering support, information and resources, and a heightened sense of community. The course was designed to show how teaching and research can fit together, and to stimulate scholarly activity for faculty with heavy teaching loads.

The course was innovative in several ways. First, its leaders were from different academic backgrounds; one was from health sciences (Communication Sciences and Disorders), one was from the social sciences (Political Science), and one from natural sciences (Biology). We believe that the variety in background was beneficial to course participants because one of us could address a participant's questions regardless of the field of study.

Second, the course leaders had very different amounts of professional experience and publication experience at the time the course was offered; one was a tenure-track assistant professor, one was a full professor and senior academic administrator, and one was a retired professor emeritus. Varied professional and publication experience affected the course design. Specifically, the assistant professor was aware of the type of productivity issues that faced tenure-track assistant professors as well as the accompanying demands for tenure, the full professor has published widely, both in the peer-reviewed scientific literature as well as in the

popular press, and the professor emeritus had an extensive scholarly publication record himself. These factors influenced the course in terms of its design.

Third, the course was offered to faculty at a traditional teaching college – not a Research I institution - and so it took this participant characteristic into account. Faculty at such a college face different demands than faculty at the typical Research I institution, such as a heavier teaching load (three or four courses equivalent to 9-12 credit hours per semester), greater expectation of commitment to service, the expectation of close faculty-student involvement, and disciplinary isolation because each faculty member is the sole expert in specific content on campus. The course leaders took these issues into consideration when designing the course to ensure that it was of a very practical nature and limited in its time requirements.

We received significant of interest from the faculty; 20 applications were received for ten positions (funding was allocated for ten participants). The 20 applicants came from a potential applicant pool of approximately 300, indicating that about 7% of the faculty expressed interest in participating. While it was our goal to include a wide variety of participants from different colleges and professional ranks, we were surprised that we actually received applications from such a diverse group – we saw representation from four of the five colleges (Liberal Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, Education, and Pharmacy and Health Sciences), and applications from lecturers, assistant professors, full professors, program directors, and others. Participants were included on a first-come, first-served basis. Participants were paid a modest stipend (\$250) for their involvement in recognition of the time commitment they made to the course and their own professional development. The stipend was also in keeping with a history of institutional support for faculty involved in a course on teaching improvement.

The course was not a writing support-group per se, (i.e., a writing circle that served to evaluate and offer feedback on others' writing, such as Eodice and Cramer, 2001; Faery, 1993; or Gainen, 1993). Rather the course was designed to enable faculty members to become successful in publication by offering them information and resources, motivation, and a heightened sense of academic community. Our goals were to show how teaching and research might fit together, and lead to a healthy publication record without detracting from successful instruction of students.

The course was offered as a 'pilot course' over a five-week period in the fall semester of 2008. Weekly activities can be seen in the appended syllabus below (Appendix A) including the readings, discussion topics, guest speakers, and activities required of participants. Each week one participant was asked to lead the group through its readings and another participant was asked to lead the group through various discussion topics. The main text selected for the group was Silvia's (2007) book titled *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. We chose the book because, in addition to being an enjoyable read and pertinent to participants across the various disciplines represented, the book was very practical in nature. Silvia's main premise is that productive writers are people who write on a structured, i.e., a scheduled basis; they are goal-oriented, but consider writing to be a process – a process that inevitably involves rejection at times. Supplementary readings in the form of brief journal articles and book chapters rounded out the list.

The discussion topics were numerous and ranged from barriers to writing, the writing process, experience with rejection, and how to pair teaching with research. The guest speakers included the Dean of Libraries, a scientific journal editor, and a book publisher.

Participants were asked to accomplish two at-home activities throughout the course; a two-year publication schedule with specific writing activities throughout, and a database of periodicals and publishers that that would accept their material for publication. A reunion dinner was held at the end of semester, about two months after the conclusion of the course, so that participants could reconvene and reflect on the course in terms of its impact and offer suggestions for improvement to the course leaders.

Lessons learned from implementation of the course

The results of a survey administered to course participants on its completion are described below, as well as several reflections from the course leaders.

