Documenting Engagement: Faculty Perspectives on Self-Representation for Promotion and Tenure

Tami L. Moore, Kelly Ward

Abstract

The documentation of engaged scholarship is critical to aligning faculty work with promotion and tenure guidelines and meeting institutional goals. At a research university where the dossier for promotion and tenure needs to show clear evidence of contribution in the area of research, presenting and documenting work in the community in a way that reflects teaching, research, and service may represent a challenge for faculty. This article presents findings from an analysis of documents and artifacts representing how faculty present their work to their institutional and disciplinary colleagues.

Introduction

Recent discussions of the civic mission of higher education *(Checkoway 2001)* and the connection between universities and the public good *(Bridger and Alter 2006; Kezar et al. 2005)* call attention to the continuing interest at all levels of academia in connecting the university with the larger community it serves. In research universities specifically, realizing the civic mission of higher education calls for simultaneous attention to revamping university mission statements and to remaining cognizant of the culture of the research institution. It also calls for attention to faculty work because faculty are essential to carrying out community-based missions.

Some research institutions have restructured tenure and promotion guidelines following Boyer's *(1990)* reconsideration of scholarship, and others intentionally foster a culture of outreach and engagement in their institutions *(Bruns et al. 2003; Dana and Emihovich 2004/2005; Hyman et al. 2001/2002; Votruba 1996)*. However, many faculty still resist the rhetoric of civic responsibility in their scholarship because of a concern for "how it counts" or how community-engaged scholarship aligns with promotion and tenure guidelines within the context of the research imperative. To advance the realization of higher education's civic mission, faculty need to be made more aware of how to include public scholarship as part

of their research, teaching, and service activities. Faculty also need to be clear about how to present and document their community-based work in ways that are recognized and validated by promotion and tenure committees, and the committees themselves need to be responsive to expanded notions of faculty work *(Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997)*.

Much of the literature on community-engaged scholarship reflects service-learning and the teaching role *(Bringle and Hatcher 1995; Chadwick and Pawlowski 2007; Fox 1994; Harwood et al. 2005; Levine 1994; McKay and Rozee 2004; Pribbenow 2005)*; in reality, public scholarship is much broader than just curricular innovations and pedagogical tools *(Clark 1997; Colbeck 1998; Colbeck and Michael 2006; Ryan 1998; Ward 2003, 2005)*. Faculty work in the community is typically tied to disciplinary expertise and can fall in the realm of teaching, research, and/or public service.

Responding to concerns about the misalignment between the research imperative and community engagement, Ward *(2003)* argues for the integration of a community focus with traditional faculty roles. Traditionally, faculty members and administrators have viewed teaching, research, service, and community engagement as separate and competing responsibilities. Ward's integration model suggests that a focus on community engagement need not be an added responsibility; it can instead be viewed as a different way of approaching faculty work. For example, she describes one faculty member in literacy who involves her students in service-learning designed around tutoring participants in an adult literacy program. The researcher is working with the program's director on a research project that explores the experience of adult learners of a second language; some of the data gathered in this project is collected by the researcher as she engages in tutoring activities. These research projects, and other activities with a community-engaged focus, were included in the researcher's dossier submitted for her (successful) bid for promotion to full professor.

At a research university where the dossier for promotion and tenure needs to show clear evidence of contribution in the area of research, faculty may find it challenging to present and document work in the community as informed by both the research imperative and the rhetoric of engagement. In this article, we examine the representation of community-engaged scholarship as part of the review process at research universities. An extensive body of research offers faculty advice on documenting engagement as scholarship *(e.g., Driscoll and Lynton 1999; Driscoll et al. 2000; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997)*, yet how to use such documentation in the review

process is unclear. This study offers a more grassroots perspective on this topic. Rather than another set of criteria or guidelines for constructing portfolios of community-engaged scholarship, this article presents a description of what community-engaged faculty who have successfully earned tenure or promotion actually do to compile their dossiers and to communicate how their work in the community reflects the mission of research universities.

This article presents findings from an analysis of curriculum vitae, tenure and promotion narratives, and publications a selected group of faculty used to document their community-based work in ways that reflect an integrated scholarly agenda. These documents were used for evaluation in the promotion and tenure process. Two questions guided the analysis: How do faculty doing community-engaged scholarship document their work for the promotion and tenure process? What lessons can be learned from these dossiers about documenting community-engaged scholarship?

"What lessons can be learned from these dossiers about documenting community-engaged scholarship?"

We believe it is essential to learn about documentation practices related to community-engaged scholarship, given the importance of the review process to success as a faculty member. We build on the presentation and discussion of the findings and, in the final sections of the article, compare the dossiers studied with the extant literature on documenting engaged scholarship, looking for congruence and departure to help us understand why faculty are emphasizing some elements and ignoring others in the presentation of their work. Finally, we outline implications embedded in these discussions, concluding by identifying outstanding questions to be explored as the scholarship in this area continues to grow.

