

federated manipulation of digital objects must be of the highest priority for all scholars and librarians.

That said, the ill-coordinated reality of the present state of AmLit on the Web does seem an appropriate match for the intensely individualistic nature of the humanities as practiced today. Organized research has not been a defining characteristic of humanistic scholarship, and probably for good reason. Attempts to rationalize the Web—the dream of many—would thus not come without costs and losses. No one involved in humanities computing on college and university campuses today is unaware of, or unaffected by, the increasingly centralized nature of academic IT. The needs for standardization, control, scalability, and cost-effectiveness are real, but so, too, is the creative freedom they tend to drive out. One of the reasons why humanities computing may not be so robust as it could be is that campus IT initiatives are almost always top-down and generic and thus antithetical to traditional humanistic practices. After all, if the new first commandment on campus is “Thou shall use Blackboard.” What are the incentives for innovation? Keep your pencils sharp and at the ready. I raise the issues of hierarchy and creativity not out of any false nostalgia for the “good old ‘90s” but, rather, out of a perceived concern that in building a more stable, durable, and usable Web future, we keep in view the need to sustain the vibrancy and creativity of the humanities at the same time. We need not be careful of what we wish for, if we wish for the right things.—*Michael Ryan, University of Pennsylvania.*

O’Meara, KerryAnn, and R. Eugene Rice.

Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005. 340p. alk. paper, \$36 (ISBN: 0787979201). LC 2005-6483.

Some fifteen years ago, a very small book made a very big noise. In *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*

(1990), Ernest L. Boyer articulated the revolutionary idea that traditional research (i.e., original research aimed at the discovery of new information and grounded in recognized methods of quantitative or qualitative inquiry), which he called the “scholarship of discovery,” was only one of four dimensions of scholarship in which faculty members might fruitfully engage during their careers. Although the scholarship of discovery was the model most often rewarded in the annual review, tenure, and promotion process, he argued, there were ways in which other professional responsibilities might be framed as valuable types of scholarship for which faculty also might be recognized. Joining the scholarship of discovery in Boyer’s model were what have since been discussed in the literature as the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of engagement (originally referred to as the scholarship of application), and the scholarship of integration. Although studies of these “multiple forms of scholarship” were sponsored throughout the past decade by organizations such as the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and although a number of monographs have focused on how to evaluate distinct dimensions of scholarly activity (e.g., Driscoll and Lynton’s *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach* [1999]), the literature was still lacking an overview of the impact of reform initiatives, inspired by what is often referred to as “the Boyer Report,” on national discourses on evaluation of faculty performance and on the guidelines for faculty evaluation developed by individual campuses. Bringing together leaders of national reform programs with the leaders of reform from individual campuses representing a wide range of institutional types, the current volume aims to fill that gap.

In part one of this collection, Rice, who served as a leader of AAHE efforts to promote new forms of scholarship and

faculty review, presents an overview of the historical factors that influenced the proposed new model for scholarship and of the role that AAHE played throughout the 1990s in sponsoring inquiry into multiple forms of scholarship. He joins recognized leaders in the field such as Lee Shulman and Amy Driscoll in providing an introduction to each of the four dimensions of scholarship and the place that each currently holds in discussions of faculty work. It will come as no surprise that some of the alternative models for scholarly work defined by Boyer (e.g., the scholarship of teaching) have made greater inroads into campus culture than others (e.g., the scholarship of integration), and the final chapters in part one of this collection focus on issues related to implementing Boyer's ideas through both national programs (e.g., Preparing Future Faculty) and local efforts.

Implementation at the local level takes center stage in part two of this collection, forming the heart of the work. Drawing on substantive case studies from nine different campuses, including liberal arts colleges (Franklin College), land-grant institutions (Kansas State University), urban institutions (Portland State University), large research universities (Arizona State University), and nontraditional institutions (University of Phoenix), part two identifies many factors that can influence the success of local efforts to redefine scholarly activity and to look anew at how those activities should be evaluated as part of the annual review, tenure, and promotion process. Although the approach taken to reform was different at each institution studied, each case study shares a commitment to articulating the cultural factors that influenced reform efforts at the local level, identifying the key players on campus and reflecting critically on the degree to which these efforts (some now over a decade in the making) have actually changed the way that scholarly efforts are viewed by members of the faculty and the administration.

