

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Imagining America

Scholarship in Action

11-2008

Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University

Julie Ellison
University of Michigan

Timothy K. Eatman
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/ia>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ellison, Julie and Eatman, Timothy K., "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University" (2008). *Imagining America*. 16.

<https://surface.syr.edu/ia/16>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarship in Action at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Imagining America by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.



Scholarship in Public: **Knowledge Creation and** **Tenure Policy in the** **Engaged University**

**A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts,
Humanities, and Design**

Julie Ellison

and

Timothy K. Eatman

Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life
Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship

2008

TENURE TEAM INITIATIVE MEMBERS

Tenure Team

Thomas Bender, Professor of History, University Professor of the Humanities, and Director of the International Center for Advanced Studies, New York University

Craig Calhoun, University Professor of Social Science, New York University; President of the Social Science Research Council

Mary Schmidt Campbell, Dean of the Tisch School of the Arts, New York University; Chair, NY State Council on the Arts

Carol Christ, President, Smith College

Gail Dubrow, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost, University of Minnesota

Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Director of the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania

Judith Russi Kirshner, Dean of the College of Architecture and the Arts, University of Illinois at Chicago

Nicholas Lemann, Dean of Journalism and Henry R. Luce Professor, Columbia University

Earl Lewis, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Emory University

Devorah Lieberman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Wagner University

Ellen McCulloch-Lovell, President, Marlboro College

Judith Ramaley, President, Winona State University

R. Eugene Rice, Senior Scholar at the Association of American Colleges and Universities

George Sanchez, Professor of History, American Studies and Ethnicity, and Director of the Center for American Studies and Ethnicity, University of Southern California

Carol Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

David Scobey, Director and Professor of the Harvard Center for Community Partnerships, Bates College

Orlando Taylor, Dean of the Graduate School, Vice Provost for Research, and Professor in the School of Communications, Howard University

Christopher Waterman, Dean of the School of Arts and Architecture and Professor of Culture and Performance, UCLA

Robert Weisbuch, President, Drew University

Consulting Scholars and Artists

Alberta Arthurs, Principal, Arthurs.US; former Director for Arts and Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation, New York

Jan Cohen-Cruz, University Professor and Director of Imagining America, Syracuse University

Diane Douglas, Executive Director, CityClub, Seattle WA

Hiram Fitzgerald, Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, Michigan State University

Gladstone Hutchinson, Professor of Economics and Business, Lafayette College

Julia Reinhard-Lupton, Director, Humanities Out There, University of California-Irvine

Clement Price, Director, Institute of Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience, Rutgers-Newark

Sarah Robbins, Professor of English and Education, Director of Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project, and Director of Keeping and Creating American Communities Project, Kennesaw State University

Lawrence Rothfield, Director, Center for Cultural Policy, University of Chicago

John Saltmarsh, Director, New England Resource Center for Higher Education, University of Massachusetts, Boston

David Thelen, Distinguished Professor of History, Indiana University, Bloomington

Nancy Uscher, Provost, California Institute of the Arts

Kathleen Woodward, Director, Simpson Center for the Humanities, University of Washington

CONTENTS

TENURE TEAM MEMBERSINSIDE FRONT COVER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... ii

FOREWORDiii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... iv

EXAMPLES OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE ARTS,
HUMANITIES, AND DESIGN vi

OVERVIEW: KNOWLEDGE CREATION AND CIVIC AGENCY viii

RECOMMENDATIONS..... 1

PART ONE: A CONTINUUM OF SCHOLARSHIP..... 5

PART TWO: THE COURSE OF A CAREER: A CONTINUUM OF
PROFESSIONAL CHOICES 16

TABLE: PATHWAYS FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AT
FIVE CAREER STAGES 21

CAREER COURSE NARRATIVES FROM THE TTI INTERVIEWS..... 22

PART THREE: CHANGING THE CULTURE:
A CONTINUUM OF ACTIONS 24

RESOURCES, REFERENCES, AND METHODOLOGY 33

ABOUT THE AUTHORS 41

IA MEMBER INSTITUTIONS..... 42

To cite the TTI Report, please use the format below:

Ellison, J., and T. K. Eatman. 2008. *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to begin by recognizing the extraordinary contributions of the Tenure Team itself. During lengthy structured interviews with Tim Eatman, these individuals thought aloud in response to a series of probing questions about public engagement and faculty work. They gave us, in the process, their convictions about democracy, their theories of knowledge, and, best of all, their stories.

The national co-chairs of the Tenure Team Initiative, Chancellor and President Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University and President Steven Lavine of the California Institute of the Arts, have been wonderful leaders and partners, shaping not only the broad goals of the Initiative, but also its most practical manifestations. Jan Cohen-Cruz, the director of Imagining America, brought the force of her discernment, the weight of her own deep experience, and the lift of her good cheer to this project. Her confidence carried us through. Imagining America is lucky to have David Scobey as its board chair. His idioms and wisdom pervade this report. Kal Alston, Associate Provost at Syracuse University, has also served as a true intellectual partner and collaborator with us on the development of this report even as she leads that institution's charge to clarify and implement the reward structures that will support the University's vision of Scholarship in Action. Along with Chancellor Cantor, Vice Chancellor Eric Spina, and academic leadership across the campus, she has focused faculty attention on engaged public scholarship and leveraged material support for the Tenure Team project at Syracuse.

This report has benefited from numerous collaborations and consultations. An informal think tank grew up around this document and the background study that preceded it. This group included our "72-hour readers," to whom we owe particular thanks, and other colleagues whose comments were invaluable: Harry Boyte, Margaret Dewar, Amy Driscoll, Hiram Fitzgerald, Sylvia Gale, Devorah Lieberman, Ira Harkavy, Sarah Robbins, Judith Russi Kirshner, John Saltmarsh, Lorilee Sandmann, Tim Stanton, and Kathleen Woodward. The staff of Imagining America, including the Ann Arbor Team (Heather Dornoff, Stacey Brown, and Brittany Mullins) and then the Syracuse Team (Juliet Feibel, Robin Goettel, Jamie Haft, and Alyssa LoPresti), was responsive to every query, strategic or tactical. The two years of research that went into the report left us indebted to a stellar group of research assistants: Andrea Jenkins, Emily Squires, Liz Hudson, Dan Merson, and Nilay Yildirim.

We are grateful to Julie Plaut for bringing Campus Compact into collaboration with us around the TTI. Campus Compact is generously supporting the June 2008 working conference and will continue to work with us on the implementation phase following that convening.

Finally, we thank our spouses, Janet Eatman and Mark Creekmore. They supported us as we commuted between Ann Arbor and Syracuse. Both of them work at the meeting places of universities and communities; they were among our most important interlocutors.

FOREWORD

Chancellor and President Nancy Cantor, Syracuse University, and President Steven Lavine, California Institute of the Arts

As national co-chairs, we are pleased to provide leadership for the IA Tenure Team. There are two good reasons why a national project should address tenure as a public matter, important to our culture.

- Policies that encourage public scholarship can make alliances between universities and other knowledge-creating institutions more deliberate and useful.
- Campus-community partnerships in the arts and humanities should be excellent; therefore, they need to be examined and evaluated.

As university presidents and chancellors, we say we want creative scholars who are also committed to the public good. So how can we create environments that attract them? Their ranks frequently include faculty of color and women in underrepresented fields—just the kind we'd like to have. So how can we steer them away from the revolving door of recruitment without retention? Many faculty members experience a frustrating clash between their intellectual goals, which include pursuing community-based scholarship and art-making, and institutional tenure policies.

To draw and keep such talent, and to encourage top-notch scholarship that contributes to the public good, we need to look hard at the culture of the academic workplace, including the places and spaces in which we do our best work today. The range of scholarly products has expanded, as have the pathways for dissemination. If we care about higher education's engagement with its communities, the local impact—as well as the national and international implications of faculty work—must be recognized. And, if we truly want to encourage the integration of teaching and action research, we must reward it at tenure time.

We have worked hard, as presidents, to support public scholarship and collaborative community-based arts practice. However, even as American higher education recovers its traditions of public practice, we are not yet always comfortable extending them to our newest faculty. Even such normally sympathetic fields as policy studies and social sciences more often tend to discourage junior faculty members from collaborative work that is interdisciplinary and publicly engaged. How many times have we heard, "You'd better wait until you get tenure before you do that"? We brag about the fabulous work of our engaged faculty—but can we get them promoted?

Significant numbers of faculty believe that public scholarship and creative work are driving vital new areas in the humanities and arts. Scholars and artists have worked across campus-community boundaries on multi-disciplinary explorations of citizenship and patriotism, ethnicity and language, space and place, and the cultural dimensions of health and religion.

As presidents, we have institutional reasons to consider this work critical. We believe that diversity, civic passion, and excellence go together and that institutional excellence inheres in the people who are exchanging ideas and doing the work. To attract and keep a diverse faculty, we need flexible but clear guidelines for recognizing and rewarding public scholarship and artistic production.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Motives

The Imagining America Tenure Team Initiative (TTI) was inspired by faculty members who want to do public scholarship and live to tell the tale.

Publicly engaged academic work is taking hold in American colleges and universities, part of a larger trend toward civic professionalism in many spheres. But tenure and promotion policies lag behind public scholarly and creative work and discourage faculty from doing it. Disturbingly, our interviews revealed a strong sense that pursuing academic public engagement is viewed as an unorthodox and risky early career option for faculty of color.

We propose concrete ways to remove obstacles to academic work carried out for and/or with the public by giving such work full standing as scholarship, research, or artistic creation. While we recommend a number of ways to alter the wording and intent of tenure and promotion policies, changing the rules is not enough. Enlarging the conception of who counts as “peer” and what counts as “publication” is part of something bigger: the democratization of knowledge on and off campus.

We want this report to serve as a toolkit for faculty, staff, and students who are eager to change the culture surrounding promotion and tenure. It offers strategies that they can use to create enabling settings for doing and reviewing intellectually rigorous public work.

History

In her role as co-chair of the TTI, Chancellor and President Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University announced the launch of the Tenure Team Initiative at the IA conference held at Rutgers in October, 2005, responding to urgings from member colleges and universities. Over a two-year period, we surveyed the growing literature on this topic, conducted original research, presented and sought feedback at numerous conferences, and published a substantive background study, available on IA’s web site.

These activities led us to formulate a set of core questions that we posed to members of the Tenure Team in a series of structured interviews conducted by co-investigator Tim Eatman, resulting in over 400 pages of coded, searchable transcripts. This report conveys the priorities and foregrounds the voices of these seasoned, eloquent leaders.

Publicly engaged academic work is scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member’s academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value.

Changing Careers and Cultures

In the first section of the report, after defining publicly engaged academic work, we locate it in a continuum of scholarship. The logic of the continuum organizes four domains and the recommendations pertaining to each of them:

- a continuum of scholarship gives public engagement full and equal standing;
- a continuum of scholarly and creative artifacts includes those produced about, for, and with specific publics and communities;
- a continuum of professional choices for faculty enables them to map pathways to public creative and scholarly work; and
- a continuum of actions aimed at creating a more flexible framework for valuing and evaluating academic public engagement.

In the two sections that follow, the report focuses on the individual faculty career over time and on institutional change.

Audiences and Allies

We address multiple sets of readers, all of them necessary to a robust campus coalition aiming to nourish a responsive environment for public work: association leaders who are essential to the coordinated efforts of campus networks; top university leaders such as presidents and provosts; leaders on the “middle ground”—department chairs, center and program directors, and deans; and engaged faculty and students.

Why are we so interested in chairs, deans, and directors? Departments, and the units with which they interact, are where tensions arise about the value of publicly engaged scholarship at the point of promotion or tenure. They are where all the work of promotion gets done and where the potential for real change is greatest. We are reaching out to department chairs in this report because they have been overlooked as key partners in public scholarship.

Now What?

In June 2008, at a working conference in New York City, representatives of IA member institutions that are rethinking tenure and promotion policies will work with other national leaders to select the most promising pathways to “climate change” on campus. IA’s national conference in Fall 2008 will include activities for several different constituencies. Regional conferences in 2008-2009, in association with Campus Compact, will encourage intercampus collaborations that are not only supportive but also convenient. But without waiting for any of these things to happen, readers of this document can “take it home” and act on it. We invite you to form an implementation group and use this report to start the discussion. Let us know what happens. Send reflections to imaginingamerica@syr.edu, and we’ll be sure to respond.

Summary Recommendations

1. Define public scholarly and creative work.
2. Develop policy based on a continuum of scholarship.
3. Recognize the excellence of work that connects domains of knowledge.
4. Expand what counts.
5. Document what counts.
6. Present what counts: use portfolios.
7. Expand who counts: Broaden the community of peer review.
8. Support publicly engaged graduate students and junior faculty.
9. Build in flexibility at the point of hire.
10. Promote public scholars to full professor.
11. Organize the department for policy change.
12. Take this report home and use it to start something.

EXAMPLES OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND DESIGN

Public History of Slavery: An international symposium on the subject complemented the publication of James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton, eds., *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*. Lonnie Bunch, former president of the Chicago Historical Society, director of the Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture, and co-editor of a publication series on the New Public Scholarship, keynoted that symposium. Regional sites of such work include the Harriet Wilson Project in New Hampshire, a community-based organization that collaborates with the Center for New England Culture at the University of New Hampshire. At Brown University, Professor James Campbell, at the instigation of President Ruth Simmons, led the Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice in a research project on the university as a “site of conscience” inseparable from its city and region, leading to the production of rich documentary and curricular resources.

Theater: New WORLD Theater (NWT) was founded in 1979 by Roberta Uno, then a faculty member at U-Mass Amherst. In 1995, NWT began a commitment to Southeast Asian, Latino, and Black youth in geographically segregated areas of Western Massachusetts. Project 2050, based on “the projected demographic shift when Caucasians will become a minority in the U.S.,” links youth, professional artists, and scholars in a series of collaborations dedicated to “imagining the near future.” NWT was also the site of “New Works for a New World,” an international performance development initiative. “In the practical work” of NWT, Uno writes, “the domestic and global have existed simultaneously.” This strand of NWT’s work led to Uno’s book, *The Color of Theater*. She is now a program officer at the Ford Foundation.

Arts and Civic Dialogue: Seeking to explore “who has voice and authority in critical writing about civically engaged art,” the Animating Democracy Initiative funded the participation of writers in three “arts and civic dialogue” projects, assigning three writers per project. The writers were familiar with civic engagement, community cultural development, and nonprofit arts organizations. The group included university-based scholars, such as John Kuo Wei Tchen and Renato Rosaldo, as well as nonacademic writers. The writers interacted with the creative teams during the development of the project and responded to the final production. The essays that resulted, with responses from the arts organizations and from community collaborators, have been published by ADI as *Critical Perspectives: Writings on Art and Civic Dialogue*, which has been used in a number of college classes.

Urban Design, Historic Preservation, and Community Development: Professor Dolores Hayden authored *Power of Place*, a book on the theory and practice of an organization that linked faculty and graduate students with municipal and community organizations in order to recover and make visible the history of women of color in Los Angeles. *Sento at Sixth and Main* is the product of a long-term historical preservation project of the University of Washington’s Preservation, Planning, and Design Program. It was co-authored by Gail Dubrow, a faculty member, and Donna Graves, a writer and planner, in collaboration with designer Karen Cheng. *Sento* documents the buildings and artifacts of the early Japanese experience in the U.S. The Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative is a university-community partnership that uses architectural heritage as a community development tool. The project engages students in courses at the University of Illinois at Chicago and at other campuses. North Lawndale is the focus of a major design competition, “Defining the Urban Neighborhood in the 21st Century.” The awardee receives a one-year residency at the American Academy of Rome. Winning design work is displayed as a part of major exhibits and disseminated through the publication of *Greystone Guidebooks*.

Teachers as Public Scholars: Sarah Robbins, of Kennesaw State University, led the Keeping and Creating American Communities Project, based at the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project (part of the National Writing Project Network). This multi-year project, supported by the NEH, developed a theoretical and critical framework for community-engaged research and teaching. K-12 teachers became public scholars of their own regions. The teachers then developed curricular modules that enabled their students to undertake local investigations that benefited the community. Two books—one composed of critical essays, the other of teaching models—resulted from this project.

