

Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Promotion and Tenure

KerryAnn O'Meara

The purpose of this chapter is to review recent research and literature on reward systems and how they regard faculty engagement. Promotion and tenure remains a dominant part of the reward system landscape, despite the smaller number of tenure-track appointments. Thus, I consider the current state of promotion and tenure within reward systems as well as enduring dilemmas in the scaffolding that surrounds the assessment of engagement in reward systems. Finally, I outline major areas for reform, advocacy, and organizational and cultural change in higher education to more effectively encourage faculty engagement and move it to the center of our institutions.

Efforts are made to broadly consider the landscape of reward systems and promotion and tenure. Other chapters in this volume should be considered in “close conversation with” this broader topic of promotion and tenure and reward systems and in fact are key aspects of it. For example, Catherine M. Jordan’s chapter considers the use of nontraditional products in promotion and tenure, good review standards, and peer reviewers. The chapter by Ann Austin and John Beck reviews research and integrating engagement into faculty roles and across institutional missions. The issues of integrating faculty engagement into faculty work in different career stages are covered in the chapter by Scott Peters and Theodore Alter, and in other places in this book, and are critical aspects of the big picture of how faculty engagement is woven into the fabric of faculty professional lives.

The Meaning of Reward Systems

For the purposes of this chapter, I build on work done previously with colleagues to define faculty reward systems as “*the many ways in which an institution regards faculty—including*

but not limited to how it recruits, sustains, assesses, and advances faculty throughout their careers" (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). This broad definition recognizes the etymology of the word "reward," which is closely related to the word "regard" or care for, and the meaning of the word "system" as a group of interacting elements that make a whole (O'Meara et al., 2008). Although we often tend to talk about reward systems and promotion and tenure processes interchangeably, it is important to recognize that the promotion and tenure process is only one of several ways faculty are "regarded" or rewarded. Increasingly, faculty are hired onto non-tenure-track positions and part-time positions (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), which also have embedded reward systems, but do not offer tenure. Thus, we need to consider promotion and tenure as one key aspect of a reward system, but also consider how else tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty might be rewarded throughout their careers.

What do we know about faculty reward systems from recent research? A quick review of the literature tells us that faculty are indeed influenced by their reward systems to prioritize some work activities over others. Several comprehensive analyses of faculty behavior have shown us that faculty respond to positive reinforcement such as awards, travel funds, professional development monies, merit pay, tenure, and promotion (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Whether referred to as "extrinsic" sources of motivation (Austin & Gamson, 1983) or as the social knowledge faculty have of what their institution values (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), these factors or sources of support have been found to influence faculty behaviors, work priorities, productivity, and satisfaction (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006; Deming, 2000; Senge, 1990). Likewise, we know from many decades of research on academic environments that extrinsic motivators sometimes come in the form of less tangible resources such as the approval of a department chair and senior colleagues who favor one type of scholarship over another. Appointments to important committees on campus or in disciplinary associations may be offered in return for certain kinds of faculty priorities and work. Also, extrinsic motivation systems do not work alone but in concert with faculty socialization and preferences. Thus, a reward system should be considered not only in terms of the formal and structural policies in place but as a more complex set of interacting social, cultural, political, and economic factors that encourage some behaviors over others. One thing is certain, however: Reward systems matter in the professional lives of faculty. Even when faculty seemingly operate against the current of reward systems or completely outside of them, reward systems are shaping how faculty present and understand their work. Also, reward systems are an important cultural and symbolic way departments, colleges, and institutions say what matters. It is for these reasons that reward systems deserve our attention.

Promotion and Tenure: Current Conditions

Perhaps the most researched and discussed aspects of reward systems in higher education today are promotion and tenure systems. With notable deviation across institutions, most promotion and tenure systems work in the following way. Faculty are recruited onto a tenure track, usually into an assistant professor position. They have six or more years "on the

tenure track” and then submit their materials for promotion to associate professor, which comes with tenure. This is usually an “up or out” decision, with successful faculty being tenured and promoted and unsuccessful faculty being given one extra year before their appointments are terminated. If faculty are successful, they then wait another five to eight years and submit materials to be promoted to full professor, although the timing between associate and full professor is highly variable. Also, this second decision is not up or out, because the person is already tenured. Faculty can apply more than once for full professor. Most faculty submit an overall personal statement discussing their professional work, a curriculum vitae, annual faculty reports, teaching evaluations and philosophies, research publications, and documentation of grants, awards, fellowships, and committee assignments as part of their portfolios.

In reviewing research and commentary on promotion and tenure systems over the past two decades, three observations seem important, especially in light of the topic of this volume of faculty community engagement. First, although there was a maelstrom of critique against the idea of tenure in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s, tenure seems to have remained stable with a few modifications. It is available, however, as a career track for a smaller number of new academics (Chait, 2002; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The modifications that seem to be most prevalent across higher education systems are post-tenure review, stopping the clock for family reasons, and broadening of the definitions of scholarship (O’Meara et al., 2008). Although each of these modifications has its own record of research in terms of successes and failures, they have all struggled to become embedded in academic cultures and reward systems as opposed to “virtually adopted” (Birnbaum, 2000). For example, research shows that many academic parents have noted that they wanted to take advantage of new stop-the-clock policies, wherein the tenure decision year is extended for the addition of the child to the family, but have not because of bias in their departments and fear that taking advantage of the policy would hurt their careers (Colbeck & Drago, 2005; Erskine & Spalter-Roth, 2005; Williams, Alon, & Bornstein, 2006). Likewise, post-tenure review has helped some institutions provide meaningful professional development for mid- and late-career faculty (Licata & Morreale, 1997; O’Meara, 2003, 2004). However, in other institutions or even departments in the same institution, post-tenure has been scorned and virtually ignored because of faculty feelings that it goes counter to valued norms of autonomy, academic freedom, and collegiality (O’Meara, 2003, 2004). As such, context is key in implementing any modifications to promotion and tenure policies (Wood & Johnsrud, 2005). This point will be underscored in discussing modifications to acknowledge a broader definition of scholarship and to recognize and reward engagement.

A second observation is that for those who actually go up for tenure, the odds are actually in their favor. In 2002, Chait estimated the chances of achieving promotion and tenure for those who submit applications to be about 3 in 4. This is an average; it is slightly less in research universities and slightly higher in small four-year liberal arts colleges.

Yet, these statistics are not the full story. For although three of four faculty who apply may be awarded tenure, not all of the faculty who started on the tenure track make it from the first appointment year to the tenure decision year. In fact, women and faculty of color have been found to have more trouble within existing reward systems than their white male

counterparts (Aguirre, 2000; Morrison, Rudd, Nerad, & Picciano, 2007). For example, when compared to their male White counterparts, women faculty have been found more likely to: not enter the tenure track, leave institutions prior to receiving tenure, or take longer to achieve tenure or promotion for family-related reasons (varying of course by discipline and institutional type) (Morrison et al., 2007; Perna, 2001a, 2005).