Methods

This article is based on an in-depth analysis of the documents of twenty-five researchers who integrate research, teaching, and service with a community orientation in the research university context. Each participant met the following criteria: primary assignment was a faculty appointment at a research university; included service-learning or experiential learning opportunities in their teaching; and conducted community-based research connected with their students' learning activities. Table 1 provides demographic information on participants.

Table 1. Demographic information by participant

Participant	Discipline	Rank
1**	Sociology	Professor
2***	Education	Professor
3***	Hospitality Business Mgmt	Associate Professor
4**	History	Professor
5****	Chemistry	Professor
6****	Bio/Ag Engineering	Associate Professor
7***	Architecture	Associate Professor
8**	Criminology	Associate Professor
9****	Bio/Ag Engineering	Professor
10***	Nursing	Associate Professor
11***	Landscape Architecture	Assistant Professor
12***	STEM Graduate Education	Senior Instructor
13***	Graphic Design	Associate Professor
14**	Conservation Social Sciences	Assistant Professor
15**	Psychology	Professor
16**	Asian American Studies	Professor
17***	Education	Professor
18***	Landscape Architecture	Associate Professor
19**	Communications	Distinguished Professor
20***	Law	Distinguished Professor
21*	Foreign Languages and Cultures	Assistant Professor
22*	Theater	Professor
23***	Education	Professor of the Practice
24*	English	Professor
25**	History	Professor

For the purposes of data analysis, participants were also grouped according to their general field of study:

*Humanities **Social Sciences ***Professional ****Sciences

Participants were identified using purposeful sampling *(Patton 1990)*. Initially, we constructed the research protocol to identify faculty in tenure-track positions with teaching and research responsibilities. We asked scholars recognized as leaders in the field of civic engagement to recommend colleagues around the country who were achieving the kind of integration we wanted to profile. In some instances, we contacted service-learning administrators and asked for their assistance in identifying faculty on their campuses who stood out in terms of their integration of research, teaching, and service. The participants identified through this method included six recipients of the Ernest A. Lynton Faculty Award for the Scholarship of Engagement and one person who has been recognized by Campus Compact with an Ehrlich Award.

Two other participants have received national recognition and formal awards in their discipline for their contribution to community-based research or service-learning. Two participants also hold endowed chairs on their campuses. We conducted semistructured interviews with each participant ranging from 90 to 180 minutes.[1] These interviews and the resulting findings are discussed in more detail elsewhere *(Moore and Lima 2007; Moore and Ward 2007a, 2007b; Ward and Moore 2007)*.

In addition to the interviews, participants shared current vitae, research statements, and references for scholarly publications reflecting an integrated and community-based scholarly agenda. These documents, which are the focus of this article, provided data for understanding how each participant articulates their integrated approach to engaged scholarship. Recognizing as Driscoll and Lynton *(1999)* did the importance of "making outreach visible," this article focuses exclusively on review and analysis of the documents and how faculty members represent and document their work in the community. The documents in the dossier explain the "whats and hows" of the faculty members' work and provide the opportunity to explain purpose, process, and outcomes *(Driscoll and Lynton 1999)*.

The data analysis proceeded in a three-stage process. First, we analyzed the verbatim interview transcripts and supporting documents using constant comparison techniques *(Glaser and Strauss 1967)* to identify common themes and to generate codes within and among transcripts and documents. Next, we created a narrative summary of the findings for each participant, using portraiture methodology *(Lightfoot and Hoffman-Davis 1997)*. Participants and researchers engaged in a reflexive dialogue process *(or "member checking," per Guba 1981; Lincoln and Guba 1985)* focused on this summary and the themes explored through the interview transcript and supporting documents. We then used codes generated from the transcripts and summaries to analyze data and generate themes. Finally, we returned to the documents and used a postmodern constant comparison method *(Shinew 2001; Shinew and Jones 2005)* that facilitated an examination of the structure of the documents and the discourse used to position community-engaged research, service, and teaching as scholarship in faculty dossiers. The following presentation of the findings discusses the common strategies and language or ideas used to articulate scholarly agendas that reflect a commitment to community engagement in the documents presented for promotion and tenure.

Findings

In this article, we focus on what we learned from analyzing the documents submitted by participants and how these faculty reflect their work in promotion and tenure dossiers. The findings suggest four approaches to the documentation of community-engaged scholarship: as part of their traditional roles of teaching, research, and service; as something that integrates and synergizes all of their roles; as a new and important kind of public work that they need to explain and document; and as a guide for the scholars and administrators who read and review the dossier.