Part three of this collection returns the spotlight to the national stage by presenting the results of an AAHE-sponsored survey of chief academic officers (CAOs) on campuses across the country. More than 700 CAOs completed the AAHE survey in late 2001 and early 2002, providing information about the formal policy changes made on their campuses during the previous decade for the purpose of recognizing the validity of multiple forms of scholarship. O'Meara, who conducted the survey in her role as an AAHE research associate, combines the information gathered through the case studies with the information gathered through the survey to identify the most common barriers to change, as well as to identify best practices for those urging the recognition of multiple forms of scholarship on their campuses. The fact that a program encouraging collaboration between members of the classroom faculty and academic librarians, especially noted by O'Meara (pp. 273–74), is a hopeful sign of the significance of these efforts in keeping the library at the heart of the academic enterprise.

Although the current collection will likely not serve as the seminal study of the impact of the Boyer report on faculty culture, Rice and O'Meara have done a great service by bringing together an enormous amount of information about a broadly defined approach to academic reform that has taken on as many shapes as there are campuses that have engaged the ideas presented in the Boyer report. For those entirely unfamiliar with the literature of the scholarships of teaching, engagement, and integration, this collection will provide a useful introduction. For those who have followed one or more threads in this discussion over the years, this collection will provide useful information about how their own area(s) of interest factor into discussions at both the local and national levels. Finally, as academic librarians continue discussions about the allocation of professional time, peer review of teaching, and the role

of the engaged academic library in the information-literate community, we can find important lessons in this collection that can help us to bring our own efforts to reform evaluation of professional performance into a broader campus context. — *Scott Walter, University of Kansas.*

Grassian, Esther S., and Joan R. Kaplowitz. *Learning to Lead and Manage Information Literacy Instruction.* New York: Neal-Schuman (Information Literacy Sourcebooks), 2005. 322p. alk. paper (+ CD-ROM), \$65 (ISBN 1555705154). LC 2005-9356.

Most books about information literacy instruction (ILI) address valuable topics such as teaching methods, scheduling, and IL standards. Grassian and Kaplowitz's focus on the overall management of ILI and the qualities of good ILI leaders, therefore, is a welcome addition to the literature. Both authors have experience in managing and leading ILI in academic libraries and have added to the research base on the topic by writing articles and jointly authoring *Information Literacy Instruction: Theory and Practice* (Neal Schuman, 2001).

Although this book is aimed at librarians who participate in instruction, its main audience includes those who wish to focus on changing ILI in positive ways. ILI librarians are in the unique and challenging position of staying up-to-date on databases, IL trends, library policies, and evolving issues in information science, while also developing instruction for the library's users, most of whom are unfamiliar with the nuances of finding aids and the nature of information.

Learning to Lead and Manage Information Literacy Instruction progresses logically from a discussion of leadership and management, in general, to sections on doing ILI research, securing relevant grants, and determining the role of technology within the instruction librarian's duties. Grassian and Kaplowitz distinguish between managers and leaders, hence the title of the book. Managers, by nature of their

duties, are in a position to control how and when things are accomplished in libraries, whereas anyone may be a leader ("grassroots leaders") regardless of their position. Leaders direct the what and why in libraries: "Each time an individual takes a stand, expresses an opinion, or suggests a new way of doing things, that person is taking a leadership role."

Much of the first half of the book covers ways of communicating and collaborating. This is another area central to the authors' ideas on effective ILI programs. Even the subsequent discussions on building teams, working through change, cooperating within and outside the library, fostering growth, developing grants, and marketing and promotion are grounded in communication and collaboration.

This book has three main strengths: (1) inclusion of many ideas for promotion and marketing (and the authors do not shy away from answering the tough question of handling the workload associated with successful promotion), (2) discussion of the realities of the technological side of the ILI librarian's job, and (3) recommendations for additional reading on ILI and management/leadership topics. One weakness is the authors' failure to discuss their ideas and successes with integrating standards, such as ACRL's Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, into ILI programs. The book regrettably concludes immediately after the technology chapter; no wrap-up or cohesive conclusion synthesizes the ideas presented in the chapters. A full bibliography and index follow the last chapter.

The CD-ROM is a helpful feature of the book package. The sample syllabus stands out as the most interesting section, with many sound ideas on working IL into the curriculum of an English course. Two sample proposals, one for a grant, serve as good, concrete examples of the text such documents may contain. A sample letter to faculty discussing the potential of ILI for their students is a nice surprise. There