When compared to their White male counterparts, faculty of color have been found more likely to be dissatisfied with their institution's tenure process (its fairness, sense of their own prospects of achieving tenure) and feel less of control over their research trajectory (Aguirre, 2000; Trower & Bleak, 2004b; Trower & Chait, 2002). It must be noted, however, that recent studies show that when appointment type, career stage, and institutional type are controlled, fewer differences emerge between faculty of color and white faculty (Trower & Bleak, 2004b).

Often the issue in looking at equity is not evident at face value. For example, in a recent review of the status of women at the University of Maryland, completed by a summer 2008 class of mine, it was found that among tenure-track faculty, women and men had the same chance of receiving tenure once they went up, but women were more likely than men to leave the tenure track before the decision (Campbell, Huang, & Stamps, 2008). Likewise, students found that although men and women who go up for full professor have the same chances of success, eligible women are less likely than eligible men to submit their bid for full professor. This of course becomes one negative influence on the percentage of women full professors on campus.

There have been more good explanations and analyses of why women and faculty of color seem to be disadvantaged within current promotion and tenure systems than can be described here. However, I observe that some of the explanations have to do with the social and human capital women and faculty of color bring to their positions vis-à-vis their colleagues (Perna, 2001a, 2001b, 2005), whereas others have focused on the cultural schemas, gender stereotyping, and implicit bias that are inherent in all who work in higher education organizations and limit the progress of women and faculty of color (Callister, Hult, & Sullivan, 2006; Valian, 2000; Williams, Alon, & Bornstein, 2006).

The reason faculty demographics are important to the discussion of reward systems and community engagement is that many studies have shown that women and faculty of color self-report greater involvements in service-learning and community engagement (Antonio, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Baez, 2000; Rosser, 2004, Umbach, 2006). Given that a majority of faculty involved in community engagement do so as part of their teaching, vis-à-vis service-learning, it is important to consider how the teaching goals and intentions of women and faculty of color may differ and how this may influence their standing within reward systems.

Recent survey research found that in comparison to their White male counterparts, faculty of color were more likely to report commitments to the holistic development of students and to out-of-class experiences, goals for social change, community engagement, and the scholarship of application in their work lives (Umbach, 2006). In comparison to male faculty, women faculty were significantly more likely to use student-centered pedagogies such as collaborative learning and diversity-related classroom activities, spend significant time

preparing for teaching and advising, and embrace liberal arts goals (Umbach, 2006). Yet Fairweather's (1993, 1996, 2005) research on reward systems consistently shows that faculty who emphasize research over teaching receive higher salaries and accrue greater prestige. Although context is key when discussing reward systems—that is, good teaching will matter more in a small liberal arts college than a research university—it is nonetheless instructive to note that those who preference engagement, either by teaching or by research, do so at the very least not in the service of their professional careers but in some cases to their own jeopardy. Women and faculty of color who engage in such work may be in a double bind, because implicit bias and stereotyping may be their first barrier and then work priorities their second.

A third, closely related observation is that the promotion and tenure system has been critiqued for other reasons unrelated to gender and race and unrelated to a failure to acknowledge the scholarship of engagement. For more than two decades research on tenure-track faculty has shown that junior faculty feel the process is ambiguous and difficult to navigate in terms of standards and expectations, and that it seems to almost always emphasize research in ways disproportionate to the weight given to it in institutional rhetoric, mission statements, formal workload assignments, and even promotion and tenure guidelines (Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000; Rice & Sorcinelli, 2002). In addition, promotion and tenure processes have been critiqued for disadvantaging interdisciplinary work, encouraging siloed/individual work over collaboration, and not recognizing multiple forms of scholarship (O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Trower, 2008).

It is critical to look at the issue of reward systems and promotion and tenure for community-engaged scholars within this broader context. Oftentimes, I have attended well-intentioned presentations on supporting faculty in community engagement where the central premise of the conversation and advice seemed to be a series of “if only assumptions.” Such assumptions regarding faculty documentation of engaged work for promotion and tenure were that engaged scholars will be successful and their work valued in reward systems:

- If only we could show the rigor of the engaged work
- If only we could prove it is the best way to promote student learning
- If only we could document its impact on the field, students, the institution, community and policy through multiple products for multiple audiences
- If only the peer reviewers could be expanded to include community partners and policy makers
- If only the promotion and tenure policy language itself would laud the value of engaged work and its importance to tenure decisions.

The problem with these “if only's” is not that they are wrong in and of themselves—they are just out of context. As other chapters in this volume point out—making a clear case for the rigor of engaged work for peers through careful documentation *will* make a difference to both the quality of the work and to reviewers who are willing to hear the case made. Expanding who is considered peer and changing institutional missions and reward system policies to laud engagement *are* important cultural armor for engaged faculty going up for tenure. My research with Gene Rice suggests the importance of redefining scholarship in promotion

and tenure criteria, workload, and mission documents for engaged scholars as well as teacher-scholars (O'Meara & Rice, 2005).

However, the crux of the issue is that much of the work we do in support of engaged faculty—while cognizant of discipline, and while encouraging linking of mission to engaged work—seems to miss the point that that each engaged scholar is not a blank slate around the edges of his or her engagement. Nor is every environment the same—even within an institutional type—in terms of relevant “currencies” sought and exchanged in reward systems.

Instead, each person who stands before a tenure or promotion committee, or in the case of a non-tenure-track faculty member, for renewal of a contract, brings with them certain currencies or assets to offer in their particular institutional political economy. One faculty member may be in a second career and bring significant professional contacts and networks. Another faculty member who joined the faculty straight from graduate school is an expert in how to use a new instrument in the laboratory. One faculty member is a favorite among students, and another recently received a large grant to implement a new curricular strategy in the local school district. As such, their engagement is part of a total picture. The prestige one faculty member offers through peer-reviewed journals may be considered equal to the currency of a new engagement-oriented NSF grant or outstanding teaching award, depending on the institutional economy at that time.

To make things more complicated, one of these faculty members is a Latina woman, one is a White man, and one is African American. One of these faculty members, while going up for tenure, is on her second maternity leave. One faculty member's research is interdisciplinary, and another faculty member is publishing much of his work online and in new media. Furthermore, whereas one faculty member has been taken in by the senior faculty in his department, another is somewhat isolated.