As part of their traditional roles

In the interview portion of the study, many participants talked about their discipline, their institution, or their home department as an inhospitable climate for community-engaged scholarship *(Moore and Ward 2007b)*. Not surprisingly, these individuals have crafted curriculum vitae framed by the traditional faculty roles. They fit their community-engaged activities into these categories—the categories of faculty work that are easily recognized. Their vitae thus reflect the inherent nature of their work in the community, and also make connections between this work, their discipline, and the priorities of their institution. The key to reading the vitae is to look at the language used in describing seemingly traditional work to see how community-oriented work is reflected in the traditional roles of teaching, research, and service.

Research: Titles of the funded grant proposals, presentations, and publications pointed to a community-engaged platform for participants' scholarship. The CVs we reviewed included entries highlighting the connections between scholarly work and a commitment to a focus on community-based issues. For example, participants have published and presented on

- Research and development with students and communities
- Developing identities [in the community]
- Transforming public space
- Human dimensions . . . [and] property owners' visions
- A study of urban landscapes and a community-university collaborative

These publications appeared in a wide variety of venues, including the top peer-reviewed journals in their respective fields, law reviews,

edited volumes on issues in their discipline and on service-learning and the scholarship of engagement, and *Change* magazine.

Participants have received competitive grant funding from local, state, and national agencies for work described as

- A model for capacity building and . . . community development
- A multimedia project commemorating [community] history
- Case studies of [community] organizing

Perhaps the most successfully funded researcher in the group described her turn to community-engaged research as a relatively recent shift in her research agenda, beginning approximately ten years ago. Subsequently, she has received more than $2.4 million in funding from a combination of public and private funders to support the community-university collaboration developed by a community organization and a small team of faculty from the local university. These grants were both the operating funds for the local nonprofit organization and support for her ongoing research agenda. Participants in the study consciously used the documentation of research to represent their community work in familiar ways (e.g., grant proposals, publications).

Teaching: Some participants used the phrase *scholarship of teaching and learning* as a broad label for instructional activities emphasizing an interaction with the community in teaching. Whether these items are listed under research or teaching seems to vary according to the relative importance of teaching in the participant's discipline. A common approach was to differentiate between primarily instructional activities (service-learning courses, presentations/publications based on the experience of teaching these courses) and activities presented as part of the participant's research record: research-based publications, presentations, and research on service-learning reported as a pedagogical approach. So, for example, one participant explains that "publications pertaining to teaching are presented in this section [labeled Teaching]; publications pertaining to teaching research are presented in [the section labeled Research and Creative Activity]." She listed a book on service-learning in her discipline under teaching, and an article focusing on experiential education under research publications. The supervision of undergraduate research and independent study projects, activities that straddle the lines between teaching, mentoring (or service), and research, also appeared with other research activities.

Service: Ward *(2003)* delineates two large categories of service, internal and external. Internal service, in this paradigm, is service within the university to students, department, or campus-level entities. External service contributes to entities outside the institution, from disciplinary groups to community organizations. Scholars in this study defined service as synonymous with Ward's *(2003)* definition of internal activities, listing departmental and university committees and student advising in this category on their vitae. The external activities *(Ward 2003)* were more typically labeled "consultations" or "professional affiliations," both of which were subsumed under the traditional service heading. Professional affiliations included both disciplinary-specific societies and community-based organizations. The participants who identified their consultancies presented lists typically including clients that were primarily (if not exclusively) community-based organizations. Similarly, one participant featured in *Making Outreach Visible (Driscoll and Lynton 1999)* also listed her work on that project as a consultation, indicating the W. K. Kellogg Foundation's Peer Review of Professional Service Project as, in essence, her client.

The relative absence of narrative in the traditional curriculum vita limited the degree to which participants used this document to express the full impact of a community-engaged focus on their scholarship. For this reason, we collected additional documents including research narratives and publications, which allowed for a richer understanding of how scholars present community as a synergistic force for organizing their work beyond the silos of research, teaching, and service.

As something that integrates and synergizes

Although the study participants use the traditional categories of teaching, research, and service to present their work, they also see their scholarship as productively transcending traditional categories. Faculty members typically contextualize their work in the research narrative, as illustrated in the narrative of this conservation social scientist:

> The mission of a land grant university is often expressed as the production, preservation and transmission of knowledge. I believe that community-based service and learning, fully integrated with campus teaching and off-campus outreach, captures the synergy of each function and best serves the educational needs of the state and the region.

The documents reviewed for the study demonstrate that faculty members clearly saw their work in the community as reflective not just of service, but of teaching and of research as well.

A tenured history professor at a top twenty-five private research institution shared a manuscript reflecting on his experiences with community-engaged scholarship, which he discussed as the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL, as he refers to it). This piece lays out his skepticism about SOTL's chance for success at research universities; however, embedded in the article's critique of what he calls "intellectual schizophrenia," he also articulates a key message implied by many other participants in their materials:

> Research . . . is the coin of the realm, and the rewards for research at [research-intensive] institutions far outweigh the rewards dedicated to teaching. . . . Faculty must refuse to accept this teaching-research dichotomy and oppose the growing bipolarity in the academy. We must recognize that our writing and our teaching are mutually complementary activities, that they are two sides of the same coin.