Visual Arts: SPARC (Social and Public Art Resource Center), founded by Judy Baca in 1976, has produced highly participatory public art projects of historic dimensions, including the “Great Wall” of Los Angeles. It has generated new curricula at UCLA and Cal State Monterey Bay, as well as numerous publications and documentaries. In Michigan, at the forefront of a growing movement in prison arts work, the Prison Creative Arts Project (PCAP) founded at the University of Michigan in 1990 is led by Professors Buzz Alexander and Janie Paul. Through a course in the U-M Department of English, PCAP supports creative writing, theater, and visual arts workshops. Alexander’s book on PCAP is under contract with the University of Michigan Press and he is a recent recipient of the Carnegie Foundation’s Professor of the Year award. PCAP serves over thirty correctional institutions in Michigan and mounts an annual Prison Art Exhibition that is videotaped and shared with each contributing prison artist. Paul, as Director of Community Connections for the School of Art and Design, oversees the School’s new engagement requirement and curates the PCAP exhibit.

Humanities Education: The Free Minds Project in Austin is supported by the University of Texas Institute for the Humanities, Austin Community College, Skillpoint Alliance, and Foundation Communities, an affordable housing organization. Free Minds is part of the national network of Clemente Course programs offering a college-level humanities curriculum for low-income adults. Free Minds was led by doctoral student Sylvia Gale. As a result of this and other collaborations, Gale and UT Humanities Institute director Evan Carton co-authored “Toward the Practice of the Humanities” and launched an on-campus sabbatical program for community fellows. Gale is writing her dissertation on the history of vocational education and the humanities in the U.S. She was the first director of IA’s PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) program.

Museum-Based Community History: The Harward Center for Community Partnerships at Bates College supports projects that are integrative of pedagogy, scholarship, and public work. One such collaboratory is a partnership, now four years old, with Museum L-A, a local museum of work and industrial community in Lewiston-Auburn, Maine. Four Bates faculty oversaw the collection of more than one hundred oral histories of millworker elders. The partnership moved on to archival historical research and exhibition development, leading to two new exhibitions: “Portraits and Voices,” a collection of photographic portraits and oral histories, and “Weaving a Millworkers’ World,” a traveling social history exhibit. Through undergraduate research opportunities, Bates students contributed to these exhibits; one went on to join the Museum L-A staff as a curator. Bates faculty and staff serve on the museum board and Exhibit Committee. Professor David Scobey has written on the implications of the project for faculty scholarly work in “Making Use of All Our Faculties: Public Scholarship and the Future of Campus Compact.”

OVERVIEW: KNOWLEDGE CREATION AND CIVIC AGENCY

How many times have we heard, “You’d better wait until you get tenure before you do that”? We brag about the fabulous work of our engaged faculty—but can we get them promoted?

Cantor and Lavine

This report was inspired by faculty members who want to do publicly engaged academic work and live to tell the tale. It is also for and about their colleges and communities. This report offers an approach to tenure that knits together the career of the publicly engaged humanist or artist, the cultures of department and campus, and the realities of community partnerships. Part of the report focuses on the individual faculty career over time, and part deals with institutional change.

The goal of Imagining America’s Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship is to help institutional leaders, and faculty themselves, to understand and value public scholarship in the cultural disciplines. Evaluating the work of civically engaged scholars in the humanities, arts, and design is a challenge. We have surveyed a large body of knowledge on this topic, conducted original research, and published a substantive background study. These led us to formulate a set of core questions that we posed to members of the Tenure Team in a series of structured interviews, conducted by Tim Eatman. Our investigations took us from thinking aloud to pushing an agenda.

Civic Agency and the Scholarly Continuum

Civic agency is fundamental to the kind of public and community-based inquiry that we are addressing here and in all of Imagining America’s programs. Our recommendations are organized around the idea of a continuum of knowledge and knowledge-making practices.

We place our work on the Tenure Team Initiative in the context of the larger civic engagement movement in higher education. The principle of civic agency underlies broad efforts for educational change seeking to “empower students and other citizens in the work of democracy,” as Harry Boyte argues in a recent essay. The agency of civic professionals on campus is crucial to our understanding of publicly engaged academic work and how institutional cultures can change in response to it. How can we enliven a negotiated, pluralistic commons for public cultural work? Recent theorists of agency describe it as the “navigational capacities to negotiate and to transform a world that is understood to be fluid and open.” As our table of professional pathways to engagement shows, we take the metaphor of wayfinding seriously. Boyte points to a shift from “equality of opportunity” to “equality of agency,” a movement away from a model of expert intervention toward one of “experts on tap, not on top” (forthcoming). Emphasizing agency shapes our view of how faculty learn, change, and change their institutions and professions. We value the self-organizing strategies of coalitions and working groups of publicly engaged faculty, students, administrators, and staff in dialogue with off-campus collaborators and allies. We believe that faculty who are eager to join the work of the imagination to the work of democracy are best served by a diversity of thoughtful voices, practical policy tools, and scenarios that support their “collective capacities to act.” In this way, we encourage the users of this report to build enabling environments for public work.

Craig Calhoun, a Tenure Team member and President of the Social Science Research Council, sees a change in the zeitgeist, revealed in

the sense of making things, this excitement around making and building institutions, rather than only commenting on the institutions. You have a lot of the smartest young people trying to build something, and I think that carries over to academia, where people are saying, “I want to do that. I want to create.”

We have tried to translate these large civic ideas, and “the sense of making things” that animates them, into the practical question of how to remove obstacles to publicly engaged scholarship and creative work by university faculty. We propose the continuum—a word that just kept coming up in the interviews—as a practical model for increasing the chances that the concrete processes of tenure and promotion can respond appropriately to knowledge creation for the public good.

Our interview with Devorah Lieberman, Provost of Wagner College, offers a real-world example of how this can work. Change at Wagner occurred through the “long, long public discussion” that led to agreement in principle on a continuum of scholarship and to suitable policies and practices:

The way we framed it on this campus is like this: picture a continuum. On the right side of the continuum is traditional engagement and scholarship and on the far left side of the continuum would be the most civically engaged or reciprocal scholarship and engagement. We’ve had several long, long public discussions about this—we’ve all agreed that anywhere you personally want to fall on this continuum, it’s fine.... And there’s gradations all the way along that continuum, so anywhere that you personally want to practice your scholarship and your engagement, it’s okay and will be recognized by the institution.

The idea of the continuum structures four key domains. Our intention is to give people tools that they can use to strengthen academic public engagement within each of these domains:

- a continuum of scholarship within which academic public engagement has full and equal standing;
- a continuum of scholarly and creative artifacts;
- a continuum of professional pathways for faculty, including the choice to be a civic professional; and
- a continuum of actions for institutional change.

We choose to focus on the word and the idea of the continuum for several reasons. It was the term of choice for Tenure Team members and surfaced repeatedly in their interviews, along with terms like “spectrum” and “gradient.” They used it to argue that tenure and promotion policies should be grounded in a notion of multiple scholarships. Framing professional practice as a continuum is a step that originated with Ernest L. Boyer and has been embraced by key initiatives and organizations (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, and Seifer; Gibson). Multiple scholarships, treated as a continuum, populate tenure and promotion policies built around Boyer’s terminology, as well as guidelines that preserve the logic of multiple scholarships using different language better suited to specific campuses.

The term continuum has become pervasive because it does useful meaning-making work: it is *inclusive* of many sorts and conditions of knowledge. It resists embedded hierarchies by assigning *equal value* to inquiry of different kinds. Inclusiveness implies *choice*: once a continuum is established, a faculty member may, without penalty, locate herself or himself at any point. There may be more negotiable options for faculty members who organize their work around community-based projects, at the point of hire or at different stages of a career. There may also be greater flexibility for the university, which can choose to encourage academic inquiry that matches its public mission, character, and place.

Finally, the continuum holds things in *relationships of resemblance and unlikeness*. The resemblance comes from the principle that connects them: that work on the continuum, however various, will be *judged by common principles*, standards to which all academic scholarly and

**OVERVIEW: KNOWLEDGE CREATION
AND CIVIC AGENCY**

creative work is held. “Quality” and “impact” in a chosen field are the most common unifying criteria, though these are by no means transparent terms. There are potential arguments embedded in the term. Distinctions like “traditional” or “innovative,” “less engaged” or “more engaged,” are commonly assigned to different points on the continuum. Without dismantling traditional conceptions of who qualifies as a peer in peer review, for example, or of what counts as knowledge or the dissemination of knowledge, a generous continuum of scholarship will be undone by a narrow definition of impact. But whatever the common principles are, assuming that they are consistent with the inclusive intent of the continuum, the key point is that “the same principles of excellence” apply to all kinds of scholarly work [Ramaley].

This four-point framework for this report—a continuum of scholarship, a continuum of scholarly and creative artifacts, a continuum of professional pathways, and a continuum of actions—organizes our recommendations. Each cluster of recommendations is tied to one of these domains.

Because Imagining America is a community of artists, designers, humanists, and interdisciplinary scholars centered on questions of culture, our approach to the Tenure Team Initiative for Public Scholarship is characterized by three defining moves:

- Looking inward, we emphasize cultural strategies to guide culture change on campus, drawing on rich narrative data and the creative use of scenarios. We focus on the academic department, right at the middle ground of the university, and its network of relationships to schools, centers, institutional leaders, communities, and publics.
- We connect cultural engagement to cultural diversity. We stress translation and bridging as necessary culture-changing and knowledge-changing abilities. This orientation is based on what we know about the high value placed on community engagement by many women faculty and faculty from historically underrepresented groups (American Council on Education—Office of Women in Higher Education; Ibarra). It also reflects the fact that cultural diversity is at the heart of major intellectual developments in key arts and humanities fields.
- Looking outward, we define public scholarship as complex knowledge that is part of broader trends and movements for change.



The Whole Figure Eight Let me draw you a “word picture” to illustrate what is wrong with scholarly reward systems and where we need to go.

Picture a figure eight: a flattened figure eight, turned on its side. The left-side loop represents a scholarly community of practice—the academic field—with its own questions, debates, validation procedures, communication practices, and so on. The right-side loop represents scholarly work with the public—with community partners, in collaborative problem-solving groups, through projects that connect knowledge with choices and action.

Our problem is that scholarly practice is organized to draw faculty members only into the left-side loop. The reward system, the incentive system, our communication practices—all are connected with the left side only. Work within the right-side loop is discouraged, sometimes quite vigorously.

Our challenge, then, is to revamp the terrain so that the reward system supports the entire figure eight, and especially scholarly movement back and forth between the two loops in the larger figure. Left-loop work ought to be informed and enriched by work in the right-side loop, and vice versa. Travel back and forth should be both expected and rewarded. This is what our project is trying to achieve. But I doubt I will live to see (laughs) the triumph of this transformative effort [Schneider].

Mixed Messages

As publicly engaged academic work takes hold in American colleges and universities, tenure and promotion guidelines lag behind scholarly and artistic inquiry and the programs that support them. One arts dean reports, “We’re doing it, but we haven’t figured out this piece.” Policies have not kept pace with a deepening sense of the value of engaged knowledge.

As the high-stakes evaluation of an individual’s body of work, “a serious day of judgment in somebody’s life” [Lemann], tenure is a magnet for collective anxieties about professional and institutional values. For our neighbors who work in the public, non-profit, or private sectors, tenure is a mystifying entitlement. It triggers questions about what colleges and universities do and how well they do it. And, insofar as tenure enforces the status hierarchy that has produced “multiple professoriates,” it is the focal point of tensions surrounding changes in the academic workplace and workforce (Katz).

For the publicly engaged faculty member, tenure review should mark the point where the results of public and community-based inquiry are accorded the full dignity of informed peer review. What policies will help those charged with assessing the dossier to value appropriately the many artifacts of publicly engaged academic work and multiple perspectives on them? What happens when such policies are absent? We heard a lot about this at a session dedicated to the TTI at Imagining America’s 2005 national conference.

- A community-engaged ethno-musicologist at a private research university notes that, without adequate tenure policies in place, she was left to fend for herself: “You have to educate your administrators, but that’s no solution.” Even her sympathetic dean had little guidance for her, beyond suggesting that she “put one paragraph about this work” in what one senior administrator called her “very strange” dossier.
- A member of the dance faculty at a public research university describes his predicament as he approaches tenure. “I’m coming up for review in the dance department: So what do I do? ...I’m an oral historian in the community. Does oral history methodology count as the co-generation of knowledge? I make performance works based on oral histories. Who are the peer reviewers for that? I asked four different department chairs ‘what is praxis?’ and got four different answers.”
- One dean asks, “Has the question already been asked and answered *a priori* about the value of public scholarship?” A second dean seeks models: “Are there lessons to be learned from clinicians and social workers and sociologists?” A third dean, a scientist who leads a large college of arts and sciences, queries, “We typically look for the second book or the second grant. So how about public scholarship? Don’t we ask, what is the next project?”

Flexible evaluation is good; continuously improvised evaluation is not. Where change outruns habits and rules, individual faculty members hear mixed messages from their academic colleagues, the leaders of campus engagement initiatives, and the community partners with whom they collaborate. Those mixed messages combine to tell them that public engagement makes for good teaching, fine publicity, and dubious scholarship.

Clear Messages

IA chose to focus this initiative on the specific problem of appropriately valuing public academic and artistic work as scholarship, research, or creative output. David Scobey, chair of Imagining America’s National Advisory Board, voices a central tenet of this report when he calls on us to demonstrate the “intellectual richness” of public and community-based inquiry in the humanities, arts, and design: “It is time for partisans of academic public engagement to spell out its intellectual claims” and, in this way, to “deliver the goods.”

Other national organizations and many universities have worked to change campus cultures, crafting model policies and rewriting faculty handbooks to include community-based teaching and professional service with a strong civic thrust. In urging changes to tenure practices, *Imagining America* stands in distinguished company. We have learned from and built upon the undertakings of the Campus Compact, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, the American Association of Colleges and Universities, the American Council of Education's Office of Women in Higher Education, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the Modern Language Association, and the Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (HENCE). Whenever possible, our goal has been to borrow and extend, to adjust the idioms and fill in the gaps of earlier efforts, in order to develop policies adequate to publicly responsive academic work in the arts, humanities, and design. This has been a sustained exercise in not reinventing the wheel. But we still need to make the case for academic public engagement as complex knowledge.

Particularly in research universities, the words "public" and "scholarship" continue to live on different planets. We acknowledge the centrality of teaching to the work of just about every public scholar and artist we know. Almost every example of public scholarship listed at the beginning of this report involves a hybrid project, combining inquiry, teaching, and contributions to the public good. But engaged scholarship—public creation and discovery—continues to be undervalued in the tenure and promotion process.

The Tenure Track in the Era of "Multiple Professoriates"

IA's Tenure Team Initiative has concentrated on Classic Coke®—the tenure track. This report is finite in scope. It does not address the capacity of all of America's "multiple professoriates" to pursue publicly engaged scholarly and creative work and to be rewarded for it. While the nation's faculty are divided according to many variables, they are differentiated, above all, by the presence or, increasingly, the absence, of tenure (Katz; Schuster and Finkelstein). Tenure has become "a fairly weak privilege that only a segment of the population gets a chance at" [Calhoun]. There is widespread tension and distress over the unequal positions of tenure-track faculty and those with multi-year clinical or "professor of practice" contracts tied to comprehensive periodic reviews, on the one hand, and contingent faculty working on annual or per-course contracts, on the other.

A university's strong commitment to its public mission does not guarantee a strong commitment to the civic potential of its faculty. Calhoun notes that:

Community colleges, parts of the four-year liberal arts college system, some branch campuses of state universities.... are doing a lot of work to reach parts of the public, open up access to higher education, shape what a variety of different constituencies will know about important issues for public debate.... But [faculty on these campuses] don't have much prospect of tenure.