Participant survey data

A survey was administered electronically on completion of the course, and participants were assured that their responses would be kept anonymous. Five of the ten participants completed and returned the survey. When asked about the course format, three of the participants responded that they thought the number of meetings (five) was appropriate, and two participants responded that they wished the course had been longer in duration – perhaps a semester in length. All respondents indicated that the two-hour meetings were appropriate in terms of length.

All five respondents strongly agreed with the statement “Participation in the course helped to create a sense of academic community for me”. Four respondents agreed, and one strongly agreed with the following statement; “Through participation in the course I acquired new knowledge / skills that I believe will help me to become published”. When prompted as to how the course contributed to their professional development (all respondents agreed that it had), the various respondents noted that it encouraged them to publish, it allowed them to meet colleagues they would not have met otherwise, it made them aware of resources available on

campus, and it helped them to establish a daily writing routine. Four of the five respondents noted that they had increased awareness of the benefits of scheduled writing to publication success.

Participants were asked whether they had submitted anything for publication since taking the course. Two of the five participants reported that they had submitted articles for publication and that those articles had been accepted.

Reflections from course leaders

The course described in this paper was a ‘pilot’ version of the course, so to speak. It was offered with institutional support on a preliminary basis, but without promise of any future support, and with the hope that its leaders would learn some key things about how to offer such a course successfully into the future. We believe that the course was successful in some respects and perhaps less successful in others. We believe that the course achieved some of its fundamental goals, as evidenced via the survey data, such as a heightened sense of academic community, collaboration, and support among the faculty who took the course. However, it is less clear whether the course was successful in terms of publication rate among those who took the course (from beforehand to after the fact) or for respondents relative to those who did not take the course. The survey results are encouraging but not determinative: two participants were published since taking the course, three participants did not report submitting any material for publication since taking the course and five participants did not respond to the survey instrument. We hasten to reiterate that the survey instrument was distributed at the conclusion of the course, so the lack of submission may be a reflection of time rather than intention.

As such, we strongly recommend that others benefit from our experience and do the following things in the future. First, we would make a practical writing component part of the

weekly scheduled activities. For example, participants could engage in an abstract-writing exercise, draft the outline of a manuscript for submission, and / or offer feedback to one another on those written pieces, perhaps on a pair-wise basis. While we believe in the “writing as a process” model espoused by many others (e.g., Figgins and Burbach, 1989), we now see the value in a goal-oriented approach to the course. To be specific, we would strongly recommend that there be a practical end result associated with course participation, such as submission of a paper for publication, as Figgins and Burbach (1989) required of their graduate students, or, at the very least, development of a manuscript outline, as per Ferguson and Tudiver (2008).

Conclusions

The purpose of this piece was to describe in detail the structure of a course offered to faculty at a small liberal arts college so others could create such a course on their campuses with minimal effort while benefiting from our experience. The course was designed to increase scholarly productivity by offering information and resources, developing a writing community, and showing how teaching and research can support one another, for faculty with heavy teaching loads. The course was innovative in that the faculty who led the course and the faculty participants had very different backgrounds in terms of field of study and years of experience, which were good things. The results of a short survey indicated that the course was successful in meeting its goals, but it is difficult to say with certainty whether scholarly output was in fact increased. We recommend that others include a goal-oriented writing outcome associated with participation in the course. We are of the opinion that institutions, even relatively small liberal arts colleges such as ours, can and should offer this type of support for scholarly publication for faculty with heavy teaching loads.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the following offices for support of the program described in this piece; the Office of the President, the College of Education, the College of Fine Arts, the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, and the College of Pharmacy & Health Sciences.