Work in the community contextualized participants' research, and in turn fed their teaching. This symbiotic relationship was evident in one literacy expert's publication reporting research conducted through a community-university partnership. The authors described the context of their work as "a university and community partnership [which has] drawn professors, undergraduates and graduate students together with youth and children from the community to learn, play and create." A "calling card of this program," they explain, was the involvement of university students through a service-learning course. By highlighting this unique setting for the research, this participant and her coauthors documented the synergy that exists in community-engaged approaches to scholarship. As they said in their article, the "social space" created within community-university partnerships provides "important, even crucial, opportunities for working and learning across identity categories." Participants in the study repeatedly mentioned how their work in the community provides opportunities to integrate the different aspects of scholarly work.

As an important kind of public work

By assigning engagement activities to the category of external service, participants could more clearly connect their public work

to research and teaching. For example, the researcher who drew on her most current research findings on a public health issue in designing client service models and programming presented her work as a "translational research program." Community-engaged teaching, or service-learning, was frequently framed as "discipline-education research" (e.g., engineering education research) or positioned as a commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Individual participants made the choice of highlighting engagement as a link between teaching and service, or as research based on the mission and objectives of their institution. They then intentionally delineated these linkages in their research narratives, curriculum vitae, and publications. This approach to documentation clearly demonstrated the direct alignment of public scholarship with disciplinary focus and with all the recognized categories of faculty work, rather than relegating community-based work to the "service" category *(Fear and Sandmann 1995)*. Further, the work in the community is linked directly with the research university mission to provide public service.

Participants described the public service work they are doing using new categories within the more traditional divisions of faculty roles. Service became more multifaceted than Ward's *(2003)* simple dichotomy of internal and external activities. Instead, service emerged in these dossiers as a way to communicate the outcomes of research and teaching to an array of audiences. Participants used many different labels to classify their work, including

- Service publications
- Community presentations, workshops, showings, and recitals in service
- Service grants and contracts
- Professional development in service
- Service awards and honors
- Recent service to schools and communities
- External support for educational programs

Some participants added even more detailed categories to the discussion of their teaching, such as the engineer whose vita mentioned three distinct areas connecting community-based work and teaching: "new teaching methods," highlighting the use of service-learning; "research support for teaching," including grants focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning and civic engagement/

service-learning; and "local instructional activities," listing presentations on service-learning and engagement alongside talks to high school students and new faculty. One of the institutions represented in this study provides prescribed categories for promotion dossiers, including one labeled "New standing testing methods, new design of equipment, etc." One participant applied this category to her work with a community group to develop unique design models for community use. These distinctions within the traditional discussions of teaching, research, and service demonstrate the importance of new ways of thinking about faculty work.

Discussing this innovative kind of public work also evoked specific attention to, and even critique and deconstruction of, the research imperative. Beyond the above critique of the scholarship of teaching and learning, participants employed proactive language and argumentation intended to push the academy further toward real engagement with the communities it serves. In some instances, participants developed these ideas in their research narratives and promotion dossiers. For example, one participant addressed in his research narrative what he called the tensions inherent in balancing a "'both/and' proposition":

> In seeking promotion, I am both submitting my work for a determination of "celebrated excellence" in each of the three discrete areas of teaching, scholarship and service, and continuing to argue . . . that the compartmentalized nature of this traditional evaluation process is philosophically inappropriate and methodologically ineffective to represent the ways in which I fundamentally define and uphold my responsibilities as a faculty member at [this institution].

He continues by laying out what he calls the "contradictory and generative" nature of the multiple realities of a community-engaged scholar, linking his engagement to the mission statement of his institution: "I view these . . . realities as . . . reflecting my deep commitments to be part of [an] urban public university, both as it exists and as it becomes." Preparing intentional narratives requires what another participant calls "translator skills," the ability to communicate about new and innovative forms of scholarship using language that reflects the research imperative and its traditional definitions of research, teaching, and service. In this role of translator, the engaged scholar is also reshaping the culture of the institution.

Other scholars provided sample publications that take on the rhetoric of civic responsibility and engagement, offering critiques of this emerging commitment and suggestions based on their own experience as engaged scholars and experts in a particular discipline. For example, one faculty member used a national publication as a venue to reflect on her work with colleagues to establish a community partnership center at a major southern university and to offer recommendations and resources for other institutions interested in doing the same. A community psychologist, a historian, a chemist, and a nurse drew on community engagement as new methodology significant in what it can contribute either to advance or to critique the current research and practice in their fields. A rhetorician shared a book chapter that asked a pointed question: "Why have public research universities failed to implement engagement fully?" He concludes with a recommendation to administrators, trustees, and other educational leaders: "Rather than starting and becoming preoccupied with practical ways to solve those problems preventing engagement, work with and empower faculty to rethink the concept of scholarship and define its many natural venues."