Each of these faculty members is going up for tenure in places that are not static but constantly evolving as well in terms of campus leadership, reward system priorities, and membership of promotion and tenure committees. Each institution also has local traditions or expectations not stated in formal policies but understood in everyday practice, such as whether it is appropriate to go up early for tenure, how much service a faculty member should have done, and what kinds of relationships with the external community are most valued. For example, I have worked several times with campuses where service to undergraduates is considered preeminent. I have heard discouragement from senior faculty of what was called “selfish research” that took junior faculty away from students as opposed to supervision of undergraduate research projects fulfilling the research role. In these environments, engagement that promotes civic responsibility among students while improving town-gown relationships has high currency.

In addition, each discipline has its own tensions, completely separate from issues of public work, regarding what is considered important to study, how to study it, and where to publish it (Sterett, 2008). These issues will have been raised in disciplinary journals, from granting agencies, and within conversations among the top scholars of a field. These conversations will inevitably also influence the scholars involved in promotion and tenure decisions, whether on a campus committee or as external reviewers.

If the original point was that we oversimplify the problems inherent in regard for faculty community engagement, I may have overcompensated by painting a picture of promotion and tenure processes that is too complex. However, both my experiences studying faculty reward systems and my own experiences as a faculty member suggest that the same two faculty members can be going up for tenure in the same department and have a completely different set of experiences based on individual demographics, their work contributions, and the priorities of the institution at that time.

What this means is that faculty members have to figure out for themselves how their public work will fit into the unique career that they are building at a particular institution and in their field. Not all faculty doing engaged work will have to struggle to make a case for their work. In more environments than we recognize, it will be regarded well or at minimum not be held against the faculty member. Even in some research-oriented institutions, the other assets engaged scholars bring with their engagement to the tenure table, whether they be peer-reviewed articles or a teaching award or a grant, offset any perceived disadvantages of time not spent on something that brings more prestige. For other faculty, it may not be their engaged scholarship holding them back at all as much as cultures not supportive of women or faculty of color, an institution that is resource-thirsty and needs faculty to bring in more grants, or preference by faculty for a different type of research, such as quantitative or qualitative.

Given that faculty live their daily lives in departments, programs, with students and colleagues, and in particular locations, we need to look at what assets and currencies faculty engagement can bring to the more intimate spaces where faculty live their professional lives. Much of the conversation about integrating the scholarship of engagement into reward systems seems highly aware of how the work differs from a perceived norm of traditional scholarship. This deficits approach attempts to prove how community engagement is as good as if not superior to traditional scholarship using criteria related to rigor, peer review, and dissemination. This is done for some good reasons—reflection on goals, dissemination, reflection, and critique can in fact improve the quality of the work. Also, it is done as a recognition that the norms of academic culture prefer traditional scholarship—at least in research and doctoral institutions, and so for the career success of the engaged scholar—and so it is better to make your argument in these terms. Likewise, the majority of faculty are socialized toward these sets of expectations in graduate school, and therefore they govern across many institutional types. However, one has to wonder whether by taking this approach, engaged scholars are in some ways cloaking the true values and value of the work. For example, commentators have noted on several occasions that there are different epistemologies, modes of work, and values around dissemination that govern engagement. One of these is the value of genuine collaboration, and another is the value of inviting in and facilitating partner knowledge and expertise in projects (O'Meara, 2008; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Currently, our advice to faculty is to work hard to point out in their portfolios what parts of a collaboration were their individual contribution and to have products with their name as solo author on them. We likewise advise faculty to go to great pains to demonstrate exactly what knowledge they themselves brought to bear on the issue and the impact of their individual knowledge.

However, what if all of the engaged scholars who have been successfully promoted and tenured at each university were actually in charge? What criteria and values would we then apply not only to engagement but to all scholarship? Clearly, the practice of engagement and the discussion around multiple forms of scholarship have pushed many campuses to add the criteria of impact (e.g., on communities and students) to their promotion and tenure processes. But I posit that at times this can still seem like adding to the edges of a system fundamentally at odds with the epistemology of engagement. Thinking any other way, though, requires our imaginations to consider not what is, but what we think should be, and to work toward those goals. Also, it requires engagement scholars to consider the possibility that they may not all be in agreement as to what ideal requirements might be for demonstrating excellence in engagement.

The next section reviews reforms that seem to have made the biggest impact so far on the recognition of faculty engagement in current reward systems. After describing the accomplishments of these reforms, I consider where we still need to go to strengthen the overall reward “systems” that support engaged faculty and all faculty in higher education, in ways that take into account individual and institutional contexts, and currencies. I also raise the question I posed above—what would we do to reward engagement if “we” were in charge?

Reform in Reward Systems

As is well known to readers of this volume, in 1990, Ernest Boyer advocated in the landmark Carnegie report *Scholarship Reconsidered* that campuses transform their reward systems to align mission and reward system and to acknowledge multiple forms of scholarship including discovery, teaching, integration, and application of knowledge. In subsequent work the term “application” was amended to “engagement” in consideration of the reciprocal nature of relationships and knowledge flow. This framework, which built directly off of earlier work by Gene Rice, resonated with provosts, deans, and department chairs struggling with striving academic cultures that did not seem to be rewarding teaching and service, much less community engagement. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) followed the initial report with *Scholarship Assessed*, which provided actual criteria for assessing excellence in these four forms of scholarship. These criteria include clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. We know that hundreds of campuses adopted the Boyer framework and put it into their promotion and tenure and related reward system and evaluation policies (O'Meara, 1997; O'Meara & Rice, 2005).

Only a few studies have tried to look comprehensively at the impact of reforms to acknowledge a broader definition of scholarship on institutions and faculty (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2006; Huber, 2002, 2004; O'Meara, 2002, 2005a, 2005b; O'Meara & Rice, 2005). For example, Braxton et al. (2006) have tried to understand whether reforms made at the institutional level have trickled down to influence actual faculty understandings of scholarship or involvements in different forms of scholarship. The authors found that while teaching and discovery remain institutionalized in workload, only discovery or research was

considered fully adopted into faculty values and assumptions. My own research (O'Meara, 2002) involved case studies at four colleges and universities to assess the extent to which community engagement was considered a form of scholarship for promotion and tenure. I found that each of the four campuses had reformed their promotion and tenure policies and were experiencing slight improvements in balance across reward systems, faculty involvement in alternative forms of scholarship, and faculty satisfaction with institutional work life. A key finding of the study, though, was that institutional type played a huge role in assessment of service as scholarship. Also, there were specific values and beliefs that worked for and against the assessment of engagement as scholarship, even among its advocates.