References

- Astin, A., & Chang, M. (1995). Colleges that emphasize research and teaching: Can you have your cake and eat it too? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 27 (5), 45-50
- Baughman, J., & Goldman, R. (1999). College rankings and faculty publications; Are they related? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 31 (2), 44-51.
- Blackburn, R.T., Behymer, C.E., & Hall, D.E. (1978). Research note: Correlates of faculty publications. *Sociology of Education*, 51 (2), 132-141.
- Brooks, T. (2008) Five Secrets to Publishing Success. *Inside Higher Ed*.
- Bydder, S., Packer, D., & Semmens, J. (2006). The value of a scientific writing training workshop for radiologists and radiation oncologists. *Australasian Radiology*, 50, 29-32.
- Centra, J.A. (1983). Research productivity and teaching effectiveness. *Research in Higher Education*, 18 (2), 379-389.
- Entes, J., & Ispahany, R. (1992). Faculty seminar on publishing in the academy. *Innovative Higher Education*, 17, 137-144.
- Eodice, M., & Cramer, S.F. (2001). Write on! A model for enhancing faculty publication. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 18 (4), 113-121.
- Faery, R. B. (1993). Teachers *and* writers: The faculty writing workshop and writing across the curriculum. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 17 (1-2), 31-42.
- Faia, M.A. (1976). Teaching and research: Rapport or misalliance. *Research in Higher Education*, 4, 235-246.
- Ferguson, K.P., & Tudiver, F. (2008). An intervention to increase publication of research results by faculty and medical residents: A case study. *Research Management Review*, 16 (1), 1-7.

- Figgins, M.A., & Burbach, H.J. (1989). Preparing our students to publish: Lessons learned. *Innovative Higher Education*, 14 (1), 15-23.
- Gainen, J. (1993). A writing support program for junior women faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 53, 91-100.
- Germano, W. (2001). *Getting it published: A guide for scholars and anyone else serious about serious books*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Grzybowski, S.C., Bates, J., Calam, B., Alred, J., Martin, R.E., Andrew, R., Rieb, L., Harris, S., Wiebe, C., Knell, E., & Berger, S. (2003). A physician peer support writing group. *Family Medicine*, 35 (3), 195-201.
- Hekelman, F.P., Gilchrist, V., Zyzanski, S.J., Glover, P., & Olness, K. (1995). An educational intervention to increase faculty publication productivity. *Family Medicine*, 27, 255-259.
- Holt, M.E. (1988). Editorial: Reflections on scholarly publications. *Innovative Higher Education*, 13 (1), 3-10.
- Kuh, G., Chen, D., & Laird, T. (2007). Why teacher-scholars matter: Some insights from FSSE and NSSE. *Liberal Education*, 40-45.
- Limerick, P.N. (1993). Dancing with professors: The trouble with academic prose. *NY Times Book Review*. 15, 199-206.
- Lumsden, D.B. (1984). Preparing future educational leaders to write for scholarly publication. *Innovative Higher Education*, 9, 36-41.
- McLeod, S.H., & Emery, L. (1988). When faculty write: A workshop for colleagues. *College Composition and Communication*, 39, 65-67.
- Perlmutter, D.D. (2008) Taking time for R&R. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Silvia, P.J. (2007). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. Washington, DC: APA Life Tools: American Psychological Association.

Zimmerman, M. (1990). The role of research at undergraduate institutions. *Council on Undergraduate Research Newsletter*, 10, 13-14.

Appendix A. Course Syllabus

Objectives:

It is hoped that this course will enable faculty members to become successful in publication, by offering them support, information and resources, motivation, and a heightened sense of academic community.

Specific objectives are as follows;

1. A higher acceptance / publication rate for participants, than prior to taking the course.
2. Publication with fewer revisions than previously required and reduced time to publication.
3. A heightened sense of academic community, collaboration, and support among the faculty.

Assessment:

The participants in this course will perform a survey on the final day of the course, designed to assess learner experience (estimation of attendance and workload) and outcomes (e.g., whether this course created a heightened sense of academic community). A follow-up survey will be administered 6 to 12 months later to assess longer-term outcomes (e.g., whether this course affected manuscript acceptance rates, etc).

Course Objective: The goal of this course is to enhance faculty success in scholarly publication by offering support, information and resources, motivation, and a heightened sense of academic community.