As a guide for other scholars and administrators

The purpose of the tenure and promotion narrative is to highlight one's accomplishments in multiple faculty roles. Engaged scholars in the study also used this document overtly to guide the review and evaluation of the accomplishments and activities detailed in their curriculum vitae. As indicated above, participants saw themselves as translators. They sought to maintain a fine balance between describing their work and explaining it to others. In essence, the participants in this study have embraced the call to rethink scholarship, and they are using their dossiers to educate others in a new way of thinking and responding to faculty work.

The documents faculty submit as part of their review dossier can be powerful tools to make the connection between faculty work and institutional mission and goals. They are also stand-alone documents, meaning that individual reviewers will sometimes read a document without reference to other pieces in the dossier. For example, internal and external reviewers of dossiers often rely heavily on the curriculum vita and research narrative to evaluate candidates for tenure or promotion. These documents are vital to communicate the connections between scholarly and community work.

Despite the challenges faced in realizing the rhetoric of civic responsibility, engagement with the community remains an important feature of the rhetoric of higher education *(Morphew and Hartley 2006)*. The documents we analyzed suggest that more work is needed to link this commitment to the tenure and review process. In his closing keynote at the 2007 Outreach Scholarship Conference, Ron Cervero *(2007)* of the University of Georgia recommended specific strategy points for advancing outreach and engagement within higher education. Rather than lamenting the marginality of community-engaged activities, he calls for consistently and intentionally communicating the value of engaged scholarship, and connecting that engagement to the challenges and opportunities facing the university. These connections, he argues, are best made through stories of engagement. In our research, we see that tenure and promotion dossiers, and particularly research narratives, provide a place to tell these stories and also to link the engagement stories directly to the mission and goals of the institution and the discipline. The documents analyzed in this article point to the importance of guiding the reader as a means to strengthen the documentation of community-engaged scholarship and the viability of the candidate for promotion.

It is particularly important for faculty members under review to provide markers that shape the reader's (read: evaluator's) understanding of particular documents. The following passage provides a prime example of how a tenure candidate helped the reader navigate and understand the narrative statement:

> The following tenure narrative outlines my progress, contributions, and sensibilities as a teacher, researcher, and community member within the domains of the university, the city and my . . . professional fields.
>
> Although my work will be evaluated in separate categories of teaching, research, and service, I view my efforts in each area as affirming and informing the others. Guiding my work, however, are some consistent, cross-cutting themes described briefly below.

His use of specific language serves to guide the administrator or other reviewer reading the document: "Keeping in mind the tensions and choices [in balancing engagement and the research

imperative], I wish to . . . clarify how I hope my work will be considered in this review process."

One of the ways the faculty members in the study have successfully navigated promotion and tenure was by paying keen attention to the importance of definition, explication, and presentation of their work in the community. We learned several important lessons from studying and analyzing the research narratives of faculty, their curriculum vitae, and publications reflecting their public scholarship: clearly name the work and its connections to traditional categories as a way to bridge to new approaches; be intentional in describing and contextualizing the work; and take seriously the role of educator/translator/guide by specifying how the narrative and other materials are to be read. The fundamental message behind these lessons is clear: the documentation of the work is very important. An additional note on this point seems necessary at this juncture: Carefully constructed documentation will not cover for poorly executed research. The work itself must be solid, well-designed, and well-implemented. The participants in this study demonstrate that taking care in the documentation of strong scholarship can make a difference between community-engaged scholarship being dismissed as service or valued as a reflection of the research imperative.

Discussion

Initial contributions to the literature related to the scholarship of engagement overlooked the tensions between research and service *(Fear and Sandmann 1995)*. Early emphasis in the engagement movement was on describing how faculty could be involved in the community and not so much on a connection to scholarly work. Advancement of public service missions, however, called for the need to connect the traditional roles of faculty members with public service. Fairweather's *(1996)* work on the alignment between faculty work and the public trust addressed this by highlighting the need to align faculty reward structures with the civic responsibility of higher education. This realignment was, he argued, essential to realizing the call to engagement *(Boyer 1990; Rice 1996)*. Further, research related to documentation of expanded notions of scholarship, including community-based scholarship, calls for alignment between reward structures and faculty work that reflects the totality of institutional missions *(Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997)*. The rate and extent of realignment of reward structures with missions has been inconsistent across institutions of higher education. For faculty engaged in work that reflects expanded definitions of

scholarship, this yields uncertainty about how to negotiate reward structures and review processes. What we found in our research is that faculty are left to champion their own causes as engaged scholars within an institution or a particular discipline that tends to devalue community-engaged scholarship as service or teaching.