Gene Rice and I (O'Meara & Rice, 2005) conducted a three-year study that included a national survey of chief academic officers (CAOs) at four-year institutions, regional focus groups with CAOs, and demonstration projects with nine campuses all amending their reward systems as suggested by Boyer (1990). CAOs from reform institutions where changes had been made (in the previous five to ten years) to acknowledge, support, and reward multiple forms of scholarship were significantly more likely than CAOs at institutions that had not made similar reforms to observe that at their institutions innovation was encouraged and rewarded, the primary interests of new faculty hires matched the institution's primary goals and direction, and that over the previous ten years their institutions had found a greater balance in the faculty evaluation process, that is, research was not rewarded over teaching and service for promotion and tenure (O'Meara, 2005b, 2006). In contrast, CAOs at nonreform institutions were significantly more likely to report that the institutions found it hard to initiate innovations that did not conform to norms at peer institutions and that faculty at their institutions wanted strategic decisions to make the institution more like peer institutions. Likewise, survey research found that CAOs at reform institutions were more likely than those at nonreform institutions to say that they had seen faculty involvement in the scholarships of teaching, integration, and engagement increase and to report that the impact of scholarship on the local community or state, the institution, students, the mission of the institution, and the priorities of the academic unit influenced promotion and tenure decisions. And CAOs at reform institutions reported a higher percentage of tenure and promotion cases that emphasized their work in teaching and engagement scholarship. They were more likely as well to report that chances of achieving tenure and promotion based on teaching or engagement had increased over the previous decade (O'Meara, 2005b, 2006).

Both the Braxton et al. (2006) and O'Meara (2005b, 2006) studies drew on representative samples of four-year institutions, and they complement each other in that the former explored institutionalization of Boyer's conceptions of scholarship from the perspective of faculty and the latter from the perspective of CAOs. Braxton et al.'s study (2006) also contributed significantly to the literature by creating measurable constructs to measure faculty work activity in each of the areas of scholarship. Huber's in-depth anthropological exploration (2004) of faculty crafting careers around the scholarship of teaching complements qualitatively these other two studies by examining the nature of faculty teaching scholarship and how it has played out in reward systems.

As the overall movement to acknowledge broader definitions of scholarship has permeated national discussion and individual campus faculty senates and promotion and tenure

committees, two movements within the larger one have quietly made inroads under this bigger tent. First, under the leadership of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, significant efforts have been made to differentiate effective teaching from the scholarship of teaching and assess it for promotion and tenure (Huber, 2002; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999).

Second, and most pertinent to this volume, there have been more than two decades of work by national associations, college presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs, as well as individual faculty leaders, to change promotion and tenure to reward community engagement in and of itself and, in relevant cases, as a form of scholarship.

Although some early advocates of this process (Diamond & Adam, 1995; Elman & Smock, 1985) must be recognized, no one really ignited the conversation as effectively as Ernest Lynton in *Making the Case for Faculty Professional Service*. Subsequently, with Amy Driscoll, Ernest Lynton worked to “make the case” for why partnerships for the public good enriched scholarship and the academy as well as the community (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999). Lynton’s (1995) early work provided rich cases of what this work was, and the aspects of it that made it scholarship, including consideration of the process and products of the work and the criteria by which they might be evaluated (Lynton, 1995). Examples were provided from multiple disciplines to demonstrate this was work for faculty not just in the social sciences or professional schools, but also in the sciences and humanities (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999).

Since then, many leaders and advocates in the engagement movement have added layers practically and conceptually to how we might transform reward systems to acknowledge the complexity of faculty engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Driscoll & Sandmann, 2001; Holland, 1999; Ward, 2003). A major contribution to assessing engaged scholarship was made by the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement and National Clearinghouse on Engagement (headed by Lorilee Sandmann and Amy Driscoll) (<http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/index.html>).

Perhaps most encouraging to those who have been advocates of higher education reward systems that encourage public work are fairly recent efforts by national disciplinary associations to weigh in on this matter. Although there are many more, I note several here that seem likely to have significant impact in terms of specific colleges and departments making judgments about engaged work.

In 2007, the Modern Language Association of America put out a report of the MLA task force on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion. The context of the report was that the association was concerned about the ever-increasing demands for publication for promotion and tenure among their members at a time when it has become even more difficult to publish single-author books with university and other presses. From this initial concern, the task force considered the status of graduate education and career options for MLA members and what might need to be done to ensure both reasonable and flexible standards for faculty. They concluded that institutions and departments affiliated with MLA need to do a better job of connecting institutional mission and reward systems and amending reward systems to acknowledge broader forms of scholarship, as well as the newer venues that these come in, such as new media. They also acknowledged the importance of the “applied work of citizenship” wherein faculty partner with public organizations, and suggest that this

work be better included in reward systems (Modern Language Association Task Force on Tenure and Promotion [www.mla.org/tenure_promotion]).

Likewise, in 2007, the American Sociological Association (ASA) recognized the long-standing contributions of sociologists to the public's understanding of, and ability to act on, the social issues of our time by asking a task force to develop guidelines for the evaluation of public sociology for promotion and tenure. The report, entitled "Standards of Public Sociology: Guidelines for Use by Academic Departments in Personnel Reviews," was submitted by the Task Force on the Institutionalization of Public Sociology. These guidelines suggest ways to define and assess what public sociology is and contains, noting that it builds on previous literature and is research-based, upholds rigorous methodological standards, is subject to peer review, and includes or should include an expanded definition of the "peer" in peer review, and identification of how portfolios can be used to display and evaluate public sociology.

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Collaborative, under the auspices of Cathy Jordan (2007), developed the *Community Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion and Tenure Package and Toolkit*, which, although applicable to faculty in many disciplines, provides very concrete tools for faculty in the health fields to define their community engagement for promotion and tenure and develop a portfolio that demonstrates rigor in both teaching and research aspects of community engagement. A mock dossier and tips for highlighting different aspects of engagement that have contributed to institutional teaching, research, and service missions are included, as well as advice for suggesting peer reviewers and creating multiple products for multiple audiences (<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html>).

Last but certainly not least is Imagining America's newest report (Ellison & Eatman, 2008) entitled *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*, created by Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman and the Tenure Team Initiative. This project advocates in the report for recognition and assessment of a "continuum of scholarship" (p. iv) that includes work created with specific publics and communities outside academe and thereby embracing of multiple products and expanded notions of peer review. Concrete examples are given of public engagement in the arts, humanities, and design. Some strengths of this work in terms of building from what came before are that it considers how interdisciplinary and intercultural engagement interact with assessment of engagement. This report also considers different paths to civic agency throughout the career of the faculty member in arts, humanities, and design.