Lecturers and part-time faculty may have deeper community ties and better civic networks and skills than tenure-track colleagues. Public engagement can create opportunities for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty to bring different knowledge to a project or program. But non-tenure-track faculty are limited in their ability to act on their public commitments where they are denied the time, resources, or professional stability to build the relationships that make possible effective community-based teaching and sustained civic partnerships. Most are ineligible even for small internal project grants, for example. "There's a lot to be worried about," says Calhoun, "whether or not there's tenure."

There is a lot to be worried about in settings where there *is* tenure. Calhoun reflects on the possibility of an inverse relationship between traditional constructions of scholarship and institutional engagement:

If by public we mean reaching out to a wider constituency, a lot of institutions that do the most are among the institutions that have cut back on tenure. And a lot of institutions, which still work according to the traditional ideas of tenure, are those that have the strongest scholasticism.

Research universities often lag in developing the intellectual frameworks, policies, and infrastructure to support academic public engagement. There is a remedial intent to this report, therefore. The “policy gap” is evident even though, with their many arts and professional schools, research-intensive campuses nurture in their midst some of the most promising models of tenure and promotion policies for publicly engaged faculty. They also offer Preparing Future Faculty programs that, with a sufficient boost, could make community and public engagement a live option for students as they move toward faculty roles. In concert with others we believe that publicly engaged academic work can hold its own in research universities. We point to the exemplary work of the Campus Compact Research Universities teams that produced the *New Times Demand New Scholarship* reports (I & II), resulting from conferences held at Tufts University and UCLA respectively. We also are convinced that research universities have much to learn from the innovations of metropolitan, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions.

What Did the Tenure Team Say?

The individuals on the Tenure Team brought the imagination and range that an undertaking like this needs. They are national association leaders, deans, provosts, and chairs. They are also historians, landscape architects, specialists in intercultural communication, sociologists, scholars of contemporary art, and scholars in Ethnic Studies. All of them are publicly engaged, but not in the same way. Some are founders of the civic engagement movement in higher education, signers of the Wingspread Declaration. Others are at the forefront of the fight for diversity and access. Several helped to bring about the sea-change in higher education that has made teaching and learning central to faculty work, building a multi-campus coalition for liberal learning. Another cluster sustains the flow between the working world of the arts, arts institutions, and schools of the arts on campus. Still others start with Dewey’s perpetual challenge to educators and center their work in community schools (Benson et al).

All of the interviewees were storytellers. Narrative is a resource in their labors on behalf of public engagement at their home campuses and in national organizations. They told stories that wove together their own intellectual passions, the social landscapes of their professional lives, and projects underway at their own institutions. We have dedicated special sections of the report to some of these stories. Interview selections are identified within brackets by last name of the Tenure Team member. A complete listing of the Tenure Team is provided at the beginning of this report.

The Interviewees:

- want to locate public academic engagement within a continuum of scholarship;
- view public academic work as part of larger shifts in the understanding and making of knowledge;
- feel strongly that universities should recognize more diverse scholarly and creative artifacts, including those that advance the public presentation of knowledge;
- want to work out the meaning of scholarship campus by campus, but with the support of multi-institutional networks; and
- believe that pursuing publicly engaged academic work is especially attractive to students and faculty of color, and especially risky for them.

This last point is sobering indeed. Members of the Tenure Team were selected, in part, on the basis of their commitments to public academic work. Thus it is all the more troubling that many of these higher education leaders voiced serious concerns about the risks run by graduate students and faculty of color who choose public scholarship or creative work as an early career priority. This issue alone warrants the adoption of tenure and promotion policies that bring knowledge-making about, for, and with publics and communities unambiguously into the continuum of scholarship.

Taking It Home

It takes a village to get promoted, and it takes a village to change promotion policies. We offer an implementation model that takes seriously the department, the center, the school or college, and the university as a whole.

In June 2008, a working conference in New York City will push beyond recommendations to concrete scenarios for change. Representatives of IA member institutions that are rethinking tenure and promotion policies will work with other national leaders to select the most promising pathways to “climate change” on campus.

The IA national conference in Fall 2008 offers activities for different constituencies. IA will launch an affinity group for department chairs. The annual PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) Summit serves as a platform for early career civic professionals. And a conference panel aimed at all IA institutional representatives will aim to broaden the impact of the June conference.

IA regional conferences in 2008-2009, in association with Campus Compact, offer a cluster approach to changing tenure and promotion policies for publicly engaged artists and scholars. They will encourage intercampus collaborations that are not only supportive but also convenient.

But without waiting for any of these things to happen, readers of this document can “take it home” and act on it. We hope that this report will be of practical use in forming coalitions of institutional leaders, chairs, faculty, administrators, and graduate students who care about the campus as part of the public life of world and neighborhood and about engaged academic work in its rich particulars. Campus working groups will ensure that tenure guidelines are nuanced through a permanent process of collegiate and departmental reflection. They will take seriously the co-authorship of promotion—what we call “writing the case.” And, suitable to the humanities and arts, they will use the power of dialogue and narrative—exemplified throughout this report—as resources for the work. We invite you to form an implementation group and use this report to start the discussion. Let us know what happens. Send reflections to imaginingamerica@syr.edu and we’ll be sure to respond.

The arguments and guidelines that we set forth here are significant in themselves. But the report matters most as an occasion for organizing campus and national efforts. As John Saltmarsh observes, “multiple interventions are needed simultaneously,” and we need to connect to, support, and learn from them all.

RECOMMENDATIONS

PART ONE: A CONTINUUM OF SCHOLARSHIP

I. DEFINE PUBLIC SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE WORK

Publicly engaged academic work is scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member's academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge "about, for, and with" diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value.

II. DEVELOP POLICY BASED ON A CONTINUUM OF SCHOLARSHIP

III. RECOGNIZE THE EXCELLENCE OF CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY WORK THAT CONNECTS DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE

Four dimensions should be recognized in academic public engagement as distinct kinds of scholarly excellence:

- The interdisciplinarity of public scholarship
- Intercultural engagement
- The integration of scholarship, teaching, and public engagement
- The impact of public scholarship across multiple publics, communities, and audiences

IV. EXPAND WHAT COUNTS

Value local and regional work equally with work of national and international scope, including projects that are jointly planned, carried out, and reflected on by university and community partners.

Evaluate more diverse artifacts and a broader spectrum of creative and critical work informed by matters of public salience.

Treat a faculty member's leadership as scholarly achievement, including the design of curricula, degree programs, and centers.

Recognize the public presentation of knowledge as scholarly or creative achievement.

V. DOCUMENT WHAT COUNTS

Develop an institutional resource to evaluate and document community partnerships and public projects thoroughly, regularly, and using a range of methods that are appropriate for the humanities, arts, and design. This will make it more likely that tenure and promotion dossiers for individual faculty members will present solid documentation on their public and community-based academic work. Continuously review the evaluation process with community partners and faculty.

VI. PRESENT WHAT COUNTS: USE PORTFOLIOS IN THE TENURE OR PROMOTION DOSSIER

The portfolio:

- begins with a framing statement that narrates the arc of the work, locates it relative to one or more disciplines or fields, explains its contributions to the public good, establishes its originality, and points to future directions;
- documents projects through a variety of relevant materials, e.g., public and scholarly presentations, multimedia and curricular materials, individual and co-authored publications, site plans, policy reports, participant interviews, workshops, and planning and assessment tools;
- is sent to external reviewers.

VII. EXPAND WHO COUNTS: BROADEN THE COMMUNITY OF PEER REVIEW

Make external letters count. Solicit letters from a diverse and highly qualified group of reviewers to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of a faculty member's public scholarly or creative work. Choose reviewers from the publics and audiences relevant to the achievements of the candidate. For some individuals, all reviewers most appropriately are located in other institutions of higher education. For others, the appropriate reviewers are located in museums, theaters, K-12 schools, or other community settings.

Work continuously within the department to build a pool of potential reviewers who are university-based public scholars or artists in or proximate to the field. Whose publications arise from public or community projects, address public issues, are being taught? Who has directed relevant programs? Who speaks to these issues in professional associations?

Counsel faculty when they are hired that they should be compiling their own annotated list of potential external reviewers who can speak to the public dimension of their work.

Solicit evaluative letters from community partners who collaborated with the faculty member, providing clear guidelines for the letter. Invite them to assess: significance of the project; contributions to theory and professional practice; nature and quality of the relationship; and impact. Compensate community partners for these letters.

Urge qualified senior scholars to serve as external reviewers for publicly engaged junior faculty when asked to do so.

PART TWO: A CONTINUUM OF PROFESSIONAL CHOICES**VIII. SUPPORT GRADUATE STUDENTS AND JUNIOR FACULTY WHO CHOOSE ACADEMIC PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

Incorporate this principle into tenure and promotion policies: "The university is committed to scholarship and creative activity that serves the public good. Therefore, it is committed to supporting those junior scholars who participate in projects that advance community and other external partnerships, public engagement, and activities that similarly contribute to public discourse and the formation of robust publics."

Build a better PFF: Create a next-generation Preparing Future Faculty program for early-career public scholars and artists that can be adapted on any campus. Organize it on the founding principles of PFF: multiple mentors, clusters of institutions of different types to provide a realistic sense of possible careers, and an emphasis on supporting students from historically underrepresented minority groups to foster a diverse professoriate.

Develop a resource that helps graduate students and faculty over the whole academic career to map out professional pathways. See IA's model, Pathways for Public Scholars, in Part III of this report.

Work with campus and national networks of faculty and students of color to integrate public and community engagement into professional development programs.

IX. BUILD IN FLEXIBILITY AT THE POINT OF HIRE: NEGOTIATED OPTIONS CONFIRMED IN WRITING

Encourage academic units to negotiate at the time of hire with faculty members who focus on publicly engaged academic work. This allows for flexible, mutually agreed-upon options, such as specializing in community-based teaching or participatory action research. The department and the faculty member, for example, should be able to plan for different ratios of professional commitment, such as appointments that are split between leading a community-based program and complementary pedagogical and research responsibilities. The outcomes of these negotiations during the hiring process are normally set forth in a Letter of Understanding or equivalent document.

X. PROMOTE PUBLICLY ENGAGED FACULTY TO FULL PROFESSOR

Free to pursue public scholarship, associate professors still may not find such work recognized in the promotion and rewards system on campus. Developing protocols to advance public artists and scholars to full professor rank should encourage retention, develop faculty leaders, and test policies for evaluating public scholarship and creative work in a less risky atmosphere than that surrounding tenure decisions.

PART THREE: A CONTINUUM OF ACTIONS

XI: ORGANIZE THE DEPARTMENT FOR POLICY CHANGE

Focus on the department in order to:

1. Build chairs' capacity through groups and networks:

- Encourage the exchange of best practices for hiring, tenuring, and promoting publicly engaged artists and scholars through programs that prepare and support chairs.
- Hold annual retreats with chairs and the directors of the campus's engagement programs.
- Link arts, humanities, and design chairs to national associations committed to doing, understanding, and evaluating public engagement.
- Join an IA-sponsored national affinity group for chairs to develop mutually supportive relationships with peers at other IA institutions.

2. Organize the department to change the discourse of scholarly and creative work by revising the departmental statement on tenure and promotion. That statement may:

- Describe the mission and priorities of the department, including its public role and activities, and link these to the overall mission of the institution.
- Articulate what scholarly, professional, and creative work looks like in your unit and discipline, communicating the work done in your department to the public and to those in other fields.

- Convey to potential and new faculty members the value that the department places on making knowledge “about, for, with” various communities and publics.
- Explain tenure and promotion criteria, process, and documentation.

3. Develop an agenda for engagement with centers and institutes:

- Strengthen relationships between departments and publicly engaged centers or institutes, including topical centers (e.g., arts and health), humanities institutes, and centers for advanced studies.
- Work with centers and institutes on joint or complementary public engagement initiatives (e.g., shared curriculum; office space, transportation, and staff support for community project teams; appointments for community fellows; pre-docs for engaged students).

XII: TAKE THIS REPORT HOME AND USE IT TO START SOMETHING

Form implementation groups (departmental, collegiate, or campus-wide) to shape tenure and promotion policies that are responsive to publicly engaged academic work. Use this report to start the discussion.

Present the results of your efforts at IA’s 2008-2009 regional conferences, dedicated to TTI implementation efforts.

Bring your campus initiative to the attention of other disciplinary, professional, and higher education associations.

PART ONE: A CONTINUUM OF SCHOLARSHIP

Introduction

“Public scholar” and “public artist” are not just academic identities. And academic institutions are not the only places in which publicly engaged intellectuals face challenges to their professional standing. Architecture, dance, public history, poetry, urban planning, journalism—all have their versions of this situation. There is much to be gained by tracking responses to publicly engaged professional practice in different domains. In this report, however, we concentrate on publicly engaged faculty and on how to change tenure and promotion policies for them.

The core of this first section presents a vocabulary—a set of keywords and key ideas—for publicly engaged academic work, ready for use in faculty handbooks and other campus policy documents. This vocabulary and the policies derived from it “put a prow on the boat” of public engagement, in the words of Chris Waterman, Dean of Art and Architecture at UCLA.

We present IA’s definition of publicly engaged academic work. Then we place that definition in a scholarly continuum with lots of options, the strategy urged by Tenure Team members. Combining definition and continuum offers both clarity and choice: clarity about the legitimacy of public inquiry and choice about how it can enter the cultures of IA’s many different member institutions from all corners of American higher education.

Defining Public Inquiry

Before taking up the questions, “What is *excellent* public cultural work?” and, “What is *excellent* public scholarship?” we need to establish what these are. Not all scholarship is public scholarship, and not all creative work in the arts is public art or public design. Defining publicly engaged intellectual work by university faculty establishes the *legitimacy* of civically engaged academic work in the cultural disciplines but not its *quality*. It simply demarcates the nature of the work whose excellence is in question.

This definition emerged from extended debate, showing exactly why tenure and promotion policies need to be deeply informed by the context and culture of individual campuses. The definition needed to encompass intensely collaborative approaches, jointly planned, carried out, and reflected on by co-equal community and university partners. It also had to extend

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

No Intellectual Compromises This is about making scholarship better, making knowledge better.

It is not about concessions in the quality of scholarship and knowledge [Calhoun].

A group of amateur historians wants you to help them with a history museum. This leads you to the historical research questions that you’re going to spend the next three years working on. So, what is it about those questions and that partnership that makes this a rigorous conversation? It’s our job to show how the work has generated interesting questions that are being rigorously vetted [Scobey].

One wants to value it fully, but also evaluate it fully [Weisbuch].

PART ONE: A CONTINUUM OF SCHOLARSHIP

to translational and applied research and the public presentation of knowledge, broadly construed. It encompasses work that is defined by local and translocal commitments. Tenure Team members kept pushing us to make finer distinctions, within broader frameworks:

- I like your definition...[with] the addition of the idea of engaged scholarship having a democratic purpose at its very core [Harkavy].
- There is a difference between public and community scholarship. Some scholars will support public scholarship but not define “public” the same way [Lemann].
- My definition of public scholarship is a shared framing of questions, a shared process of, of gathering and interpreting, and applying the knowledge gained. Public scholarship provides a different way of deciding what’s worth pursuing and what isn’t [Ramaley].

In the end, we arrived at the following as a definition that serves the purposes of this report and the needs of IA’s membership:

Publicly engaged academic work is scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member’s academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value.

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

The Continuum of Scholarship People move from, “I’m doing work that might be useful to the public” to, “I will interpret my work in order that others may understand its value” [or] “I know things the public ought to know and I will teach it to them,” to a very different approach that builds upon a deep collaboration with people in the broader community. I think it is a continuous movement toward, “I will work with the public to generate the kind of knowledge that will be useful to all of us” [Ramaley].

The way we framed it on this campus [is like this]: on the far right side of the continuum is traditional engagement and scholarship and on the left side of the continuum would be the most civically engaged or reciprocal scholarship and engagement. We’ve come up with a long, long public discussion about this—we’ve all agreed that anywhere you personally want to fall on this continuum, it’s fine [Lieberman].