Our findings offer an interesting corollary to Fairweather's suggestions: Where reward structures are not changing, or change slowly, faculty can act proactively to position themselves and their work in a way that maintains integrity with their motivation and commitments, but also directly and persuasively connects their work to the standards of the research imperative. The documents presented for review are key to providing the translation between community-oriented work and what is traditionally rewarded with promotion and tenure at a research university (i.e., research). It is incumbent upon the candidate to interpret their work in the realms of the community in terms of its connection to disciplinary expertise, the research mission, and scholarship *(Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997)*.

The key element for administrators and colleagues assessing the documents in this study is recognition of multiple definitions of scholarship and multiple definitions of service. In *Scholarship Reconsidered* Boyer *(1990)* called for expanding definitions of scholarship to more fully reflect both the reality of faculty work and the complete mission of colleges and universities. The impetus for the book was, in part, concern that research universities, in particular, had adopted definitions of research so narrow that they stifled the application of faculty expertise to meeting societal needs, and inhibited universities' efforts toward meeting their missions in the areas of teaching, service, *and* research. Where a narrow definition of research prevails, teaching is undervalued and service is overlooked. Service tends to be reduced to committee work better avoided by faculty members who want to succeed at a research university. Expanded definitions of service recognize that service performed internally can support the institution (e.g., curriculum committees, student advising) and that service as faculty involvement in community-oriented work can support universities' public service mission. Ward *(2003)* differentiates between external and internal service to help faculty and administrators think broadly about the service aspect of faculty

"Where a narrow definition of research prevails, teaching is undervalued and service is overlooked."

work and see how it can be tied to the application of disciplinary expertise to diverse contexts.

The key element for faculty members is to present their work in ways that reflect the realities of the research university mission. A major finding in this study is that it is incumbent on the faculty member to document their work in ways that champion their own cause and that reflect the university mission. Campuses often tout public service missions, but the faculty review and reward process tends to reward and recognize traditional research. In spite of administrative-level rhetoric emphasizing the importance of the public service mission, reward structures remain largely unchanged. The faculty members in the study indicate that in such an environment, it is incumbent upon them to provide documents that clearly indicate how their community-based work is tied to their disciplinary expertise and how it meets the research imperative.

The research and advocacy of scholars and practitioners like Ernest Boyer *(1990, 1996)*, Ernest Lynton *(Lynton and Elman 1987; Driscoll and Lynton 1999)*, and Eugene Rice *(1996)* have done much to call for expanded definitions of scholarship, to define public service in ways that connect to scholarship, and to provide faculty members with ways to present and document their work. The calls for public service by Boyer, Lynton, Rice, and others have played a key role in providing administrators with rhetoric to guide thinking and organizational vision about what it means to be a multifaceted research university that provides public service. However, the same calls do not seem to be heard by the faculty members in the study. Unfortunately, we found that much of the great work that defines expanded scholarship and its documentation is unknown and/or underutilized by the study participants. Although a majority of the participants followed much of the documentation advice called for by Driscoll and Lynton *(1999)* and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff *(1997)*, they were unfamiliar with work in this area. Based on this finding, we recognize a disjuncture between research done *about* community-based scholarship and the presentation of research done *by* community-based scholars.

"When it comes to evaluation, how faculty represent their work lives is as important as the work they do."

We also recognize a disjuncture between administrative calls for public service and the realities of a promotion and tenure process that continues to focus on traditional research. The institutions

represented in the study remain largely unchanged in terms of how they reward faculty members, so study participants expend considerable effort translating their community-based work into the traditional triad of teaching, research, and service. Ongoing efforts to expand public service missions of colleges and universities need to face two realities head-on: community-based scholarship does not always "adorn itself in the traditional cap and gown" *(Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997, 38)*, and in spite of institutional calls for public service, the review process at research universities continues to advantage traditional research.

Implications

The findings from this study have implications for faculty members, administrators, and researchers working in the scholarship of engagement.

For faculty members

The findings provide ample evidence of the importance of the tenure or promotion dossier. When it comes to evaluation, how faculty represent their work lives is as important as the work they do. In the research university context, the traditional research artifacts associated with grant acquisition and peer-reviewed publications will continue to be rewarded. Work in the community that is tied to faculty expertise needs to be explained and interpreted in light of the university context and the research imperative. Effective documentation calls for clear links between work in the community and the faculty roles of teaching, research, and service. The research narrative, in particular, can provide the translation between what the faculty member does, how it is tied to disciplinary expertise, and how it supports the research imperative and the research mission of the university. Faculty engaged in the evaluation process can benefit from viewing sample dossiers of scholars involved in community-based work and resources related to expanded definitions of scholarship and documentation. These resources can help faculty members situate their work in ways that allow them to simultaneously describe their work in the community and its connection to their faculty role.