There is no doubt that the recent efforts of these disciplinary associations in showing how public work might be conducted, assessed, and rewarded in their disciplines are a major step forward for the engagement movement. Vivid examples in such publications, as well as the national awards such as the Ernest Lynton and Thomas Ehrlich awards, respond directly to naysayers who said earlier in the movement, "Well, that is very nice for education and social work, but I am in medicine"—or English, or even engineering. We know because of such projects that there are roles for public scholars in every field and discipline, and we know there are concrete ways to assess the work.

Likewise, reforms in mission, planning documents, promotion and tenure, and other reward system documents that emphasize multiple forms of scholarship have helped support and—perhaps as importantly—regard the work of engaged faculty.

The recent work of disciplinary associations and interdisciplinary partnerships has also moved the issue forward by better defining engagement, identifying its benefits in specific disciplines and areas of public life, and providing concrete ways to assess its excellence.

Yet, returning to the earlier discussions, it does seem as if the entire movement operates on the defensive when it comes to faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure. We seem to develop better and better ways to “make cases” for what we assume to be hostile receptions to engaged teaching and scholarship. Clearly, there are good reasons for this, as the very research and personal experiences of engaged scholars suggest those hostile rooms that prize more traditional work over engaged scholarship.

However, this situation seems very similar to that of the dominant narrative on faculty in higher education, which tends to emphasize constraints on faculty work lives and careers (O'Meara et al., 2008). Although it is true that there are serious constraints in terms of equity, workload, reward systems, mission creep, balance of work and family, and other major factors that limit faculty capacity to thrive in their careers, it is also true that these differ greatly by institutional type and discipline, and that these are also careers that are highly sought after with comparably high satisfaction rates. By revealing the constraints, we help provide paths to ameliorate them; but our focus is also not on other key aspects of faculty work life—such as growth (O'Meara et al., 2008).

Likewise, by taking the defensive and devising strategies to make cases for engagement in environments that prize research above all else, we sometimes obscure the environments (of which there are likely more) that are already interested in engagement and in tenuring engaged scholars. We also shift attention from what we might do to better develop the entire pipeline of faculty learning and growth in community engagement. In the next section I outline major issues I see remaining in terms of the overall system of rewards and regard for community engagement, and then discuss four critical areas for reform.

Enduring Dilemmas and Issues

This volume provides a comprehensive examination of the many issues propelling and holding the scholarship of engagement back. The topic of this chapter is reward systems and promotion and tenure. However, it is impossible to observe what needs to be done specifically with reward systems and promotion and tenure without also acknowledging broader work that must be done to embed community engagement in supportive cultures and systems of support. I offer each of these three areas on top of the areas already mentioned in terms of improving equity for women and faculty of color, lessening ambiguity in the tenure process, and recognition of multiple faculty talents and scholarships. Because each of the following is covered in more detail elsewhere, I touch on each issue briefly and then turn to three critical issues for improving the regard for community engagement in higher education reward systems.

Issue One: There is no widespread system of graduate education providing opportunities to learn the skills and values of engaged work. There are some excellent enclaves, but no systems.

Although important work is being done by new enclaves within disciplines and interdisciplinary research centers, there is no widespread system wherein doctoral students are learning the knowledge sets, skills, or professional orientation of engaged work. This is really the long-term problem of the movement, as we know from decades of higher education research that it is during graduate programs that doctoral students develop their identity as scholars, develop networks with others doing similar work, and develop a sense of competency and then priority for some types of work over others (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Colbeck, O'Meara, & Austin, 2008; Golde, 2008; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). This means the current generation of future faculty are missing opportunities for critical experiences that help them to see how their topics connect to public work (O'Meara, 2007, 2008; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2007). It also means that they are not receiving an apprenticeship with senior engaged scholars that shapes their professional identity toward public work (Colbeck, 2008; Golde, 2008; O'Meara, 2008).

Perhaps as important, it means that community engagement is not being mainstreamed into department cultures and expectations in such a way that even graduate students who do not wish to become involved nonetheless see it as a legitimate pathway for their classmates and something common in their field. As a result, these graduate students become future faculty who have no experience with engagement when a colleague presents it as scholarship in their new department.

Also, the requirements of the dissertation still focus predominantly on individual rather than collaborative work, with choice of topics focused on contributions to academic knowledge as opposed to public knowledge. Many of the values inherent in the process of creating the dissertation are thus in conflict with the values of engaged scholarship, which encourages problems identified with community partners, in collaboration (Strand et al., 2003; O'Meara, 2008).

It is true, however, that these problems are not central concerns in all institutional types, because many faculty eschew their research training to intentionally choose colleges that prioritize teaching and engagement and are thus more open to regard of such work in their departments. Yet the residue of such socialization seems to impact even these scholars, even if in ways they do not realize as they evaluate community engagement as a form of scholarship (O'Meara, 2002). Thus, a central concern for future generations is the reform of graduate education to be more focused on public work.

Issue Two: Most reward systems privatize faculty work toward the interests of individual faculty, departments, colleges, and institutions, as well as disciplines.

Although there are some notable exceptions, most junior faculty enter departments without a focus on public work but rather with very private interests, reinforced through private rewards. The reward of tenure is given to an individual and its private benefits to the individual reinforced through a pay increase, greater autonomy, and prestige.

In reflecting on his own academic experiences, John Saltmarsh (2004) observed that while at Northeastern, "The deeper I got involved in service-learning the less my work was private.

I was dealing with public issues.” (p. 14). He goes on to note that after leaving Northeastern, he began to work with Campus Compact and stepping out into this role made him

see academic culture in ways that I hadn't seen so clearly before. I never quite appreciated how we are socialized to be accountable only to ourselves. I was socialized to believe that my first loyalty was to my profession (a loyalty that was fairly undefined but meant something about my scholarship adhering to the standards of the craft) and after that there were no loyalties, not to institution, department, colleagues or students. This deep socialization fostering the privatization of the faculty role led to inherent disengagement in social and political affairs (p. 15).

I would add to Saltmarsh's observations that as mentioned earlier, I have been involved in research with graduate students on the status of women on my campus for our Women's Commission. This collaboration invites a kind of accountability into the work that I am not subject to in the same way when submitting work to a peer-reviewed journal. In the latter process three or four well-known scholars in the field weigh in on the quality of the ideas, methods, and findings. Their deliberation and feedback no doubt makes the next draft better. But in the former case, because the questions about the status of women are asked publicly, members from across the campus in very different types of positions and with very different viewpoints get to ask questions of the work and have a say in what we might do with the findings. This kind of public work actually invites greater scrutiny, but also at times seems more relevant to the daily life of my academic home.