How is it that scholars should distinguish between engagement and service? It’s a mistake to distinguish between them. It’s important to put them on a spectrum of activity that will make it possible for those who have a service ethos to see themselves.... A spectrum or a continuum [of public scholarship] is pretty important that allows people to enter wherever they are and see themselves within the frameworks of their own institutional context and what it rewards [Dubrow].

Changing Knowledge, Changing Roles, Changing Artifacts

It is not enough just to define public cultural work. It needs then to be located within an expanded spectrum of creative and critical activity encompassing everything that counts as research, scholarship, or creative activity. The best approach is to define public scholarship and creative work clearly and to incorporate them into a scholarly continuum that recognizes many professional pathways.

The rationale for changing the faculty reward system extends beyond tenure and promotion policies. It requires thinking hard about how knowledge and the professional lives of those who make it are changing. Public engagement alters knowledge production in many ways. It affects:

- how work is organized;
- what is made;
- the status of the work and of the people doing it;
- institutions and organizations;
- fields and disciplines.

What we see when we look around us is this: more faculty members with plural roles in complex projects are generating more diverse scholarly and creative artifacts. From these people and these artifacts come the pressure to craft more flexible systems of evaluation and reward.

Public scholarly and creative work is grounded in the assumption that knowledge is socially produced. As John Saltmarsh has argued, this “fundamental epistemological position” leads us to understand “the role of the university within a larger domain of knowledge production.” In the arts, humanities, and design, this means knowledge about and through culture.

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

The Scholarly Continuum at Work: Sustained Relationships, Diverse Artifacts

What I’ve built are sustained relationships and out of those relationships come a plethora of interesting projects of many forms: student theses, classes, weekend events, and books. What I’m trying to sustain are the partnerships and relationships over time transcending any particular project. And those are the skills I try to teach, because they’re critical to the work and are needed in the curriculum [Dubrow].

In collaboration with the Japanese American National Museum, I organized a research team investigating this multiracial history that led directly to an exhibition. I witnessed our USC undergraduate and graduate students leading discussion groups at the International Institute that brought together current residents of the community with former residents that had left Boyle Heights over fifty years ago.... In the end, this decade-long project produced a wide range of public scholarship from many of its practitioners: a major museum exhibition, a teacher’s guide made free to all teachers, high school student radio projects, undergraduate and graduate research papers, and hopefully, within a year or so, my own next book [Sanchez].

Participating faculty take on plural, mediating roles as they shuttle between their faculty office and the project site. Projects and programs serve both civic and intellectual purposes, leading to experimental pedagogical and critical strategies that add to the complexity of the work. And just as members of collaborative teams have affinities with different communities, so the artifacts that they produce take shape in many genres and speak to various and specific publics.

The Continuum of Scholarship Expands What Counts

It is important to expand what counts as scholarly and creative work. In practice this means developing policies that respond to the features of community-based projects. Because our recommendations in this report address the challenges of the real world of publicly engaged academic work—the real world of campus-community projects—we opened the report with two pages of examples. As our examples show, public scholarship takes the form of projects that combine pedagogy, research, creative activity, and publication.

Many public scholars—perhaps most of them—organize their scholarship, creative practice, and teaching around projects. A project is carried out by a purpose-built team organized for a finite period of time in order to bring about specific results or to create particular events or resources. One way of making promotion review more coherent for administrators and individual faculty members is to review projects in a holistic fashion.

Tenure and promotion policies need to be responsive to the project as the molecular structure of public scholarship and creative practice. Project-friendly policies should not use national and international scope to define intellectual quality, for example. Academic endeavor that is local or regional in focus has equal claims to complexity, creativity, and rigor. Project management and leadership, the design of new programs and curricula, and the public presentation of knowledge—all may flow from project-based academic work. It is definitely challenging to evaluate the scholarly excellence of integrative projects that combine inquiry and discovery with teaching and service. But it has to happen.

Portland State University's policy document urges promotion committees to accept blurred boundaries and cautions them against confining faculty engagement within narrow categories:

One should recognize that research, teaching, and community outreach often overlap. For example, a service learning project may reflect both teaching and community outreach. Some research projects may involve both research and community outreach. Pedagogical research may involve both research and teaching. When a faculty member evaluates his or her individual intellectual, aesthetic, or creative accomplishments, it is more important to focus on the general criteria of the quality and significance of the work...than to categorize the work.

This recommendation parallels the guidelines of the University of Illinois, which also declare that the *both/and* logic of publicly engaged academic pursuits can be a positive benefit:

Much as the research...of individuals may positively affect their teaching and public service, so too their involvement in public service may positively serve the purposes of their research and teaching. This interaction among teaching, research, and public service can contribute significantly to the vitality of the institution, its colleges, units, and departments, as well as to the vitality of its individual faculty members.

In the spirit of these exemplary policies, we urge colleges and universities to recognize the particular excellence of creative and scholarly work that connects and migrates across different domains of knowledge. (See Recommendation 4, “The Four I’s.”) This does not mean piling on sets of criteria, as George Sanchez argues on the basis of his own experience:

Often I would get reviewed as both an interdisciplinary scholar and a historian. Now that might mean that I have to [meet] criteria in two different places as opposed to just one. It’s a penalty. So, imagine now the public scholar. In most Research I universities, it’s often viewed as an extra set of criteria. And of course, it’s that extra set of criteria then that hurts your case.

It is vital to establish the significance of a work of public scholarship for one or more fields or as integrating teaching, community engagement, and knowledge creation. But faculty should be accountable to one clear set of criteria.

The Excellence of Publicly Engaged Academic Work: Like and Unlike Other Kinds of Scholarship

However diverse, all scholarly and creative achievements face the question of excellence. The judgment of excellence is arrived at dialogically and contextually, through cycles of evaluation that take place on campus and through a geographically dispersed community of peers—local, regional, national, transnational.

The Tenure Team calls attention to the *both/and* logic that should prevail in evaluating public cultural work: it is both like and unlike other kinds of scholarship. Phrases such as “just as” and “no different...except” underscore the fact that the two sides of that *both/and* principle are of equal importance. “Just as with conventional scholarship,” writes David Scobey, “the assessment is done by a peer community that has talked together about what counts as excellence in that mode of work.” President Ramaley affirms that public scholarship “varies” from other kinds of scholarship in some ways but it is “no different” in others:

The basic motivation for public scholarship is no different from any other kind, except that what varies is who helps frame the question, who wants to generate and then interpret the evidence, and who uses the results—but using the same principles of excellence that we would apply to any other form of scholarship.

What are those principles of excellence? Sometimes it is as simple as “quality” and “impact.” More often, universities are turning to criteria derived from Boyer’s multiple scholarships. Mary Taylor Huber finds broad consensus across disciplines and institutions on six attributes that, taken together, define scholarly and creative excellence in the domains of teaching, outreach, and discovery:

1. Clear goals
2. Adequate preparation
3. Appropriate methods
4. Significant results
5. Effective presentation
6. Reflective critique

These criteria are a good starting point for tenure and promotion policies that support publicly engaged scholarly and creative work. They are applicable “to a broad range of intellectual projects, while allowing the markers for what is clear, adequate, appropriate, significant, effective, and reflective to vary among different kinds of scholarly projects” (Huber; see also *Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff; Diamond and Adam II 8). They have been adopted by many universities and by groups such as the team that launched the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. But criteria for excellence, in themselves, do not constitute a tenure and promotion policy.

The Continuum of Scholarship Expresses Campus Values

The continuum of scholarship conveys the university’s commitment to innovation, diversity, and choice. Our research demonstrated that policies organized around the scholarly continuum are vehicles for the expression of campus values and character.

There are three good institutional reasons to incorporate a continuum of scholarship into tenure and promotion policies:

- A scholarly continuum makes it easier for the institution to evaluate new or undervalued professional practices or artifacts. Policies grounded in this principle can serve a clear institutional interest, weighting teaching or community engagement more heavily, for example, or responding to new forms of work, like digital publication.
- The continuum of scholarship helps to foster an intellectually and culturally diverse faculty. Allowing faculty members to define themselves more flexibly may be an effective recruitment strategy, especially in light of data pointing to the high value that faculty of color and women faculty assign to community engagement and “multicontextual” environments (Ibarra).
- Tenure and promotion policies grounded in a continuum of scholarship make a statement about intellectual community. A heterogeneous, fluid, tolerant academic culture—in the words of Art and Architecture Dean, Judith Russi Kirshner, of the University of Illinois at Chicago, a culture that celebrates the “prodigality” of knowledge—is a positive good.

A number of tenure and promotion guidelines that contain statements of value are embedded in the metaphor of the continuum or in vocabularies of range and representation. We single out three, from Portland State, Syracuse University, and the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Michigan.

Portland State University, in many ways served as a national laboratory for tenure and promotion policies supportive of public engagement. Its policies have been deeply internalized by the faculty by virtue of iterative, participatory learning sustained over a number of years. Its policy emphasizes the campus’s urban mission in a “value” statement and then goes on to provide a capacious definition of outreach scholarship:

[The University] highly values quality community outreach as part of faculty roles and responsibilities....The setting of Portland State University affords faculty many opportunities to make their expertise useful to the community outside the University. Community-based activities are those which are tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge. Such activities may involve a cohesive series of activities contributing to the definition or resolution of problems or issues in society. These activities also include aesthetic and celebratory projects. Scholars who engage in community outreach also should disseminate promising innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review.

Syracuse University has made “scholarship in action” its institutional mission. In a draft policy document currently under discussion, Syracuse faculty are generously characterized as “actively engaged in an intellectual life that enhances the knowledge base and extends the boundary in their chosen area of concentration.” In its suggested template for a letter to external reviewers, Syracuse underscores the “wide latitude” that a scholarship continuum permits: “The Syracuse University faculty is strong in part because it engages in scholarship that comprises a spectrum of excellence from disciplinary to cross-disciplinary, from theoretical to applied, and from critical to interpretive. Syracuse University is committed to long-standing traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship.”

University of Michigan’s Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning, too, makes a statement about the relationship between the diversity of knowledge and the diversity of people:

We need diversity in breadth of knowledge, in range of professional experience, in representation of disciplines, in professional productivity and attainment. Some faculty are scholars in the humanistic tradition; some are artists; others pursue empirical research or develop methodologies in the traditions of the natural or social sciences.... a substantial group is oriented primarily to the world of practice, and makes its contribution in solving current problems.

Clearly, policy is not just a set of rules. Tenure and promotion guidelines are highly expressive, value-laden documents. Policies that emphasize scholarly engagement use the idea of a “spectrum of excellence” to say something important about campus culture.

The Continuum of Artifacts

“Expanding what counts” relies on a continuum of artifacts as well as a continuum of scholarships. Community-based projects generate intellectual and creative artifacts that take many forms, including peer-reviewed individual or co-authored publications, but by no means limited to these. The continuum of artifacts through which knowledge is disseminated and by which the public good is served matches, in inclusiveness and variety, the continuum of scholarship. This is why we recommend the use of portfolios in the tenure dossier. The portfolio may include writing for non-academic publications; presentations at a wide range of academic and nonacademic conferences and meetings, as well as at participatory workshops; oral histories; performances, exhibitions, installations, murals, and festivals; new K-16 curricula; site designs or plans for “cultural corridors” and other place-making work; and policy reports.

Portland State’s policy on tenure and promotion shows how the continuum of artifacts translates into practice:

It is strongly recommended that the evaluation consider the following indicators of quality and significance:

- publication in journals or presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings that advance the scholarship of community outreach;
- honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition received for community outreach;
- adoption of the faculty member’s models for problem resolution, intervention programs, instruments, or processes by others who seek solutions to similar problems;
- substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice;

- models that enrich the artistic and cultural life of the community; and
- evaluative statements from clients and peers regarding the quality and significance of documents or performances produced by the faculty member.

It is impossible to list all the many things that can count as products of publicly engaged scholarly and creative work. More important than the inclusion of any single item is the encouragement of the mixing, sequencing, and integration of artifacts. Knowledge changes and grows as it is translated into different contexts and idioms—from the archive to performance, from story to site plan, from exhibition to journal article. It encounters and links different communities of reception. These changes of state call for more integrative and possibly more narrative forms of review. That is why we recommend the use of portfolios in the tenure dossier.

Message from the Tenure Team: Value The Public Presentation of Knowledge

Tenure Team members made it clear that a continuum of scholarly artifacts includes the public presentation of knowledge. They are strong advocates for public intellectual work, the dissemination of knowledge, and more expansive forms of “scholarly communication” [Bender]. Taking the public presentation of knowledge seriously, in all its forms, is a priority for them in enlarging what counts as scholarship. Indeed, they view the public presentation of knowledge as a significant professional asset, agreeing with Don E. Hall, who argues that “being multi-voiced is a necessary job skill” (105).

The Tenure Team member with the most direct relationship to the issue of the public presentation of knowledge, Nicholas Lemann, Dean of the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, stressed the two-pronged meaning of “public” for *Imagining America*, suggesting that we “divide ‘public’ into two categories”:

A lot of academics will say, “I love the idea of public scholarship,” but if you talk about co-creation of knowledge with people in the local community, “No, that’s not what I had in mind at all. I had in mind reaching a broad public outside the disciplinary audience with my work entering public discourse.”

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

The Public Presentation of Knowledge There is not enough value put into the translation, synthesis, and presentation of research. It’s not enough to do good research. You’ve got to make sure that the work gets into the minds of other people. That can come through a wider audience for reading. It can come through getting it produced in alternative media. It can come through informing a museum exhibition. It can come through performance [Calhoun].

The questions are informed by matters of public salience and the knowledge is addressed to a larger public conversation.... [This implies both] thinking about the public uses of knowledge and new genres of presentation and dissemination [Scobey].

We call attention to the difference between local publics and the broad public to which Lemann refers. We think that tenure and promotion policies need to credit both. Most Tenure Team members value both meanings. They express a desire to link public presentation to a specific local or regional project. Informative lobby exhibits accompany performances. A new book on *Keywords in American Studies* is published with a companion web site hosted by a humanities institute, where groups can add new keywords of their own (Burgett and Hendler). Interviewees like campus-community collaborations that produce radio or video documentaries dealing with a particular locality. But they also have a healthy respect for the critically acute, well-researched book for nonacademic readers, such as Lemann's *The Big Test* or Cornell West's *Democracy Matters*. "We are asking the question, what scholar has given substantive time to presenting publicly?" said one Tenure Team member. "Cornel West is an excellent public scholar. I would judge him on the fact that he can take very hefty content [in] *Race Matters* or *Democracy Matters*, and he can communicate it in a way that makes sense to the public."

Thomas Bender, a leading historian of the disciplines in American universities, points to the kind of public meaning-making that fundamentally defines the humanities. "There is a continuum between our research and the public" that has to do with the nature of "communication networks." Humanists write and speak, he suggests, to a "generalized public," not "a client or sponsor," and "not as expert, but as contributor." This model of a communicative continuum can encompass both specific and general publics.

Documenting the Continuum of Artifacts: Portfolios

As knowledge creation changes, so, too, do the genres of documentation. We are in the midst of a portfolio boom. The use of e-portfolios for self-assessment and reflection by students is becoming common. For applicants for K-12 teaching positions as well as for junior faculty jobs, teaching portfolios are now the norm.

In this environment, we want to stress the wisdom of the professional practice portfolio in the design disciplines and its availability as a model for the tenure or promotion dossier. The professional work portfolio is well suited to public scholarship and public creative work, as it allows for reflective, critical analysis and for a broad diversity of sometimes-unconventional artifacts.