For administrators

The findings make clear a disconnect between administrative-level rhetoric espousing public service and the reality of department- and college-level evaluation of public service as perceived by faculty. The problem as we see it (with the help of the participants

in this study) is that community-based work, even when tied to traditional research, is often devalued by colleagues who use traditional notions of research as their guide. Administrators who evaluate faculty work by providing leadership in the revision of promotion and tenure protocols can support faculty efforts to meet public service missions *and* research missions. For instance, providing examples of community-based research in promotion and tenure guidelines would help validate work that is related to public service. Further, revising promotion and tenure guidelines to point more directly to different types community-based scholarship and service has the potential to encourage faculty to report the many aspects of their work in the community.

One of the findings from this research is that classifying community-based work in the categories of teaching, service, and research (with an emphasis on research) often leaves much faculty work in the community unreported. There was a tendency to not report community endeavors that did not fit neatly into the teaching, research, and service triad. There was also concern that evaluators would perceive a conflict between this type of public service and faculty efforts to accomplish research. Given the prevalence and importance of higher education and its faculty contributing to the public good, failure to report on public service activities that so clearly meet the public service mission but that cannot be directly tied to traditional research is a loss for the institution.

Another finding that has direct implications for administrators is that the faculty member is the key person to explain their scholarship. The individual faculty member's case for engaged scholarship would be improved and clarified by administrative support in translating public scholarship. Again, revising the promotion and tenure process would involve all faculty, not just the faculty under review, in knowing more about engaged scholarship and its outcomes and artifacts. Integration of nomenclature that supports community-based scholarship would take this educational responsibility off the shoulders of the faculty member preparing the dossier. Administrators can play a role in continuing to provide leadership for public service at the institutional and faculty levels by supporting revision of promotion and tenure protocols.

For scholars researching engagement

There is a disconnection between research and faculty work in higher education engagement and more widespread faculty practice. In short, the findings of very important research and scholarly practice related to community engagement are not reaching

the campus and faculty level. Researchers working in engagement could help remedy this disconnect by publishing their work in multiple types of venues, including those with a disciplinary focus or a particular administrative audience. For example, an article in *The Department Chair* newsletter would help to get information about reward structures and faculty work in front of the department chairs that help guide the process for their faculty. An article about documenting engaged scholarship in the *American Agricultural Economics Association Newsletter* that directly addresses how to present public work in the agricultural economics context is more likely to reach scholars in that field than an article published for other researchers of community engagement. In essence, researchers in fields like higher education that do empirical work related to engagement need to think about presenting their work not only in traditional academic venues to meet the research imperative but also in broader venues to expand awareness of engagement and address the public service imperative.

"As faculty involvement in community-based scholarship continues to grow and evolve, contributions to ongoing research in this area become increasingly important."

As faculty involvement in community-based scholarship continues to grow and evolve, contributions to ongoing research in this area become increasingly important. The findings from this study also point scholars to additional questions that have yet to be addressed by research in engagement. For example: How might findings differ with data from faculty at other institution types? What role does mission play in documentation of faculty work at nonresearch universities? Do faculty at institutions with teaching missions (e.g., community colleges and liberal arts colleges) focus more on service-learning in their documentation? Also, how does employment at private versus public institutions affect such findings? Would the findings be different if the participants in this study had not been promoted based on their record of engaged scholarship? How would findings differ for faculty at institutions that have undergone significant work on their public service missions and faculty at institutions that have not? Responses to these and other questions can continue to guide research in community-based scholarship and can also contribute to ongoing understanding of faculty work, how it is documented, and how it is rewarded.

What community-engaged faculty do as scholars is critical to realizing the civic mission and to changing the culture of higher education institutions. The discourses of faculty work and civic engagement need to parallel one another, and work toward the common goal of higher education contributing to the public good. The next step in institutionalizing civic responsibility and in recognizing and rewarding engaged scholarship is more effective communication about what faculty do in the community, how they utilize disciplinary knowledge, and how they address the research imperative. The dossier proves to be an important venue for advancing these conversations, and this study demonstrates the importance of taking care to craft the materials accordingly by addressing both the faithful supporters and the critics of civic engagement.

Endnote

1. Interview transcripts are on file with Tami L. Moore, Oklahoma State University–Tulsa.

References

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.

Bridger, J. C., and T. R. Alter. 2006. The engaged university, community development, and public scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 11 (1): 163–78.

Bringle, R. G., and J. A. Hatcher. 1995. A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2:112–22.

Bruns, K. A., N. Conklin, M. Wright, D. Hoover, B. Brace, G. Wise, F. Pendleton, M. Dann, M. Martin, and J. Chambers. 2003. Scholarship: The key to creating change through outreach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 8 (1): 3–10.

Cervero, R. 2007. Why outreach matters: Mission, money, and strategy. Keynote address delivered at the Outreach Scholarship Conference, Madison, WI, October.

Chadwick, S. A., and D. R. Pawlowski. 2007. Assessing institutional support for service-learning: A case study of organizational sense-making. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 13 (2): 31–39.