Indeed, a great challenge at the root of the community engagement movement is the degree to which the structure of faculty careers as well as the cultures of departments, colleges, institutions, and disciplines privatizes faculty work. This is a complex issue worthy of many pages, but the brief point I make here is that as long as faculty appointments are made in such a way as to stake the faculty member's work in the immediate needs of departments and institutions as well as to prioritize cosmopolitan interests over local interests (Rhoades, Kiyama, McCormick, & Quiroz, 2008), public access to faculty work and capacity to hold them accountable for relevance of their work is severely limited.

Issue Three: Faculty work is rarely held to standards related to public relevance, impact, and long-term contributions and relationships.

Although I argued earlier that cases made for engaged scholarship seem to take the defensive and assume that if only engaged scholars could show the rigor of their work to the more traditional scholars, they would be successful in achieving promotion and tenure, I now make a complementary point.

Too often, those engaged scholars who make it through the promotion and tenure process, do not push traditional scholars on criteria most exemplary in their own scholarship. Alan Bloomgarden (2008) recently completed a study of fifteen engaged scholars on prestigious liberal arts campuses and found that although these engaged scholars tended to support their more junior colleagues in the promotion and tenure process, helping these individuals to make their cases, they did not seem interested in or willing to take on the very epistemological assumptions of the process that disadvantaged their and their colleagues work to begin with. In fact, many engaged faculty seemed relieved that they were through with the promotion

and tenure process, and having had the process work for them, they were satisfied to continue their work and ignore rather than transform the institution's reward system.

The engagement movement needs strong advocates who have tenure and full professor status to question the criteria and standards by which engaged work is disadvantaged. Perhaps even more importantly, such faculty need to speak up and inject their own sense of values and beliefs about scholarship and criteria into judgment of traditional scholarship. For example, why hasn't the movement pushed back and suggested that all scholarship—including theoretical work in journals and basic science—be considered for issues of impact, relevance, and contribution to public issues? Why are there not more faculty asking of their colleagues, "Who will use this research?" or "How will it make a difference?" Why does no one ask if researchers provided any findings to the subjects of their studies or if there was any reciprocal collaboration? This would not be done in such a way as to suggest every piece of scholarship must look the same or make the same contributions. Rather, I pose here that part of the enduring dilemma the engagement field faces is the silence of its own advocates within reward systems and the failure to push for more of the values of engaged scholarship to be considered in assessment of all scholarship, not just engaged work.

The next section considers these three embedded, somewhat enduring dilemmas in efforts to move community engagement to the center of reward systems.

Three Critical Issues for the Next Decade

Each of the following three issues is offered in the spirit of recognizing both the accomplishments and the limitations of where the engagement movement is today. Rather than addressing how all of higher education needs to change in order to be more connected to communities and public life, I consider how promotion and tenure and reward systems need to change to cause the kinds of change that engagement scholars seek, and to reflect that change in a deep way.

Making Faculty Appointments, Work, and Rewards More Public

A critical piece of how faculty are regarded is how they are held accountable and in conversation with their different constituencies. Although there are benefits to the ivory tower model of colleges and universities in terms of space for reflection and cultivation of intellect and free inquiry, these things can still be preserved in academic cultures that strive to create more intimate relationships with their alumni, grant-making agencies, community partners or organizations, the media, and colleagues from other disciplines.

Although a large-scale change in the governance of institutions and how faculty are appointed to give community members greater voice, create more joint appointments, exchange programs, and invite such partners into reward systems as external reviewers is important, there are smaller ways in which faculty professional lives might be connected with the public that would ultimately help change reward systems. First, many interdisciplinary centers have for some time had advisory boards that help the center develop priorities for research, grant funding, and to comment on curriculum. Such advisory boards

are a way of inviting constituencies into conversation about where the field is going, what research matters, and where it can make the biggest difference. Likewise, in the area of pedagogy, such advisory boards can connect courses to public problems and issues that prepare students for careers while connecting the institution and community.

Second, each year faculty complete many research projects and publications with ideas and findings very relevant to public debate, but they are not circulated in any meaningful way on campus or off. If more campuses developed strategies for writing policy briefs or short summaries of findings and how they may be relevant to current national, state, or regional issues, and if these were more intentionally posted in libraries, discussed with local reporters, and shared electronically, even posted in places where public comment was possible, we would do much to open up our campuses and research to the public. Granted, this is a one-way strategy and does not solve the problem aptly described by Boyte (2008) and others of technocracy wherein the experts talk and the community is supposed to listen. However, by at least opening the research up for the public, we take another step toward a conversation from which partnerships and important action may form. Likewise, descriptions of what faculty are doing on sabbaticals could be posted on websites and in community newspapers each semester so that the public knows that these faculty members are working on and can connect with them on issues of common interest.

Third, the scholarship of teaching movement has pushed many faculty to consider how to make their teaching more public—moving beyond teaching evaluations from students to ways in which peers might be invited into consideration of teaching and learning in classrooms. Many faculty who are at institutions that prioritize service to undergraduates do not consider themselves part of a civic engagement movement, but nonetheless are everyday passionately engaged in teaching that prepares citizens with valuable skills for a democracy. For example, higher education institutions value thinking systematically about issues, using evidence to make points, and considering issues from multiple perspectives (Sterett, 2008). As good teachers, they have students debate issues, consider alternatives, role play, and engage in collaborative deliberation. Many of these classroom conversations would be enriched by participation from local voices and indigenous knowledge on the topics. Institutions could open many windows by having regularly scheduled days in which community members could join classes on campus, in local schools, or in conjunction with public events so that what is happening in those classrooms is more transparent and so that students and community members can enrich each other's learning.

There are many more small ways that the actual work of faculty and what they do might be made more public. Some are more realistic and appropriate for some disciplines, local contexts, and missions than others. Regardless, making the daily work of faculty more public will help in making the basis for faculty appointments more public. This will in turn raise public expectations regarding faculty work and its potential relevance to their communities. It could act to change public perception of faculty work as unrelated to the real world and thereby put external pressure on campuses to “open up” their reward systems and be accountable for rewarding engaged scholarship that benefits the public.

Making Reward Systems More Growth Focused

In a recent monograph with my colleagues Aimee Terosky and Anna Neumann, we have argued for a national narrative on faculty that is less focused on constraints and more focused on growth. By faculty growth we referred specifically to the following:

Change that occurs in a person through the course of her or his academic career or personal life and that allows her or him to bring new and diverse knowledge, skills, values, and professional orientations to her or his work (O'Meara et al., 2008).

We further define growth with four aspects:

- Learning (ability to engage, personally and professionally)
- Agency (ability to assume)
- Professional relationships (ability to create, nurture, and sustain)
- Commitments (ability to act on and form).