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

A Portfolio of Professional Practice [Someone like me] will typically present a portfolio of work that will include a continuum of products from peer-reviewed scholarship in high status publications (the *Journal of American History* or *American Quarterly* in my field) to public scholarship in more heterodox publications.... I published a Maine-contextualized essay [in the *Maine Policy Review*] about the civic mission of K-12 education. But it was peer-reviewed; it was part of a scholarly conversation. And through the continuum to non-peer-reviewed intellectual products like a set of materials produced to accompany a new performance work....When I got tenured at Michigan in the School of Architecture and Urban Planning, the particular form of my tenure case was to submit four portfolios: a scholarly research portfolio, a teaching portfolio, a service portfolio (for institutional service), and what they called a professional practice portfolio, which was the place where architects put architectural designs and where I put the [historical] exhibits. So one of the templates is a fourth portfolio where cultural resources or non-scholarly public products get put. Another one would be to expand the research portfolio, to have a more capacious sense of what research products are [Scobey].

Making Outreach Visible: Guide to Documenting Professional Service also offers valuable examples of project portfolios that can be adapted to the documentation of public scholarship. Two of these examples are especially useful for faculty in the humanities: the Memphis Anthropology Project Portfolio and the Portland YWCA History Project Portfolio (Driscoll and Lynton).

Expand Who Counts as a Peer: Broadening the Community of Review

Writing the promotion case for a publicly engaged faculty member is demanding interpretive and critical work. Authorial roles include writing as an external reviewer, writing as a community partner, writing—as department chair—the all-important letter to the dean. Writing the case involves reading closely, balancing multiple judgments from multiple perspectives, connecting specific artifacts to significant trends and contexts, and then bringing all this together in a persuasive document, embodying the collective judiciousness of the department for non-specialist readers. It is of inestimable importance. It may call for new genres, such as the portfolio. It definitely requires a broader and more diverse community of peers, capable of responding to newly valued kinds of productivity.

As public scholars based in and out of the academy gain more experience in evaluating those doing similar kinds of public cultural work, national cohorts of peer reviewers are developing that can serve as national authorities on engaged professional practice in specific fields. The task now is to put this cohort to work.

A departmental strategy for promotion needs to address the writing of several different kinds of letters—including the letters that are written to solicit letters, explaining the institution's definition of scholarship and criteria for evaluation. Well in advance of promotion, the department chair should seek letters from a diverse and highly qualified group of reviewers to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of a faculty member's public scholarly or creative work. The department should make sure that clear criteria for public scholarship are delivered into the hands of external reviewers who are qualified public scholars themselves, so that they can compose letters useful to departmental committees. This process will work better if the chair and other mentors have counseled faculty when they were hired that they should be compiling their own annotated list of potential external reviewers who can speak to the public dimension of their work.

Who are the external reviewers? Reviewers should be chosen from any and all relevant publics and audiences for the achievements of the candidate. "The assessors," urges Robert Weisbuch, "should be a mix of people in the relevant fields and people in the world who care about these issues...the distinguished strangers who are going to read the work." For some individuals, all reviewers are located most appropriately in other institutions of higher education. For others, they are located in museums, theatres, K-12 schools, or other community settings.

The letters to potential external reviewers should not mince words. Craig Calhoun proposes a script:

You ask the external reviewer something like, "We expect there to be a demonstration of merit for tenure and it should include these different kinds of successes or achievements." You explicitly ask the question: "The University values effective presentations to wider non-academic audiences. What has this candidate done to offer that?" All right. And then [if you are the external reviewer] you say, "I see something."

In addition to seeking out nationally known publicly engaged scholars and artists, departments should also solicit letters from community partners who collaborated with the faculty member, providing clear guidelines for the letter. Restricting external reviewers who are not themselves academics to the domain of “practice” or “application” reduces their standing as co-creators of knowledge for whom theory-building and critical reflection matter. They should be invited to comment on all relevant intellectual and material dimensions of the work. They may be asked to assess the significance of the project; its contributions to theory and professional practice; the nature and quality of the relationship; the work’s impact. It is important to compensate community partners for these letters. Including such letters in the dossier may mean changing departmental policies to permit external review by close collaborators.

This logic also extends to forming promotion subcommittees. Scholars and artists who are experienced public scholars at the faculty member’s home institution, along with the directors of centers for community partnerships or other engagement programs, may be represented on tenure and promotion subcommittees.

Finally, we encourage senior scholars to serve as external reviewers for publicly engaged junior faculty at other institutions. Scobey reports, “In the last six months I’ve done three tenure reviews in three different schools and departments because I’m asked to come, not as the historian, but as the publicly engaged humanist who can speak to the excellence of particular work.” Joining the growing pool of senior faculty who can speak to the excellence of publicly engaged academic work is a vital professional service.

LISTENING TO TENURE TEAM LEADERS

We’ve got to have evidence about what we’re doing, but it has to be evidence that brings in the voices of people other than in the university [Rice].

The most progressive foundations...have developed either impact assessments or assessments of the strength of partnerships. Can you assess the quality of a partnership? Well one of the things is, you ask the partner.... Right now we have tenure and promotion guidelines that say you can’t go to someone you’ve collaborated with to recommend you [Dubrow].

Are the values they embody shot through all the other practices, evaluations, and procedures of the university? Do they count toward tenure decisions for participating faculty, really count? Work that bridges the academy and the community should count toward tenure and promotion [Valaitis].

• • •

We have begun by delineating what public inquiry is and urging the flexible model of the continuum of scholarship. This model led logically to strategies of documentation and external review that match the inclusive and plural character of the continuum of artifacts that is the logical consequence of the continuum of scholarship. In the next section of this report, we focus on publicly engaged faculty members themselves.

PART TWO: THE COURSE OF A CAREER: A CONTINUUM OF PROFESSIONAL CHOICES

Our greatest goal is to enhance an individual over the course of a career. Go forth and do it, but do it smartly.

Earl Lewis

We need practical steps that operationalize not only the shape of the institution, but the shape of the individual's career over time.

David Scobey

From Anxiety to Agency

The ethic of care is palpable in the Tenure Team's interview transcripts. The conviction that members of the rising generation of public artists and scholars can advance their own interests as civic professionals in the academy is not. We take a hard look at the feelings of trepidation that surround public scholarship and share reflections by Tenure Team members themselves who strained to balance contradictory pressures as assistant or associate professors.

We believe that alliances among engaged graduate students, junior and senior faculty, and university administrators can produce better tenure and promotion policies and better professional development programs. Colleges and universities have been crafting pathways for undergraduates interested in community service learning and civic engagement. Duke's Scholarship With a Civic Mission program is a fine example of this approach. But to our knowledge there are no similar developmental pathways for engaged faculty.

"We need three or four different paradigms that individuals" can choose from, states Earl Lewis, Emory's provost. It is our goal here to answer that need, with the proviso that these pathways need to be developed with, not for, graduate students and assistant professors. If there are few pathways, there are many desire lines, routes carved from the footfalls of men and women looking to engage with publics and communities.

This section of the report focuses on the concerns of individual faculty members, while the following section examines ways to change the institutional culture of colleges and universities. Since individuals are best served by enabling networks of peers, mentors, and campus leaders, this portion of the report inevitably anticipates the next.

The Cost of Doing—and of Not Doing—Publicly Engaged Academic Work

Faculty members, graduate students, department chairs, deans, and provosts who care about public scholarship and community engagement hold in common an unshakeable belief that public scholarship is good for universities, for communities, and for themselves as individuals. They agree with the principle stated by George Sanchez:

You can't say the university really values community engagement and that only senior faculty should be allowed to do this work. You have to incorporate it into the very guts of the institution and what it values.

The mood, however, when one asks what the academic career options are for a graduate student or junior faculty member, is one of anxious boldness among graduate students and profound concern among everyone else. Most academic elders on the Tenure Team, aware of the risks of staking professional advancement on public engagement, are protective of students and junior colleagues. They balance encouragement and caution.

Publicly Active Graduate Students

Graduate students are restless. Some are finding dissertation topics and peer mentoring networks that allow them to work out how to integrate engagement into their fields or disciplines. These groups emerge, for example, in the Public Engagement and Professional Development program at the University of Texas, the Black Humanities Collective at the University of Michigan, and the annual Public Humanities Institutes for graduate students at the University of Washington and the University of Iowa. Some students have found their way to degree programs designed

to train publicly engaged artists and scholars, such as the Ph.D. program on Theatre for Youth at Arizona State. Others are taking charge of re-thinking the possibilities of graduate education itself through Imagining America's PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) program.

Their mentors may urge them to stop. The PAGE Fellow who remembered being advised to disengage from community commitments told an Imagining America audience, "I felt like someone was asking me to cut off my legs." She rejected this advice and took the risk. Especially for graduate students who have become accustomed to community service learning as undergraduates, perhaps writing a senior thesis that arose out of a community or public project, the transition to the civically disassociated world of a graduate program can be stressful. "There is tension in the system" between student-centered engagement, which is encouraged, and faculty-centered engagement, which is not, Earl Lewis told IA. President Carol Christ of Smith College, a member of the Tenure Team, speculates: "I would imagine colleagues saying not, 'Oh, I think that's a waste of time. I don't think that's valuable,' but 'I don't suggest you spend a lot of time on that because it's not going to count.'"

Junior and Mid-Career Faculty: Postponement and Under-Reporting

If some early-career artists and scholars pursue engagement, others think just as hard about their options and decide to postpone community-based teaching or research projects until later. And then there are a number of junior faculty who are engaged in public or community work, but who under-report it:

The two situations I see are, one, people don't do public scholarship work even if they want to because they figure it's not going to have any role in tenure. And, two, I see situations in which people who do incredible or significant public scholarly work don't know how to put it in the context of their tenure case. People say, "Oh, it's gonna hurt me." People don't know how to put it in effectively...and it ends up... just getting placed under service, which is often just a list [Sanchez].

Tenure Team members—including two who have been or are presently graduate school deans—recall vividly how they themselves negotiated the pressures on emerging public scholars. (See Career Course Narratives below for full accounts.)

- Earl Lewis, now Provost of Emory University and former director of the Responsive Ph.D. initiative of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, recalls how scrupulously he weighed his choices about public projects. He remembers calculating the costs and benefits of including these activities in his annual report on professional achievement.
- Gail Dubrow, Graduate Dean at the University of Minnesota, says, "I was a canary." She tells the story of how she both fulfilled and defied stringent disciplinary demands by pursuing a "do-it-all" strategy—and how she decided to go into administrative leadership in order to keep others from having to do the same.
- Devorah Lieberman, Provost of Wagner College, is still indignant about the advice she got from a university administrator as an associate professor, who told her to publish only on her dissertation topic at a point when she was ready to branch out from there. Her narrative points to how often the constraints on public scholarship are also the constraints on cross-disciplinary work.

It is clear from these vivid memories of career-long adjustments that just getting tenure does not resolve the stresses of public scholarship. While we focus here on publicly engaged faculty members at early career stages, we also suggest that universities pay close attention to associate professors.

Students and Faculty of Color: A Sense of Risk, A Challenge to the Status Quo

What is the relationship between diversity and engagement? The sense of risk is most pronounced in the interviews with African-American academic leaders. While committed to public engagement and proud of a long history of “speaking for the community,” they voiced the strongest concern for the professional jeopardy risked by graduate students and junior faculty who choose this path.

The theme of safety recurred throughout our interviews, as did the call for institutional change that responds in concrete ways to the real and perceived vulnerability of engaged students and faculty. To “preserve an individual over the course of a career”—Provost Earl Lewis’s overriding priority—was especially urgent for deans and scholars of color. This group of interviewees included those with the strongest conviction that diversity and engagement are urgently connected, as well as those with the deepest misgivings about the wisdom of public engagement for untenured faculty of color. And what is the risk? The risk is that the relationship between the university and the faculty member will end prematurely:

Each institution has to work with its own tolerance for risk. Because it’s really about risk. Anytime we hire a junior faculty member, it’s a risk. And we should do everything in our power to help that person develop so they will be able to maintain that thirty-year relationship with their institution [Lewis].

The argument for caution, backed up by Woodrow Wilson’s report on Diversity and the Ph.D., is convincing. It is summed up by Tenure Team member Orlando Taylor, Dean of the Graduate School of Howard University:

Faculty of color face so many barriers, so many doubts, [are] often marginalized, often given too much minority service, outreach responsibility. When the time comes for tenure, they learn that it doesn’t count.... They don’t get promoted. So part of me says, when you get into this avant garde, think-out-of-the-box kind of a model, are we setting up minority faculty for failure?.... More often than not, it is a minority scholar or the woman who tends to have more of this social idealism that leads them to want to engage in this kind of work.... But those who hold power in academia more often than not...don’t value engagement, don’t value civic responsibility, and therefore you have this tension where you’re getting more women and people of color on the faculty, but the gatekeepers...[are] from another generation. And so...these persons may be set up for disappointments [Taylor].

Taylor issues a challenge to university leaders:

I’d like to see boards of trustees or governing boards of institutions, academic senates, chief academic officers build new systems of reward and evaluation of faculty, such that this kind of work is safe.

“Everything in our power” involves doing two things that benefit all faculty members. First, pragmatically, it may mean urging a junior colleague to avoid community-based scholarship in the early years of a career. Devorah Lieberman, Provost of Wagner College, observes that “the department has to be clear” with the new faculty member: “Otherwise, it’s confusing.... Whatever their guidelines are, either very narrow or very broad, they should be very clear.”

Second—and we will have much more to say about this in the next section of the report—structural features that divide academic units from engagement units—a feature particularly of decentralized research universities—need to be addressed as part of a comprehensive institutional effort to create an ecology of public work. There is a “two-cultures” problem on many campuses. The normative academic culture is made up of departments, deans’ offices, professional societies, national and local faculty networks, journals and conferences, and

institutes. There is also a thriving culture, or counter-culture, of engagement. This tends to be located in “extraterritorial” units: centers for community service learning, undergraduate living-learning communities, outreach offices (Ellison).

Faculty members who are active in the “engagement culture” operate constantly in both domains. This double identity presents opportunities for integration, cross-fertilization, and the practice of translation. It can also be professionally schizophrenic and render important areas of achievement illegible at the point of promotion: “These faculty may be the most valued members of that counterculture of [engagement], but they can only arrive there through the tortured processes we have developed in a departmental culture which is particularly alienating yet required,” George Sanchez observes.

Sanchez goes on to stress the importance to the future of minority scholars of departmental support for publicly engaged faculty:

The contradictions between traditional departmental culture and the counter-culture of engagement.... haven’t gone away. Minority scholars have seen this tension right from the get-go and have tried to find a middle path. Often...they take on the role of translator—translating what they know from the community into the academy or the other way around. That role means walking a tightrope, with the possibility of a lot of failure along with it.

Without an alliance between Orlando Taylor’s “gatekeepers” and “avant garde” junior faculty who are attracted to publicly engaged academic work, this binary split will persist. It will keep on reinforcing inhibitions among those interested in careers as public scholars and artists, while allowing others to view the professional choices of engaged colleagues as eccentric. These campus constituencies need to form coalitions to develop viable pathways—or, as Earl Lewis put it, “paradigms”—for engaged faculty in the humanities, arts, and design. Academic public engagement requires a continuum of scholarship, a continuum of artifacts, and a career continuum, as well.

Agency is an Option: Navigating Pathways to Public Engagement

As we argued in the Overview to this report, civic agency includes the “capacities to negotiate and to transform a world that is understood to be fluid and open.” Building an enabling environment for academic public engagement requires fostering relationships that lead to productive working groups and purposeful collaborations for change. The next and final section of this report is dedicated to institutional strategies toward that goal.

But even where the institutional climate is not encouraging, groups of like-minded colleagues can come together, serving as peer mentors and developing supportive networks. One can choose the path of public scholarship and public culture-making and, even in the most constrained climate, find ways to move along that path as a graduate student, untenured faculty member, or senior professor.

As a way of fostering those “navigational capacities,” we have developed a tool for mapping pathways to public engagement at five career stages (below). What we offer is a sample only, as this template can be adapted to many different sorts of faculty appointments and to campuses with differently weighted priorities. This tool includes several critical (and recurring) stages of professional development: making a decision to put public engagement at the heart of one’s research, scholarship, or creative activity; building knowledge; and identifying and acquiring relevant skills. A faculty member or graduate student can exercise agency in these three areas even in settings unsympathetic to community projects. David Scobey concludes, “If we really take seriously the idea that this is part of what a rigorous, generative, great academic institution does, we have to have a story that we tell about the beginning, middle, and end of a career that does this.”