Format: This course will consist of five weekly two-hour meetings, and will include guest speakers, discussion of readings, and at-home practical activities. Participants will be encouraged to discuss reactions to weekly readings as well as the topics listed below. Each week, one participant will moderate the discussion topics listed below and/or other topics of interest to the group. Another participant will moderate discussion of the weekly readings, beginning with a brief, informal commentary on those readings. The course will conclude with an off-campus reunion dinner at the end of semester.

Schedule

Sept. 4th **Getting started**

Introductions:

An introduction to participants including their areas of expertise, personal experience with publication and rejection, and reasons for taking the course. An introduction to the course.

Readings;

Silvia, P. (2007)	Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: Specious barriers to writing a lot Chapter 3: Motivational tools
Zimmerman, M.	The role of research at undergraduate institutions.

Suggested discussion topics:

1. The research process; developing an idea, the relationship between research and teaching.
2. Translating ideas into publishable things, defining scope, what to do with that dissertation...
3. Collaborative writing with students and colleagues.

At-home activity:

Begin to outline a two-year publication schedule using the template on Blackboard. Modify the template to suit your individual needs.

Sept 11th **Resources and new media to support the process**

Guest speaker: Dean of Libraries

The dean will speak about support for publication, such as library resources for research purposes, guides to various periodicals (i.e., information on circulation, acceptance rates, time to publication, etc.), and note-taking and bibliographic software.

Readings;

Limerick, P. (1993).	Dancing with professors: The trouble with academic prose. <i>NY Times Book Review</i> .
Silvia, P. (2007)	Chapter 5: A Brief foray into style

Suggested discussion topics:

1. Tips and tricks that facilitate the writing process.
2. Academic prose and stylized writing (APA, MLA, etc.).
3. Online / "Open Access" publication, use of the internet in publishing (websites, blogs, etc.)

At-home activity:

Add specific writing activities to publication schedule; i.e., the means by which your goals can be accomplished.

Sept. 18th Identifying the best place for your article and the peer review process

Guest speaker: Professor, Department of History
 Professor, Department of History, Indiana University; Editor, *Journal of American History*. An active journal editor, will speak about tailoring the style of a paper to a specific periodical and handling the peer review process effectively.

Readings:

- Brooks, T. (2008) Five Secrets to Publishing Success. *Insider Higher Ed*.
 Germano, W. (2001) Chapter 7: Surviving the review process
 Perlmutter, D. (2008) Taking Time for R&R. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
 Silvia, P. (2007) Chapter 6: Writing journal articles

Suggested discussion topics:

1. The value in conference attendance to present ideas through talks and network.
2. Translating your dissertation or a conference talk into journal article publication.
3. Identifying the best venue (periodical/publisher, reviewers/editors...) for an article.
4. How to know when your work is ready for submission

At-home activity:

Create a database of information on specific periodicals / publishers that may accept your material. Include, for example, information on circulation, the editorial board, acceptance rates, time to publication etc. Gather *information for authors* from specific publishers listed in your publication schedule and incorporate this information into the planned writing activities on your two-year plan.

Sept. 25th Networking, conference talks, and book publication

Guest speaker: Director, Indiana University Press
 Director, Indiana University Press
 The speaker will talk about how to find the right publisher for your book, what makes an especially strong book proposal, and what book editors look for.

Readings:

- Germano, W. (2001) Chapter 1: Introduction
 Chapter 2: What Do Publishers Do?
 Chapter 3: Writing the Manuscript
 Chapter 4: Selecting a Publisher
 Chapter 5: Your Proposal
 Chapter 6: What Editors Look For

Suggested discussion topics:

1. Research monographs, textbooks, and trade books.
2. Can my dissertation become a book?
3. Developing and organizing a book, and the prospectus.

Oct. 2nd Concrete plans for moving forward

Readings:

Silvia, P. (2007). Chapter 4: Starting your own agraphia group

Suggested discussion topics:

1. Fitting writing into the fall and spring semesters, writing productively in the summer.
2. Opportunities conducive to publication, e.g. internal grants, external workshops.
3. Individual publication schedules.

Dec. 11th, 6pm

Dinner to follow the conclusion of the course, at an off-campus location (TBA).