This framework for faculty growth has significant implications for the entire system of faculty recruitment, support, and reward with regard to engagement. There are deep problems with approaching the tenure track as both a sprint and a marathon where faculty members must move as quickly as possible to publish as much as possible over a six-year period to prove themselves as teachers and scholars. I believe that a key issue for the improvement of reward systems overall, and for engaged scholars specifically, is to focus more on how faculty might learn through their work and what they are learning. This includes what faculty are learning through professional relationships with community partners and through long-term commitments to address particular social issues. It also means “regarding” faculty relationship building, leadership, social entrepreneurship, and impacts alongside the grants, articles, new media, books, and other products that come with it. This also has serious implications for faculty development for engagement.

Those vested with supporting faculty development and preparing faculty for success in reward systems might consider what supports they can provide faculty along a “learning continuum” as opposed to simply a career stage or tenure-track continuum, as different faculty members will come to their engagement with various levels of knowledge and community-building skills. Also, regardless of appointment type, we know that faculty are attracted to their positions out of a desire for learning. As such, faculty new to an area might benefit right off from “orientations to place” so that opportunities to make long-term commitments to specific neighbors might be understood earlier in careers and considered part of faculty learning and career building.

Faculty growth in engagement also requires a sense of civic agency. A reward system truly trying to help everyone succeed in engagement will help faculty develop a sense of self-efficacy in developing partnerships and facilitating public dialogue on key issues. It will facilitate skills in integrating service-learning or community-based research into their classes and studying the impact on student sense of civic responsibility and civic agency. Small faculty learning communities, peer networks, and encouragement of exchanges where faculty reside in community and public organizations and community partners reside in departments will facilitate such faculty growth. In sum, a reward system that truly contributes

to and reflects an engaged university is one where faculty learning in engagement is nurtured in very concrete ways and regarded as central to evaluation.

Making Cases That Resist Accommodation

Finally, the bottom line in supporting engaged scholars through reward systems is that we need a new “script.” This new script needs to take into account the unique assets and accomplishments of the engaged scholar and place them in context. This means avoiding the tendency to assume, “If all engaged scholars do X, then . . .” and instead make cases based on the quality of the work as we define it. By this last point I mean resisting the temptation to accommodate the criteria and epistemology of traditional research if it is not relevant, and instead to call the work what it is and make the case for why that is important for institutions, students, and public life.

The first point relates to the issue of context. A valid critique of exemplar studies are that they try to make practice seem generalizable that in fact is very bound in context. Thus, it seems as if the critical issue advocates of engagement need to help faculty with is less how to make “the” case or an exemplar case, and more how to make his/her individual case, which changes the focus from the important contributions of engagement overall and turns it toward the ways in which engagement is fostering learning, growth, and contribution in different parts of the faculty member’s work, enhancing student learning and sense of civic responsibility and positive outcomes in communities.

Here I think some of the most recent conventional wisdom on integration of engagement within the triad of teaching, research, and service and of attendance to different audiences and to different purposes is most wise. Rather than arguments that may sound overly altruistic and moralistic, or praise engagement for its importance in and of itself, cases for promotion and tenure and within broader reward systems should put questions and methods—including public issues, collaborations, pedagogies, and outcomes—at their center.

This type of case also involves taking into account the unique context of the institution at that point in time. It would also consider the currencies an individual is bringing to the institution through her or his work—which may come in things other than scholarly outcomes.

Perhaps one of the biggest challenges that civic engagement faces is resisting attempts to compromise the major priorities, process, and values of civic engagement either to institutionalize it within higher education institutions or for civically engaged faculty to secure more prestigious and secure positions. For example, many faculty engaged in the scholarship of engagement espouse values of collaboration, reciprocal relationships with community partners, and dissemination of outcomes to as broad an audience as possible, privileging those that reach interested citizens over academic audiences (O’Meara, 2008; Strand et al., 2003). Many engaged scholars have written of their primary interest in capacity building in citizens, eschewing the traditional technocratic role of expert for the facilitator and catalyst, the partner in activism to address common social environmental or educational problems (Boyte, 2004, 2008). Likewise, there is a political and activist agenda with regard to much engagement work. As Peter Levine (2008) notes, the best examples of

service-learning are “true collaborations among students, professors, and community members; they have a political dimension (that is, they organize people to tackle fundamental problems collectively)” (p. 21). Likewise, Butin (2006) argues that service-learning “embodies a liberal agenda under the guise of universalistic garb” (p. 485). Whether an individual engaged scholar agrees with this perspective or not, the point is that many engaged scholars may describe their work and operate with their colleagues in what Vogelgesang and Rhoads (2003) refer to as a “zone of indifference,” in order to minimize controversy related to their work in their institutions. Yet, there is something lost, in terms of both the visibility of the work and understanding of its goals, by not making its more progressive, activist dimensions public and holding the work accountable to those values.

What is lost? Perhaps the way to remake the system. Rhoades et al. (2008) point out that much of the literature on faculty of color and women points out obstacles confronting new entrants to the profession and chronicles challenges in a system that is structured in the interest of the dominant group. Likewise, O’Meara et al. (2008) observe a “narrative of constraint” in research on faculty in higher education and note that the focus on constraint at times obscures the contributions of faculty and opportunities for faculty growth. Furthermore, Rhoades et al. (2008) observe that advice for faculty of color and women often suggests how faculty members should “fit within existing incentive structures” (p. 215). They go on to note that “the advice is more about how to ‘make it’ than how to remake it” (p. 215).

This seems an apt description of where we are with promotion and tenure and reward systems for engaged scholars. We need to extend beyond helping engaged faculty make it within a system that was not developed with them or their work in mind, and instead help them over the next generation to remake it in their own image. This image will involve more public work, more open doors, more regard for collaboration, and more accountability to the public. And this is how we will remake promotion and tenure systems.

References

- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 582–602.
- Antonio, A., Astin, H., & Cress, C. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation’s faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373–397.
- Aquirre, A., Jr. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 27. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions*. ASHE-ERIC higher education research report, no. 10. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Using doctoral education to prepare faculty to work within Boyer’s four domains of scholarship. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards using Boyer’s four domains of scholarship* (pp. 51–65). New directions for institutional research, No. 129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363–391.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). The life cycle of academic management fads. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 1–16.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bland, C., Center, B., Finstad, D., Risbey, K., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89–123.
- Bloomgarden, A. (2008). *Prestige culture and community-based faculty support*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyte, H. C. (Ed.). (2004). *Going public: Academics and public life*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Boyte, H. C. (2008). Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students. *Change*, 40(3), 8–15.
- Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W. T., & Helland, P. A. (2006). Ideal and actual value patterns toward domains of scholarship in three types of colleges and universities. In *Analyzing faculty work and rewards using Boyer's four domains of scholarship* (pp. 67–76). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 273–290.
- Butin, D. W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 473–498.
- Callister, R., Hult, C., & Sullivan, K. (2006). Is there a global warming toward women in academia? *Liberal Education*, 91(3), 50–57.
- Campbell, C., Huang, B., & Stamps, L. (2008). *Report on the status of women faculty at the University of Maryland*. College Park: University of Maryland.
- Chait, R. (2002). *Why tenure? Why now? Questions of tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2008). Professional identity development theory and doctoral education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 113, 9–16.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Drago, R. (2005). Accept, avoid, resist. *Change*, 37(6), 10–17.
- Colbeck, C. L., O'Meara, K., & Austin, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professoriate*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Vol. 113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deming, W. E. (2000). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Making outreach visible: A workbook on documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2001). From maverick to mainstream: The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 6(2), 9–19.

- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*. Imagining America.
- Elman, S. E., & Smock, S. M. (1985). *Professional service and faculty rewards: Toward an integrated structure*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Erskine, W., & Spalter-Roth, R. (2005). Beyond the fear factor. *Change*, 37(6), 18–25.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993). *Teaching, research and faculty rewards*. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401–422.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Golde, C. (2008). Applying lessons from professional education to the preparation of the professoriate. In C. L. Colbeck, K. O'Meara, and A. Austin (Eds.), *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professoriate* (pp. 17–26). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4(1), 37–43.
- Huber, M. T. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. In C. L. Colbeck (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance* (pp. 17–26). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 114. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Huber, M. T. (2004). *Balancing acts: The scholarship of teaching and learning in academic careers*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations. New developments. *Change*, 31(5), 11–15.
- Jordan, C. (2007). *Practical tools for overcoming the challenges of advancing your career as a community-engaged scholar*. Available at <http://www.compact.org/wpcontent/uploads/2009/04/jordan-final1.pdf>.
- Levine, P. (2008). The landscape of higher education. In Brown, D. & Witte, D. (Eds.), *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey*. Dayton, OH: Kettering.
- Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (1997). Post-tenure review: Policies, practices, precautions, new pathways. In *Faculty careers and employment for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Morrison, E., Rudd, E., Nerad, M., & Picciano, J. (2007, November 8). *The more things change? Gender inequality in careers of recent social science Ph.D.s*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Louisville, KY.
- O'Meara, K. (1997). *Rewarding faculty professional service*. Working Paper No. 19. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE).

- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, 26, 57–80.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2003). Believing is seeing: The influence of beliefs and expectations on post tenure review in one state system. *Review of Higher Education*, 27(1), 17–44.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2004). Beliefs about post-tenure review: The influence of autonomy, collegiality, career stage, and institutional context. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 178–202.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2005a). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types. In K. A. O'Meara and R. E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 77–95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. (2005b). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 46(5), 479–510.
- O'Meara, K. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Have academic cultures really changed? In J. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship* (pp. 77–96). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. (2007, February). *Graduate education and civic engagement*. NERCHE Working Brief, No. 20, pp. 1–8.
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Graduate education and community engagement. In Colbeck, C. L., O'Meara, K., & Austin, A. (Eds.), *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professoriate*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Jaeger, A. (2007). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: History, barriers, facilitators, models and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11(4), 3–26.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Rice, R. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work-lives: A professional growth perspective*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 34 (3) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perna, L. W. (2001a). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(5), 541–567.
- Perna, L. W. (2001b). Sex differences in faculty salaries: A cohort analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 283–307.
- Perna, L. W. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contribution of family ties. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(3), 277–307.
- Rhoades, G., Kiyama, J. M., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 209–235.
- Rice, R. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). Can the tenure process be improved? In R. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure* (pp. 101–124). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New pathways, inquiry no. 7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rhoades, G., Kiyama, J. M., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 209–235.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285–309.

- Saltmarsh, J. (2004). Building bridges. In Boyte, H. (Ed.). *Going public: Academics and public life* (pp. 14–15). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Senge, P. S. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Sterett, S. (2008). *Speaking prose all Along? Public good research and teaching*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Trower, C. A. (2008, January 28). *Promoting interdisciplinarity: Aligning faculty rewards with curricular and institutional realities*. Presentation at the American Association of Colleges and Universities Annual Conference.
- Trower, C. A., & Bleak, J. L. (2004b). *Study of new scholars: Race: Statistical report [Universities]*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~newscholars/newscholars/downloads/racereport.pdf>.
- Trower, C. A., & Chait, R. (2002). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*, 104(4), 33–38.
- Umbach, P. D. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(3), 317–345.
- Valian, V. (2000). Schemas that explain behavior. In J. Glazer-Raymo, B. K. Townsend, and B. Ropers-Huilman (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (2nd ed., pp. 22–33). ASHE Reader Series. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Vogelgesang, L., & Rhoads, R. (2003). *Advancing a broad notion of public engagement: The limitations of contemporary service learning*. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://www.collegevalues.org/seereview.cfm?id=1017>.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education—A perilous passage?* ASHE-ERIC higher education report No. 28(3). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Williams, J. C., Alon, T., & Bornstein, S. (2006). Beyond the “Chilly Climate”: Eliminating bias against women. *Thought & Action*, 22, 79–96.
- Wood, M., & Johnsrud, L. K. (2005). Post-tenure review. What matters to faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 28(3), 393–420.

C: Standards for Promotion and the Award Of Tenure. For the award of tenure, Vanderbilt requires (1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one's discipline; (2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching; and (3) satisfactory performance in the area of service. From discipline to discipline, the form taken by a candidate's contributions will vary. To qualify for tenure, candidates must demonstrate a high overall level of teaching effectiveness, with appropriate weight given to performance in each of the various forms of teaching that are important to the respective programs of their departments or schools. Command of the subject, clarity in communication, and sensitivity to the needs of students are indispensable assets of effective teachers. Tenure and promotion requirements have changed over time: in the 1980s most university departments wanted to see excellence in at least one of research, teaching, or service (Gardner & Veliz, 2014), and then a shift occurred in which excellence in teaching and service was no longer sufficient to earn tenure (Youn & Price, 2009). Again, despite department chairs strongly valuing teaching towards tenure and promotion in some contexts, there remains little career advancement value in the service aspect of a faculty career. Many RPT guideline documents provide lists of research, teaching, and service requirements, but it appears "œsome bullet points are more equal than others" (p. 269; Macfarlane, 2007). Engaged Scholarship: Research/Scholarship/Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University-Community Engagement, University of South Florida, Report. http://www.coedu.usf.edu/main/CommunityEngagement/What_Is_CEScholarship.html. The University of South Florida (USF) Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University-Community Engagement issued this report to promote ways in which to align academic policy with the University's institutional commitment to community engagement. Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship (pp. 230-251). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.