Setting an Intellectual Agenda: The Choice of Subject Matter

Tenure Team member Craig Calhoun stresses the critical moment of choosing one's topic:

Deciding to do research on something that really matters to the public good is basic.... Everybody should ask themselves (first), "Am I doing something that is really important?".... and second, "Is this a line of research that is important for the public good?"...Everybody at every stage of their career should be asking this.

You say, "Well, I want to work on this," and your advisor says, "That's too broad. Let's try to frame it better. Let's try to figure out the research methods." But not talking you out of the problem. You've got to have fire in your belly. You've got to believe it's important.

The emphasis on exercising the freedom to choose one's subject matter and one's stance toward it is an important dimension of agency, particularly for graduate students. "We have produced a system in which, instead of empowering students to do the things they think are important better, we teach them that something else valued by the discipline is what they should go after," Calhoun asserts. For many younger scholars, knowledge "that really matters to the public good" includes "research on behalf of social movements" [Calhoun]. Universities can distinguish between public scholarship as civic engagement and public scholarship as activism without banishing either one from academic legitimacy. David Scobey contrasts work that is "about citizenship" and work that is "about justice." Both may meet the criteria for professional activity. Social movements can be bridges to knowledge. We see this in the history of African American Studies, Women's Studies, Disability Studies, and Gay and Lesbian Studies—academic fields that emerged through social movements and brought into the academy a characteristic mix of research, critique, policy-making, theorizing, public debate, the formation of new public spheres, and local organization building.

Publicly Active Graduate Students

The University of Michigan's excellent resource, *How to Mentor Graduate Students: A Guide for Faculty at a Diverse University*, was developed through an exemplary process of collaboration with graduate students and faculty members. It provides good advice and thoroughly convincing best practices. However, it presents graduate students almost exclusively as the recipients of wisdom, without attributing to them the capacity to exercise agency in electing research or creative projects informed by civic commitments and acquiring the skills needed to advance those projects. The language of mentoring often assumes lack, dependency, or neediness. Can we move toward a strength-based, or asset-based, model of mentoring?

Imagining America's PAGE program—Publicly Active Graduate Education—has shown us how networking and self-organizing by graduate students leads to growing agency. To date, almost 200 graduate students in the humanities, arts, and design have applied for 48 conference fellowships. PAGE fellows have established annual summits at the IA national meetings. These events are driven by a set of readings, a set of issues, and the deliberate shaping of a culture of peer mentoring and workshoping.

The success of PAGE has implications beyond the cultural disciplines. It contains lessons for Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) programs nationwide. PFF programs, as valuable as they are, do not concretely address graduate students' futures as civic professionals or as future faculty in colleges and universities with a strong public mission. Integrating new modules on dimensions of engagement into PFF programs could clarify professional pathways for graduate students and early career faculty.

As David Scobey has pointed out, "We have to develop a picture of the successful trajectory of an academic career as a public scholar." On the following page, we offer a planning tool that we hope will enable people to do just that.

PATHWAYS FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AT FIVE CAREER STAGES

A HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE:

ACTIONS	CAREER STAGES				
	Grad. Student	Asst. Prof. 1-3	Asst. Prof. 4-6	Assoc. Prof.	Full Prof.
I. DECIDING TO BE A PUBLIC SCHOLAR					
Establish “public good” focus area for teaching, scholarship, creative work	x	x	x		
II. BUILDING A KNOWLEDGE FOR PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP					
Identify civic, public, community issues in your field and know who is working on them	x	x	x		
Map campus (people, programs, pathways)	x	x	x		
Map community (people, programs, issues)	x	x	x		
III. DEVELOP SKILLS: PRIORITIZE AND START TO ACQUIRE THEM					
Teaching, networking, presentation, writing and speaking accessibly	x	x	x		
Ethnography and oral history	x	x	x		
Documentation, evaluation, digital resources	x	x	x		
IV. MENTORING PUBLIC SCHOLARS					
Get mentoring	x	x	x		
Peer mentoring	x	x	x	x	x
Give mentoring				x	x
V. DOING PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP					
Participate in Preparing Future Faculty programs (PFF)	x				
Teach community-based class		x	x	x	x
Join campus-community project team			x	x	x
Public presentation of knowledge		x	x	x	x
Supervise community-based undergraduate research			x	x	x
Get involved with national programs for engaged grad students and faculty	x	x	x		
Explore collaborative publication	x	x	x	x	x
VI. EXERCISING LEADERSHIP					
Coordinate project	x	x	x	x	x
Collaborate on course or curriculum development		x	x	x	x
Co-direct campus-community project	x	x	x	x	x
Write grant proposal		x	x	x	x
Speak for public scholarship and creative practice on key committees				x	x
Seek leadership role in national association				x	x
Launch publication project (journal, book series, position papers)				x	x
Serve as program or center director					x
Serve as chair or dean					x

CAREER COURSE NARRATIVES FROM THE TTI INTERVIEWS

I. Earl Lewis

I realized...that my colleagues expected several things from me and I expected several things. So I would engage in different kinds of public scholarship, and I'll show you an example. Some years ago there was this book that was being produced called *Still I Rise*. It's a cartoon history of African Americans. And I became Nell Painter's historical consultant on this. I thought this was important because it was actually a way for a certain audience of folks to get into the history of African Americans. I went through and made sure, content-wise, historically, that it was accurate. It was important to me to do it. I saw that something was important and reached a broader public than essays I might write for a historical journal. It could show up in high school classrooms. It would show up in other places. W.W. Norton published it and so there's this trade book that would show up in bookstores all over.

I thought, I'll reference it at the end of the year, but I realized it would take too much explaining to my colleagues as to why I would take on this project. It was in a minor listing of the things I was involved in that year rather than a major listing of the things that I was involved in that year. I realized that sometimes I am going to have to trade [this kind of project] with an article in a traditional venue. So then I will mix and match. How many public kinds of things that were a little off the beaten path could I do in a given year? And how many other things would I have to do, in the academy? In some years it was balanced one way or another, but I was always cognizant of the fact that one had to balance these things, because I understood that my department was more comfortable with [one] category than with the other.

There's [another] piece, which is to take my scholarly work and translate it for a lay audience. I started doing this when I was an assistant professor at Berkeley and we'd do live radio, just trying to translate that. Getting it out into a different form. So, that was another way that one engages in a different kind of public scholarship in collaboration, in this case, with the media.

I was told when I was at Berkeley, publish as much as I could, better single-authored than co-authored, community stuff wouldn't earn me any credit. You do it on the side.... And so I said, yeah, I will publish as much as I can. [But] I believed co-authoring was important, and so I started doing that with some of my own students. And then I continued to do that, across the career.

John Hope Franklin said it. He was here in town on Friday. Someone asked him about being an academic and being an activist. And John Hope said, "You can't study American history and come up when I did without seeing a need for change." And so, he said, "I thought of myself as a scholar and an activist and the two," he says, "were never incompatible in my view." And so my view is that the privilege of being in the positions that I have been in over the years came also with a responsibility. I try to figure out venues and contexts for sharing [what I have] more broadly than just with the scholarly community and finding that right balance.

And so when I was at Michigan, I was chairing during the midst of the affirmative-action lawsuits. We did it by producing videos on issues of diversity that dealt with not only race but also mental health and the whole range [of difference]. And, so, you end up creating a public scholarship.

II. Gail Dubrow

I faced enormous pressures over the value of public scholarship in my own case for tenure and promotion, particularly over what constituted appropriate venues for and the right balance among and between professional practice, scholarship, and public engagement. I received my Ph.D. in Urban Planning and was primarily tenured in a planning department, though I also had appointments in other fields. Planning departments typically recognize professional practice, but you need to be a national leader or innovator, not just a routine practitioner. Drawing

heavily on established norms in the social sciences, academic planners are expected to contribute scholarly articles to the top planning journals. As someone who focuses on cultural issues in planning, I was trained in a humanistic tradition of book publication and was intrigued by the possibilities, as well, of producing work that would be accessible to the diverse communities with which I was working to preserve their cultural heritage. As my dossier evolved it included books for scholarly and public audiences, book chapters aimed at bringing ideas about cultural preservation to varied disciplines, and articles for preservation planning professionals intended to reform established policies and practices.

I published for all of these audiences, extending the reach of my work substantially beyond the usual suspects (though my books were reviewed in the top planning journals), but it was not a smooth path to tenure and promotion by any means because publication in planning journals is the metric that continues to matter the most in planning departments. Interestingly, the approach to planning with which I am most closely associated, community engaged planning, has yet to figure out a meaningful relationship between planning with and for communities, and producing tenure-worthy publications of any relevance to those communities. This haunting contradiction led me to engage community members in the process of reviewing my book manuscript, develop modes of publication that are jargon-free and accessible on multiple levels to a wide range of readers, and to develop distribution channels designed to reach these communities as well as academic peers. Unfortunately, these approaches have not yet infused the ethos of academic planning, much less the review process for tenure and promotion. Moreover, work that is informed by the theoretical and methodological concerns of multiple disciplines, e.g. critical race studies, feminist studies, and ethnographic methods, among others, still is not valued in academic planning unless it is directed to planners exclusively. The time has come to recognize interdisciplinary and engaged work because it has the potential to solve problems that cannot be solved through the tools and methods of a single discipline or field, much less by academic expertise exclusively. Ironically, in my case, I was highly productive and had developed a national reputation in multiple fields—including preservation planning, planning history, and the history of architecture, to women's history and Asian American studies—and multiple communities, but the narrow departmental currency left me with a constant feeling that I was headed for career failure.

As I progressed from beginning Assistant Professor through promotion to Full Professor, departmental debates over the value of my work often were demoralizing, though I took refuge in a wide range of social and intellectual communities beyond the department and university walls. When I finally moved to a different public research university, I was simply astonished to see the body of work that had made me suspect in my former position qualify me for tenure at the rank of full professor in four different departments simultaneously. An institutional culture of openness to interdisciplinary and engaged scholarship made all the difference in how my record was valued and perceived. As my career evolved, I entered academic administration to change the policies and practices that have unnecessarily privileged contributions to established disciplines over contributions to knowledge that reach broader segments of society. I'm thrilled to see long overdue changes coming for the next generation of scholars, practitioners, and students who view their commitments and loyalties in the widest terms possible as citizens of the university and the world.

III. Devorah Lieberman

When I was applying for promotion to full professor, I was interested in a form of scholarship that was not traditional. It still resulted in publications, but the research wasn't very traditional. I started publishing this research and a university administrator called me in and said that I wasn't publishing in the area in which I earned my Ph.D. I told him I wasn't interested in traditional research at that period of time. I told him I had grown. He told me to publish in the area in which I earned my Ph.D. and then after I was promoted to full professor I could publish anything and anywhere I wanted. So I said, "OK." I went back and I published two traditional articles that year and the next year I was promoted. When I was promoted I told him that I wanted to write an article entitled "Publishing Without Passion for Promotion." I don't want to ever put a scholar in a situation where they have to publish without passion just to get promoted. It's empty, it's an empty promotion.

PART THREE: CHANGING THE CULTURE: A CONTINUUM OF ACTIONS


The questions asked in the tenure review process matter a lot. Who can change the questions? The dean can change the questions. The president of the university. They can start the discussions and hope the values change [Calhoun].

Today, I wish to nominate engaged learning—learning and action—as the University’s defining characteristic. The University itself has led me to this decision, and I want to take a few minutes to tell you about yourselves because, in truth, you have nominated this theme to me [Weisbuch].

Building an Alliance

We shift here from the arc of the individual career to the process of institutional change. We repeat Orlando Taylor’s call for altered reward systems for faculty members whose scholarly and creative work has public sources and takes public forms:

I’d like to see boards of trustees or governing boards of institutions, academic senates, chief academic officers, build new systems of reward and evaluation of faculty.



Building a culture of scholarly and creative engagement means “seeding...acceptance and... support for public scholarship at three different levels of the institution,” Scobey notes. The most effective strategies for changing institutional culture rest on alliances that connect these three sets of people with different relationships to the project of changing the collective common sense surrounding tenure and promotion:

- top university leaders—presidents and provosts;
- faculty doing public and community-based intellectual work;
- leaders working on the “middle ground,” including program and center directors, department chairs, and senior staff.

Presidents and Provosts

A major theme in this final section of the report is the powerful role of language—language of, about, and for the purposes of public engagement. This forms part of our discussion of the role of presidential speech, the departmental discourse of knowledge, and the function of critical documents in the tenure or promotion dossier. We focus on speaking and writing as social meaning-making by people in purposeful groups. Deciding what words we use and how we use them is part of the work of building relationships among individuals, affinity groups, and university departments and programs.

David Scobey observed in his TTI interview:

The central administrator, the provost or the president, is better placed to see the force of the movement for civic engagement in higher education. Their job is to think outside of the disciplinary norms and interests of any particular group. They'll tend to ask a question like, what should a college look like as a whole, in teaching writing or in encouraging undergraduate research or in community engagement.

Our focus here in this final section of the report is on the institutional middle ground, above all on the department as the locus of hiring, mentoring, and tenure. But before turning to the department, we want to call attention to the way in which presidents and provosts craft an institutional story. There are lessons in this for faculty, as well.

Calhoun observes, "Presidents can change the question" by "starting the discussion." Academic leadership has been defined, after all, as aiming faculty contributions "toward some desired future state" (Gmelch and Miskin 106-107). Language is the most potent resource of presidents and provosts in specifying the near future. President Carol Christ noted:

Whatever I say as president to persuade the faculty to put those criteria within the formal faculty code...would be the only bully pulpit that I would have.... it's a combination of talking about that, but [then] really working with the faculty to make sure that it's included in...formal definitions and procedures.

What does this presidential process look like in action?

President Robert Weisbuch of Drew University began his 2008 State of the University address by "nominating" (literally, naming) *learning in action* as the defining mission of the campus. He offered an eloquent public discourse for something that was already happening: "I want to tell you about yourselves because, in truth, you yourselves have nominated this theme to me."

This reciprocal motion of faculty action and presidential persuasion—mediated by the deans, chairs, and directors who work the middle ground—has three important consequences. First, the president's language gathers together an array of projects, courses, and programs, legitimizes them, and makes them into something large that is held in common. Second, the mission of "learning in action" establishes a framework for specific decisions about campus priorities. At Drew, this means a new Center on Religion, Culture, and Conflict; a new major in Environmental Studies; and a Master of Arts in Teaching that marks "a new era of school-university partnerships." Third, a well-crafted discourse, delivered by the president, setting forth the intellectual grounds for knowledge that "completes itself in purpose" clears a space for future experimentation and calls on faculty to design it.

A committed president or provost is a prerequisite for a campus-wide revision of tenure and promotion policy. As President McCulloch-Lovell notes, "If deans and provosts and presidents don't...encourage it, then the faculty member is waging a very lonely effort." Equally important are the mediating formations—a Council on Public Engagement, a vice provost for Outreach and Engagement, a task force on tenure and promotion policy—that bring together different university constituencies.

- Robert Bruininks, former provost and current president of the University of Minnesota, made public engagement his issue, starting a reexamination of the university's public mission and the implications of this mission for scholarship and creative practice. This civic thrust, sustained by the Council on Public Engagement and the Vice President for Engagement, is now in its seventh year.

**PART THREE: CHANGING THE CULTURE:
A CONTINUUM OF ACTIONS**

- Chancellor and President Nancy Cantor of Syracuse developed Scholarship in Action as a framework for the faculty bodies that are moving to broaden the scope of tenure and promotion policy.
- Missouri State made strategic use of its public affairs mission, both from the top, as President Michael T. Nietzel convened the university's leadership to rewrite the faculty handbook, and from the faculty and staff by way of the "extended campus."
- Michigan State University's vehicle for institutional climate change was the policy document known as *Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach*. The MSU provost who instituted the policy—Lou Anna Simon—is now the president. MSU is about to issue a report on the 294 tenure and promotion cases carried out under this policy.