Checkoway, B. 2001. Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education* 72 (2): 125–47.

Clark, B. R. 1997. The modern integration of research activities with teaching and learning. *Journal of Higher Education* 68 (3): 241–55.

Colbeck, C. 1998. Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *The Journal of Higher Education* 69: 647–71.

Colbeck, C. L., and P. W. Michael. 2006. The public scholarship: Reintegrating Boyer's four domains. *New Directions for Institutional Research* 129 (Spring): 7–19.

Dana, N. F., and C. Emihovich. 2004/2005. Actualizing a culture of engaged scholarship in the College of Education at the University of Florida. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 10 (1): 29–46.

Driscoll, A., and E. A. Lynton. 1999. *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Driscoll, A., L. Sandmann, P. Foster-Fishman, and R. A. Bringle. 2000. Documenting the scholarship of engagement and practice: Advancing rewards for professional service and outreach. Paper presented at the Eighth AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, New Orleans, LA, February.

Fairweather, J. S. 1996. *Faculty work and the public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Fear, F. A., and L. R. Sandmann. 1995. Unpacking the service category: Reconceptualizing university outreach for the 21st century. *Continuing Higher Education Review* 59 (3): 110–22.

Fox, H. 1994. Teaching empowerment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1 (1): 55–61.

Glaser, B. G., and A. L. Strauss. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glassick, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Guba, E. 1981. Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Development* 29 (2): 75–91.

Harwood, A. M., L. Och, D. Currier, S. Duke, J. Hammond, L. Moulds, K. Stout, and C. Werder. 2005. Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining service-learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 12 (1): 41–51.

Hyman, D., E. Gurgevich, T. Alter, J. Ayers, E. Cash, D, Fahnline, D. Gold, R. Herrmann, P. Jurs, D. Roth, J. Swisher, M. S. Whittington, and H. Wright. 2001/2002. Beyond Boyer: The UniSCOPE model of scholarship for the 21st century. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 7 (1 & 2): 41–65.

Kezar, A. J., T. C. Chambers, J. C. Burkhardt, and Associates, eds. 2005. *Higher education for the public good*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Levine, M. A. 1994. Seven steps to getting faculty involved in service learning: How a traditional faculty member came to teach a course on "Voluntarism, Community, and Citizenship." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1 (1): 110–14.

Lightfoot, S. L., and J. Hoffman-Davis. 1997. *The art and science of portraiture.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lynton, E. A., and S. E. Elman. 1987. *New priorities for the university: Meeting society's needs for applied knowledge and competent individuals.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McKay, V. C., and P. D. Rozee. 2004. Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10 (2): 1–33.

Moore, T. L., and M. Lima. 2007. *Increasing faculty involvement in civic engagement.* Paper presented at the Gulf South Summit on Civic Engagement, New Orleans, LA, March 13–15.

Moore, T. L., and K. A. Ward. 2007a. *Beyond exemplars and best practices: Reframing the discussion of community-engaged faculty.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Louisville, KY, November 7–10.

Moore, T. L., and K. A. Ward. 2007b. Faculty at work as teachers, scholars and citizens: Managing integration and complexity. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 9–13.

Morphew, C. C., and M. Hartley. 2006. Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *Journal of Higher Education* 77 (3): 456–71.

Patton, M. Q. 1990. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pribbenow, D. A. 2005. The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 11 (2): 25–38.

Rice, R. E. 1996. *Making a place for the new American scholar.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Ryan, J. H. 1998. Creating an outreach culture. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 3 (2): 29–36.

Shinew, D. 2001. Disrupt, transgress, and invent possibilities. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 29 (3): 488–516.

Shinew, D. M., and D. T. Jones. 2005. Girl talk: Adolescent girls' perceptions of leadership. In *Geographies of girlhood: Identities in-between*, ed. P. J. Bettis and N. Adams, 55–67. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Votruba, J. C. 1996. Strengthening the university's alignment with society: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 29–36.

Ward, K. A. 2003. *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, K. A. 2005. Rethinking faculty roles and rewards for the public good. In *Higher education for the public good,* eds. A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, J. C. Burkhardt, and Associates, 217–34. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ward, K. A., and T. L. Moore. 2007. Faculty at work: The practice of engaged scholarship. Workshop presented in the Engaged Scholar Series at the National Center for the Study of University of Engagement, East Lansing, MI, March 22.

About the Authors

- Tami L. Moore is assistant professor of higher education in the Educational Leadership program at Oklahoma State University–Tulsa. Her research explores the role of the university and its faculty in society, employing social and critical theory in the reading of community engagement.
- Kelly Ward is associate professor of higher education at Washington State University in Pullman. Dr. Ward's research is focused on faculty life. She studies work and family concerns for faculty, and faculty roles, including the development of a service ethic among faculty. She is author of the ASHE Higher Education Report Series monograph *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*.