At Wagner College, Provost Devorah Lieberman combines the central administrator's systemic viewpoint with activities that form groups and, above all, model relationship-building through conversation. Variations on the words "conversation," "discussion," "circle," "web," and "groups" make the point in key sections of Wagner's annual report. Lieberman concentrates on supporting department chairs and faculty:

SUPPORT FOR FACULTY AND CHAIRS AT WAGNER COLLEGE

[adapted from the 2005 Wagner College annual report]

Substantive educational reform must go through a number of stages. Change begins with vision and inspiration, moves on to adoption and implementation, and begins to shift institutional culture as new good practices are pervasive. The architects and early adopters of change do become exhausted by their dual roles as designers of new processes and implementers of the new curriculum. The challenge of sustaining change calls at once for reinvigoration of the originators and involvement of new faculty.

- **Mentoring.** The associate dean of the faculty partners new faculty with senior faculty mentors. For groups of faculty, the provost holds informal open conversations at her home. Similar discussion groups meet on campus. Discussions focus on academic success and the dynamics of strengthening the faculty as a whole.
- **Provost's meetings with varying faculty groups.** Open conversations are held at the provost's home... for differently identified groups of faculty members—department chairs, professors, the newly tenured, scientists, etc.
- **Town meetings.** Each term, an open town meeting of all faculty is held where stimulating topics of pressing interest such as "defining scholarship" and "what is meant by service learning" are discussed broadly.
- **Scholarship circles.** Led by the provost and the associate dean of the faculty, this wonderful web of faculty groups and subgroups supports and promotes scholarly work. Many older faculty members as well as newer colleagues find these very helpful and productive, particularly in linking innovations in effective teaching to disciplinary interests. Retired faculty, librarians, the provost, and associate deans meet monthly with these groups of faculty to serve as resources and to provide feedback.

The department chairs must feel that they are internal department mentors. And there need to be workshops on the campus annually so that any junior faculty member feels that there are people there who can help him or her think through the big picture on how to get to the next step. There has to be enough faculty development to help them.

Decentralization and the Institutional Middle Ground

So far we have provided examples of campuses where publicly engaged academic work is linked to a central mission. There are lessons here for more decentralized universities, too—those characterized by receptivity to intellectual entrepreneurship by faculty but averse to public engagement driven by the administrative center. It is unlikely that a coalition of innovative deans, directors, and chairs could raise public engagement to the level of a unified agenda in these settings. A coalition can form a powerful bloc, however, that connects multiple programs, starts joint initiatives, and fosters a civic subculture.

Will institutional leaders take the next step of bringing the sites of intellectually ambitious public engagement into formations that have decisive critical mass? Or will we be stuck in the administrative strategy of keeping most programs going with minimal resources, praising them regularly, and thinking that they cannot now or ever represent intellectual values shared by the faculty as a whole? We don't know how this question will be answered, campus by campus. But we do know that there is plenty that can be accomplished in the middle ground.

We move now to a closer look at departments, centers, and deans, in order to understand better how departments that want to tenure and promote publicly engaged faculty members can take action in any campus environment. We start with the department. We do this for three reasons:

- The department is the locus of hiring, mentoring, and promotion; it is the point of connection to disciplines and interdisciplinary field.
- The department is undervalued as an intellectually generative site for public cultural work.
- The department is a key matrix for vivifying knowledge through public engagement.

Departments Can Change the Discourse

Support Department Chairs

James C. Vortruba, President of Northern Kentucky University, when asked at a conference what he wished he had done more of in his highly successful career as a leader of public engagement, paused and then said: "I wish I'd done more for chairs." We do recommend more support for and investment in chairs as partners in public engagement. The challenges they face are overwhelming, as researchers on academic leadership unanimously conclude. But we also believe that chairs are already positioned to be powerful mediators and organizers.

"The chairs have the hardest job," Scobey notes, agreeing with Vortruba. "They don't have models of how to be a civically engaged department, and they're not getting kudos and pats on the back from editors of journals or panelists in academic conferences for their department's public engagements. Chairs need ways of thinking about how it serves the needs of good work in their disciplines to reward publicly engaged scholars and give them tenure."

How can universities, and chairs themselves, build chairs' capacity to foster a culture of scholarly and creative engagement? How does the campus support chairs in their efforts to learn about, understand, encourage, and evaluate the public scholarly and creative work of faculty?

Although it differs from IA's approach by using the vocabulary of service rather than that of scholarly and creative engagement, the *Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process* from the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign (UIUC) provides an example of how tenure and promotion policies can be supplemented with resources arising from and directly addressing the concerns of faculty. The guide supports both engaged faculty and those charged with evaluating their work. It specifies how people can work together to create an institutional climate that supports public scholarship and art making:

The guide provides important information regarding how to make a case that an individual's performance is of high quality, that it is integrated with teaching and research (scholarship), and that it makes an impact on the quality of life. Use of this guide by faculty members, department heads, and committees should lead to better-supported promotion and tenure documents, more successful cases, and more fulfilled and appropriately rewarded faculty members.

The guide pays close attention to the role of chairs, emphasizing the fundamental importance of early and sustained mentoring. Chairs are urged to become involved in work that is as particular as the project planning process and as general as the culture-changing enterprise of making public service "visible, evaluatable, and improvable."

Above all, chairs need to be supported through relationships, ones that they seek out and ones that they are invited into by others. Developing relationships is at the heart of our proposed sequence of support strategies, set forth in Recommendation XI.

Rewrite the Department's Statement on Scholarship

We recommend that departments interested in making their tenure and promotion documents more inclusive of publicly engaged intellectual and artistic work start by rewriting the departmental statement on scholarship or creative activity. This document is an expression of collective self-understanding and a public expressive action of the faculty. It puts an identity out there in the world of the university and—used as the basis for the departmental web site, communications with visitors, and review committees—in a broader world as well. Within the department, developing a common language and intellectual rationale for publicly engaged intellectual work, then putting that language into writing in core departmental documents makes a material difference in changing the institutional culture.

Learning, purposeful relationship-building, and articulation are the critical first steps for a department that wants to create a tenure and promotion policy for engaged faculty. Listening to and conversing with "the university"—individuals and offices in the central administration—is a critical first step in this departmental undertaking. Departmental and university discourses continue to speak past, not to, each other. "I've read universities' wider mission statements and the missions of Ethnic Studies departments and they seem to want to fulfill the same goals," says George Sanchez, "but they don't acknowledge each other." This is by no means unique to Ethnic Studies. Yet nothing can change without such mutual acknowledgement. This is the basis for establishing alliances and coalitions that can make the case for the intellectual generativity of public engagement.

The importance of language labor—discussion and writing in groups and by groups—for the process of institutional change cannot be stressed enough. Once a department has constructed a discourse for scholarly and creative engagement, there are eager audiences for it. Chris Waterman, dean of Art and Architecture at UCLA, spoke from his perspective as the recipient of tenure dossiers from the departments in his college, including the chairs' all-important accompanying letters. He stresses "context" as the critical factor in the subcommittee's report and the chair's letter—the context, for example, of how public work speaks to and advances trends in the field or discipline:

Language [on public academic work] is very important for an ad hoc committee and the chair who has to write a letter—guidelines about [how] you talk about community work as is research. What I say to the chairs and to the faculty committees doing promotion and tenure work is that setting up a context for a dossier or a file is the most important thing. We are all translators. When you're talking about somebody doing "Make art/ Stop AIDS" on the UCLA campus...and in particular when you're talking about the community projects that may be aligned with these things, providing context is absolutely crucial.

Listening to the Disciplines

Departments listen closely to professional associations and learned societies. A number of these associations are quietly establishing the legitimacy of public scholarship and creative work, including its standing in the tenure process. We propose that arts, humanities, and design departments study the examinations of faculty effort carried out by disciplinary associations.

For many years, the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) sponsored the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, which Eugene Rice directed. This crucial initiative was joined by complementary and intertwined undertakings by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the national Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards project, based at Syracuse University. The latter focused on working with scholarly and professional associations in order to generate "discipline-specific statements about the kinds of faculty work that ought to be honored and rewarded in particular fields" (Rice 7). It was this project that led to the publication of two volumes that departments interested in supporting publicly-engaged faculty work can use in faculty professional development.

Robert M. Diamond and Bronwyn E. Adam's *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty* contains contributions from twenty societies and associations, including six humanities and arts fields. The MLA's fifty-page contribution in the second volume stands out for its boldness in making visible faculty work that has been invisible and undervalued, bringing rigorous theoretically-informed critical analysis to bear on the task, and developing a series of hypothetical case studies against which to test a redefinition of scholarship in the real world of tenure and promotion. This document is the forebear to the report of the MLA Task Force on Tenure and Promotion. These statements are useful starting points and process models for departments interested in updating core documents.

The Intersection of Departments, Centers, and Deans

We recommend that chairs, deans, and center directors work together to strengthen relationships between departments and centers or institutes, including topical centers (e.g., arts and health, diversity and democracy), humanities institutes, and centers for advanced studies. Departments and centers could address joint or complementary activities, such as providing funding, space, and staff support for public or community projects; appointments for community fellows; global engagement; the presentation and publication of public scholarly and creative work; fellowships for engaged Ph.D. students; and professional development workshops for publicly active faculty and students.

Tenure Team member Thomas Bender focuses on the advantages—and a few pitfalls—of the department/institute pairing:

You've got this institute, which no other department has, what if you put the activist stuff there? It may be that this is the way to get both resources for community scholarship and also recognition. You could buy some people time. You could give them small research grants....That's the kind of institutional mechanism that might actually have some appeal as a way of recognizing this scholarship. It's a form of reward, legitimization....Often these things will come at a fairly high level [from] the provost's office or something like that, which also gives a certain credibility to the whole enterprise. The only thing you have to be careful [about] is that it doesn't become a ghetto for what is perceived as "some social types."

We are seeing a boom in cross-fertilization among departments and centers. There are humanities institutes with strong public missions (at Texas, Iowa, Rutgers-Newark, Washington-Seattle, for example), academic units sponsoring new degree programs (such as the M.A. in community-based cultural studies at Washington-Bothell and the new degree program on health sciences and architecture at the University of Illinois, Chicago); and Institute-within-the department formations (for example, the Diversity and Democracy Institute in American and Ethnic Studies at USC, or the Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute at NYU). And there are even more intricate models, such as the Public Scholars program in Museum Studies at IUPUI. Public scholar appointments link Museum Studies to several different schools and colleges, each associated with a public cultural institution in the region.

The risk in all of this entrepreneurship is that the department will be left behind as the place where only business as usual occurs. It is important to make sure that the center does not draw faculty away from the department because it offers a more enabling setting for an engaged artist or scholar. The department needs to become an imaginative locus of engagement, too, and to partner effectively with the centers and institutes that serve its faculty members.

As a public research university arts dean, Judith Russi Kirshner is committed to developing new programs that advance critical practice and public scholarship. "We began," she recalls, "by borrowing models from those other disciplines [with] whom we collaborate." She finds herself hiring faculty for these programs who introduce creative "rupture" into the arts and design. She looks for "prodigality," "the practice of critique," and "community engagement" when hiring. Now, echoing Bender's concern, she is asking, how do I foster an institutional culture in which faculty in these programs can build successful tenure cases?

Participatory Policy Change

The process of arriving at a self-conscious and deliberate language, and deploying that language within the institution, is as important as its content. The principles of engaged learning in groups work for faculty as well as students. Even more important than vision and voice at the top is the regular coming together of faculty and mid-level leaders in small groups to craft—to speak and to write—new policies and then to implement them by broadening the conversation more and more.

Once changes in tenure and promotion policy have been made, a number of institutions have implemented them through interactive or performative activities. At Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, a determined effort focuses on senior faculty. All faculty members who are serving on tenure and promotion bodies in any given year participate in a required workshop on the multiple forms of scholarship, including engaged scholarly and creative work. Some campuses have "held mock deliberations of promotion and tenure committees" using sample portfolios from *Making Outreach Visible* (Driscoll and Lynton 23).

At the University of Michigan, the renowned CRLT Players of the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching use theater to address, among other things, the process of tenure review. The troupe's presentations are based on scenarios built from research conducted through interviews and focus groups. The Players' sketches are designed to "bring to life the unspoken assumptions, motivations, and feelings" surrounding an issue. The actors talk to the audience but stay in character, and a facilitator provides "research-based information about the topic at hand." These dialogic experiences show how listening, talking, learning, and acting on policy change unfold together.

These collective strategies for updating campus policies point toward the need for periodic revision and should be carefully documented. While the temptation is to rewrite the faculty handbook as rarely as possible, tenure guidelines should be reviewed and amended every three to five years, drawing on feedback from the annual promotion cycle.

Learning from Future Faculty: Pressure in the Pipeline

If publicly engaged future faculty are to stay in the university and thrive there, resisting the forces that cause "leakage" in the "pipeline," the university needs to listen to graduate students. IA's PAGE program has taught us how strategic bootstrapping by graduate students can be. "The more informed students become and the more they begin to demand to work this way," notes Ellen McCulloch Lovell, Marlborough University's president, "the more people are going to adjust." Research-intensive universities are well positioned to bring graduate deans and graduate students fully into the engagement conversation, as well, tapping the network of Woodrow Wilson's Responsive Ph.D. initiative.

Sylvia Gale and Evan Carton's essay, "Toward the Practice of the Humanities," argues for the humanities "as a social practice" that does things as well as interprets them. The hunger for both interpreting and doing is evident in individual careers and in changes on campus. New degree programs and centers are connecting cultural studies and community practice; ethnic studies and police training, community development and art. Public artists and scholars are foraging widely for an appropriate repertoire of disciplinary and professional tools. There is pressure in the pipeline.

Pressure in the Pipeline: Voices from PAGE 2007 Summit

- Help credentialize new programs that are being run and staffed by graduate students by providing office space, resources (like a phone line!), and yearly small grants to help pay for people's time.
- Create job descriptions that recognize community education and program work as integrated with the departmental mission of educating undergrads and advancing research.
- More funding for such programs as UC Irvine's Humanities Out There (HOT) and UW-Madison's Humanities Exposed (HEX) makes a significant difference to graduate students.
- We need ways to facilitate a stronger connection between Humanities Centers/Community Engagement offices and graduate student instructors.
- It would be fantastic if tenure review standards in some way recognized this kind of work as legitimate, worthy, and productive.

Conclusion: Taking the Work Home

“My sense of strategy,” Dean Gail Dubrow told us, “is to take leading members of Imagining America, that represent different sectors, and for the institutional leaders to commit themselves to transformation and to rely on one another as a support network for changing practices.” That is our sense of strategy, as well.

In June 2008 a working conference in New York City will push beyond recommendations to concrete scenarios for change. Representatives of IA member institutions that are rethinking tenure and promotion policies will work together to select the most promising pathways to climate change on campus.

The IA national conference in Fall 2008 will offer activities for different constituencies. IA will launch an affinity group for department chairs. The annual PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) Summit will serve as a platform for early career civic professionals. And a conference panel aimed at all IA institutional representatives will aim to broaden the impact of the June conference.

IA regional conferences in 2008-2009 will offer a cluster approach to changing tenure and promotion policies for publicly engaged artists and scholars. They will encourage intercampus collaborations that are not only supportive but also convenient.

But without waiting for any of these things to happen, readers of this document can “take it home” and act on it. We invite you to form an implementation group and use this report to start the discussion. Let us know what happens.

RESOURCES, REFERENCES, AND METHODOLOGY

Online Resources and Policy Documents. For links to these and other resources, see [imagingamerica.org](http://www.imagingamerica.org).

Campus Compact

New Times Demand New Scholarship I
www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/Civic_Engagement.pdf

New Times Demand New Scholarship II
www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/Civic_Engagement.pdf

Community Campus Partnership for Health Toolkit
<http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html>

Committee on Institutional Cooperation
www.cic.uiuc.edu/groups/CommitteeOnEngagement/index.shtml

Georgia State University Women's Studies Institute
www2.gsu.edu/~wwwysi/faculty_staff/policies.html

Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis
<http://imir.iupui.edu/ceinv/>

Imagining America's Tenure Team Initiative Knowledge Base
www.imagingamerica.org/TTI.html

Pennsylvania State University
www.outreach.psu.edu/outreach-scholarship/

University of Minnesota
<http://academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/promotion.html>

University of Michigan Taubman College of Architecture and Urbana Planning
www.tcaup.umich.edu/facultystaff/tcaupcollegerules0903.pdf

Modern Language Association–Task force on Tenure and Promotion
www.mla.org/tenure_promotion

Michigan State University
<http://outreach.msu.edu/default.asp>

National Clearinghouse on Engagement
<http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/index.html>

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=224&srcid=183

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
www.oc.uiuc.edu/engagement/p&tfacultyguide2000.pdf

Syracuse University
http://provost.syr.edu/documents/2007/10/1/Tenure_Provost_Statement09-07.doc

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

The Responsive Ph.D.
www.woodrow.org/responsivephd/

Diversity and the Ph.D.: A Review of Efforts to Broaden Race and Ethnicity in U.S. Doctoral Education
www.woodrow.org/responsivephd/RPHDresources.php

References

- American Council on Education–Office of Women in Higher Education. *An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers*. Washington, DC, 2005.
- Battistoni, Richard M. *The Engaged Department Toolkit*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2003.
- Benson, Lee, Ira Richard Harkavy, and John L. Puckett. *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform: Civil Society, Public Schools, and Democratic Citizenship*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007.
- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Menlo Park, California (1st), San Francisco, California (2nd): The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1st), Jossey-Bass, Inc. (2nd), 1990 (1st), 1997 (2nd).
- Boyte, Harry C. "Going Upriver—Against the Current." *Change*, forthcoming May/June (2008).
- Boyte, Harry C. *Going Public: Academics and Public Life*. Dayton, Ohio: Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 2004.
- Brown, D. W., and D. Witte, eds. *What is 'Public' about what Academics do?* Kettering Foundation Report, Higher Education Exchange, 2004.
- Bruckardt, Mary Jane, Barbara Holland, Stephen Percy, and Nancy Zimpher. *Calling the Question: Is Higher Education Really Ready to Commit to Community Engagement?: A Wingspread Statement*. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, 2004.
- Burgett, Bruce, and Glenn Hendler. *Keywords for American Cultural Studies*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.
- Calhoun, Craig. "The Promise of Public Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56.3 (2005): 355-63.
- Calleson Diane C., J. Kauper-Brown, and SD Seifer. "Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit." Seattle, WA, (2005). Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. 12 Jan. 2008 www.communityengagedscholarship.info.
- Cantor, Nancy, and Steven D. Levine. "Taking public scholarship seriously." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52.40 (2006).
- Cantor, Nancy. "Transforming America: The University as Public Good." *Imagining America Foreseeable Futures* #3 (2003).
- Chait, Richard. *The Questions of Tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Cracks in the Educational Pipeline: a Business Leader's Guide to Higher Education Reform*. Committee for Economic Development, 2005.
- Diamond, Robert M., and Bronwyn E. Adam. *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.
- Diamond, Robert M., and Bronwyn E. Adam. *The Disciplines Speak II: More Statements on Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
- Diversity & the Ph.D: A Review of Efforts to Broaden Race & Ethnicity in U.S. Doctoral Education*. Princeton, NJ: The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, 2005.

Driscoll, Amy, E. A. Lynton, and Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards (American Association for Higher Education). *Making Outreach Visible: a Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1999.

Edwards, Richard. "The Academic Department: How Does it Fit into the University Reform Agenda?" *Change* 31.5 (1999): 16-27.

Ellison, Julie. "The Two Cultures Problem." *In The Research University as Local Citizen*. University of California, San Diego, 2002.

Gale, Sylvia, and Evan Carton. "Toward the Practice of the Humanities." *Good Society* 14.3 (2005): 38-44.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, Gene I. Maeroff, Ernest L. Boyer, and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Guillory, John. "Evaluating Scholarship in the Humanities: Principles and Procedures." *ADE Bulletin* Spring 137 (2005): 18-33.

Gmelch, Walter H., and Val D. Miskin. *Chairing an Academic Department. Survival Skills for Scholars*, Volume 15. Sage Publications, 1995.

Gibson, Cynthia M. *New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement—A Leadership Agenda*. Tufts University and Campus Compact, 2006.

Hall, Donald E. *The Academic Community: a Manual for Change*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007.

"How to Mentor Students: A Guide for Faculty at a Diverse University." Ann Arbor: The Rackham School of Graduate Studies, 2006.

Huber, Mary Taylor. "Evaluating Outreach: The Scholarship of Engagement for the 21st Century." Best Practices in Outreach and Public Service Conference. Pennsylvania State University, PA. 10 October 1999.

Ibarra, Robert. "Context Diversity: Reframing Higher Education in the 21st Century." In B. Holland and J. Meeropol eds. *A More Perfect Vision: the Future of Campus Engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006.

Jones, Susan R., Vasti Torres, and Jan L. Arminio. *Negotiating the Complexities of Qualitative Research in Higher Education: Fundamental Elements and Issues*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Katz, Stanley N. "What Has Happened to the Professoriate?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 6 (2006): B8-B11.

Kecskes, Kevin. *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publication, 2006.

Kezar, Adrianna J., Tony C. Chambers, and John Burkhardt. *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Koch, Cynthia. *Making Value Visible: Excellence in Campus-Community Partnerships in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*. Ann Arbor, MI: Imagining America, 2005.


Longo, Nicholas V. *Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

REFERENCES


- McKay, Valerie. *Community Service Learning Center: Retention, Tenure, & Promotion Document*. Long Beach, California: Community Service Learning Center, California State University Long Beach, 2005.
- Mustafa, Emirbayer, and Ann Mische. "What is Agency?" *The American Journal of Sociology* 103.4 (1998): 962.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, and R. Eugene Rice. *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Percy, Stephen L., Nancy L. Zimpher, and Mary Jane Brukardt. *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publication, 2006.
- Peters, Scott J., Nicholas R. Jordan, Theodore R. Alter, and Jeffrey C. Bridger. "The Craft of Public Scholarship in Land-Grant Education." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 8.1 (2003): 75-86.
- Plater, William. "Background Paper for Consideration of a Project on the Future of the Professoriate." Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007.
- Rao, Vijayendra, and Michael Walton. *Culture and Public Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Rice, Eugene. *Rethinking Scholarship of Engagement: The Struggle for New Meanings*. American Association for Higher Education USA, 2006.
- Reilly, Kevin P. "The Engaged Institution, the Twenty-First Century, and the New University Extension." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 8.1 (2003): 29-36.
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: the Art of Hearing Data*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Schuster, Jack H., and Martin J. Finkelstein. *The American Faculty: the Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Scobey, David. "Making Use of all our Faculties: Public Scholarship and the Future of Campus Compact." In B. Holland and J. Meeropol eds. *A More Perfect Vision: The Future of Campus Engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006.
- Stanton, Timothy K. *New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement—Opportunities and Challenges*. Los Angeles, CA: Campus Compact, 2007.
- Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place: A Guide for Leading Public Engagement at State Colleges and Universities*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2002.
- Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet M. Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1998.
- The Modern Language Association of America. "Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion." New York, 2007.
- Valaitis, Kristina A. "Response to Nancy Cantor's Keynote Address" in "Transforming America: The University as Public Good." *Imagining America Foreseeable Futures* #3 (2003).
- Wergin, Jon F. *Departments that Work: Building and Sustaining Cultures of Excellence in Academic Programs*. Anker Publication, 2003.

Methodology

Survey The study design for the Tenure Team Initiative project consists of a web-based survey and structured one-on-one interviews with members of the Tenure Team. The questionnaire instrument addresses those with a special interest in the evolving field of public scholarship, community engagement, and the development of appropriate evaluation methods about promotion and tenure policy. A total of ninety-four (94) useable cases resulted from the data collection. The primary limitation of the TTI survey is the relatively small number of cases available. While the survey targeted members within the IA consortium, other interested persons eager to express their views were also encouraged to complete the questionnaire. The data were examined for descriptive analyses; chi-square tests and Analysis of Variance were examined for all categorical and dichotomous variable pairs. Open-ended questions were categorized and used in the development of the structured interviews. We include here some of the descriptive contextual gleanings of the survey data.




Level at Which P & T Policy Addresses Public Scholarship and Creative Work at Respondent's Institution



Respondent's Own Public Engagement

N = 94



Interviews Members of the Tenure Team are among the most experienced and knowledgeable leaders in the field of higher education with expertise in the domain of public scholarship and engagement. The selection process leading to these interviewees began with ideas about expertise in the area (Rubin and Rubin). In total, nineteen participants, all members of the Tenure Team, engaged in semi-structured interviews consisting of sixteen questions about public scholarship, public engagement, and current and future practices related to tenure and promotion. Interviews varied in duration, but averaged approximately forty-five minutes. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim resulting in 438 pages of data about these issues. Random comparison analyses were conducted to ensure accuracy of transcription data: narrative summaries were developed within twenty-four hours for each interview. Interviews were carefully read and re-read by individual members of the research team. Then, the data was analyzed using an open-coding method, where the participants' utterances were classified according to theme. Analysis toward themes allows exploration of the "commonalities, differences, and relationships" (Jones et al. 90) among participants' responses, giving a general idea of the aim of thematic analysis, which is to explain "what is going on" in the dataset (Rubin and Rubin). This is in contrast to other analytic approaches, which would highlight one phenomenon deeply and the issues surrounding it, for example.

This approach to interview data allows for recognition of participants' reactions to the broad range of questions and issues, rather than searching for their reactions to something specific. From there, this information can be synthesized toward broad sense-making of participants' understandings of the issues as a whole. The process was similar to the constant comparative method (Strauss and Corbin), where the researcher is constantly refining the classification scheme as the analysis continues. Researcher triangulation was used to ensure the highest quality analysis and representation of the data.

Defining Public Scholarship We would like to establish a common understanding of the term public scholarship, as it applies to publicly engaged work in the cultural disciplines. We will be asking you questions that pivot on this term, and we are interested in your own working definition. Acknowledging that a definition of public scholarship is still a work in progress, we use the term to describe:

- Scholarly and creative work jointly planned and carried out by co-equal university and community partners; collaborative knowledge-making with colleagues in non-academic settings, including the labor of crafting and sustaining relationships between individuals and organizations;
- Intellectual and imaginative work that yields a “public good” product, such as K-12 curricular resources, exhibits, performances, site designs, policy recommendations, and broadly accessible publications;
- Historical, critical, and artistic work that contributes to public debates over, for example, citizenship, human rights, group and national identities, affirmative action, the construction of public memory, school reform, historic preservation, and immigration;
- Efforts to change higher education itself, including the development of new programs, and research on the success of such efforts.

Question Pool

1. How do you define public scholarship? Are there scholars that come immediately to mind as you formulate such a definition? Why?
2. What is your sense about how universities can best value public scholarship in the tenure and rewards system?
3. What doubts or misgivings do you have about institutions of higher education growing public scholars? What pitfalls do you see? What policies or other strategies can circumvent these pitfalls?
4. How should scholars distinguish between engagement and service?
5. From your perspective, where are the most critical policy opportunities for academic central administrators to promote public scholarship?
6. On the TTI web survey you identified a number of institutions that represent models of faculty evaluation and rewards as they apply to publicly engaged cultural and creative work. Would you please elaborate about why these examples are so compelling? What dimensions are missing in these models?
7. Given the types of public scholarship in the arts, humanities, and design that you have engaged in over the course of your career, what advice do you have about policy recommendations to buttress that kind of work?
8. We are very interested in the flow of artists and humanists between academic and community-based institutions. What perspectives do you have about how to maximize reciprocal benefits in those situations?

METHODOLOGY

9. Are there specific experiences that have changed your perspective on faculty tenure and promotion policies? Would you care to elaborate in a general way?
10. What does it take for campus-community collaborations involving faculty to meet academic standards for scholarship?
11. What specific promotion and assessment strategies apply to public or community projects in the arts, humanities, and design?
12. How important is benchmarking and what are some approaches that might work with poets and artists?
13. In order to make the case for modifying current evaluation rubrics to provide for the non-traditional aspects of public scholarship, should we be looking to other sectors, for example, the assessment strategies used by the nonprofit arts sector and foundations?
14. Exposure and dissemination are important aspects of any valuable work. What are some strategies for getting public scholarship recognized inside and outside the academy?
15. What advice might you offer about making the case for public scholarship in a way that really speaks to humanities and arts faculty constituencies?
16. What critical arguments should we be making about the advancement of tenure and promotion policies for public scholarship?

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Julie Ellison is Professor of American Culture, English, and Art and Design at the University of Michigan, where she has taught since 1980. She is also Director Emerita of Imagining America. Professor Ellison is one of the nation's foremost experts on emergent models of public, community-based, and project-centered scholarship in the humanities and arts. Ellison has worked with collaborators in South Africa since 2003 on the changing relationship between cultural institutions and universities there and on new communities of writing. She recently completed a speaking tour of New Zealand universities as a Fulbright Senior

Scholar, keynoting a national humanities congress. Before IA, Ellison served for four years as Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Michigan. She received her B.A. from Harvard in American History and Literature and her Ph.D. in English from Yale. Ellison's scholarly work ranges across the literature and culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with particular emphasis on gender, emotion, politics, and genre. Chicago University Press published her third scholarly book, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* in 1999. She has published poems in a number of quarterlies and journals. For the last ten years, she has taught a series of community-based classes dealing with poetry, as well as seminars on cultural citizenship and the new public scholarship. Her current research project focuses on the reframing of the imagination as a democratic condition by Black intellectuals, artists, and politicians.



Timothy K. Eatman is Assistant Professor of Higher Education at Syracuse University and Director for Research of Imagining America. Tim has provided research leadership for the Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship since its inception. Professor Eatman also pursues research on students from groups that are traditionally underrepresented in higher education. In this regard his primary interests lie in the pipeline to graduate school and the professoriate. Eatman conducts research that examines the relationship among institutional policies, programs, and college student development. He earned degrees in Education (B.S.-Pace

University, NY and M.Ed.-Howard University, D.C.) and a Ph.D. in Educational Policy from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, Associate Professor of Education at Spring Arbor University, and Associate Director for Research and Policy of the Academic Investment in Math and Science Program at Bowling Green State University. Eatman has published in venues including the *Journal of Educational Finance*, *Readings on Equal Education*, book chapters, and reports. As a member of the leadership team for Brothers of the Academy Research Institute, Eatman has worked with scholars from around the nation to promote progressive scholarly interaction and collaboration between researchers in academe and community leaders around issues of educational equity. He also serves on the Board of Directors of Mt. Pleasant Christian Academy, a private non-profit K-12 school in New York City.

IMAGINING AMERICA MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Allegheny College
American University
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Bates College
Bellarmine University
Beloit College
Boston College
Bowling Green State University
Brown University
California Institute of the Arts
Carleton College
Clark University
Colgate University
Columbia College Chicago
Columbia University
Cornell University
Dartmouth College
Drew University
Duke University
Eastern Connecticut State University
Emerson College
Emory University
Grand Rapids Community College
Hamilton College
Hampshire College
Indiana State University
Indiana University Bloomington
Indiana University-Purdue University,
Indianapolis
Iowa State University
Kalamazoo College
Kennesaw State University
Lafayette College
Lawrence University
Macalester College
Massachusetts College of Art and Design
Miami University of Ohio
Michigan State University
Missouri State University
Nassau Community College
New York University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
Pennsylvania State University
Portland State University
Purdue University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Richland College
Rutgers University
Southern Oregon University
Stanford University
Stony Brook University-
State University of New York
Syracuse University
Tulane University
University at Albany, SUNY
University at Buffalo, SUNY
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Delaware
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
University of Maryland
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Notre Dame
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Puerto Rico, Humacao
University of Southern California
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington, Bothell
University of Washington, Seattle
University of Washington, Tacoma
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Vanderbilt University
Virginia Tech
Wagner College
Wesleyan University
Winona State University
Xavier University of Louisiana

