5-2016

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Community Engagement: How the 2020 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Application Can Encourage Campuses to Support Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Their Community Engagement

Allison LaFave
University of Maryland at College Park

Damani Lewis
University of Maryland at College Park

Sarah Smith
University of Maryland at College Park

Recommended Citation

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Community Engagement: How the 2020 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Application Can Encourage Campuses to Support Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Their Community Engagement

Allison LaFave

Damani Lewis

Sarah Smith

University of Maryland, College Park

Please send correspondence to:

John Saltmarsh
Director, New England Resource Center for Higher Education
University of Massachusetts, Boston
john.saltmarsh@umb.edu

Introduction

In 2006, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching developed an elective classification for community engagement for institutions of higher education. To receive the classification, campuses must complete an application and respond to questions by providing evidence that demonstrates a commitment to sustaining and increasing their community engagement efforts (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Many of the application questions relate to policies and practices that affect faculty careers. For example, the 2015 Community Engagement Classification application asked institutions to describe relevant professional development opportunities and ways in which faculty community engagement is incentivized, recognized, and rewarded. These questions are important, as research has shown that faculty members are central to campus community engagement efforts (O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011).

Yet, the 2015 Community Engagement Classification application failed to capture the contributions of and supports for non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), an ever-growing segment of the faculty population (Burgan, 2006; Hoeller, 2014). This is not surprising, as few institutions collect data about their NTTF or have adequate structures to support their careers (Kezar, 2012; New Faculty Majority [NFM], 2014). However, until the classification application requests this information, it is impossible to know what role NTTF play in the larger institutional commitment to community engagement. If the institutionalization of community engagement is heavily dependent upon faculty, then future advancement of community engagement will be increasingly dependent on NTTF as well.

This paper seeks to answer two key questions. First, unless campuses facilitate and encourage the full participation of NTTF, can institutions truly maximize their community engagement potential? Second, if fair treatment of faculty is a form of community engagement in and of itself, do institutions that subject their NTTF to unfair wages and working conditions deserve the community engagement classification?

We begin with a rationale for why "community-engaged" institutions must support NTTF and their efforts to become community engaged. These reasons are rooted in the Carnegie Foundation's definition of community engagement, namely in its emphasis on valuing the assets of all and its commitment to promoting democratic values such as fairness, inclusiveness, equal treatment, and equal benefits (Carnegie, 2015). We then use Sturm's (2006) theory of full participation to contextualize the barriers NTTF face in their efforts to become community engaged. These barriers are described through a literature review of NTTF-related policies and

practices. Examples of how these barriers affect community-engaged institutions are integrated throughout the review, as are recommendations for revising the Community Engagement Classification application. The discussion section explains how a revised application could serve as a catalyst for change and provide an opportunity for campuses to positively distinguish themselves from their peer institutions. It also emphasizes the importance of using context-based solutions to improve existing policies and practices (Kezar, 2013). The paper concludes with implications for stakeholders and limitations to implementing our recommendations.

"If Not Us, Then Who?" — Recognizing the Value of All Faculty

Since the 1970s, higher education institutions have become increasingly reliant on adjunct and/or part-time faculty (Altbach et al., 2005; Ballantyne et al., 2010; Burgan, 2006; Clark et al., 2011; Dolan et al., 2013; Ehrenberg, 2012; Hoeller, 2014; Langen, 2011; Thyer, Myers, & Nugent, 2011). According to Hoeller (2014), from 1970 to 2011, the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty increased by 35.6%, while the number of part-time faculty increased by 305.3%. Today, nearly three fourths of all faculty members at degree-granting institutions are off the tenure track (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Hoeller, 2014; Maisto, 2014). As more tenured faculty approach retirement age, and institutions look for additional cost-cutting measures, these numbers will continue to climb (Bland et al., 1997).

Since the majority of faculty are off the tenure-track, we believe that institutions cannot—and should not—be considered "community engaged" unless their NTTF are also participating in community engagement efforts. Institutions that fail to engage their NTTF in these efforts unnecessarily limit the efficiency and effectiveness of their work. For example, at Midwestern University[1], a large, public research institution, NTTF teach 70% of service-learning courses. Clearly, Midwestern University would be less community engaged without the help of its NTTF.

"And Justice for All": Promoting Democratic Values Off *and* On Campus

On September 1, 2013, the death of 83-year-old Margaret Vojtko captured the attention of higher education instructors across the United States (Pathe, 2014; Sanchez, 2013). For 25 years, Vojtko had served as a part-time NTT French instructor at Duquesne University, a Carnegie community-engaged institution, earning just $10,000 a year. Then, just months

---

[1] Pseudonyms are used throughout this paper to protect the identity of Carnegie Community Engagement Classification applicants.

before her death, Vojtko learned that her teaching contract had not been renewed. Distraught, she attended a preliminary meeting of Duquesne's adjunct faculty and representatives from the United Steelworkers. At the meeting, Vojtko asserted her belief that she and other NTT faculty deserved a living wage and basic employment benefits. With the remnants of her meager earnings, Vojtko was struggling to pay mounting medical bills, the result of a recent cancer diagnosis. That September, impoverished and nearly homeless, Vojtko died of a heart attack.

Unfortunately, Vojtko's story is not an anomaly. A distressing number of contingent and NTT faculty struggle to make ends meet—which is hardly surprising, given their low wages. In 2014, the average contingent faculty member earned just $2,700 per three-credit course (NFM, 2014). Unfortunately, many institutions choose to hire NTTF *because* of their ability to provide cheap labor (Burgan, 2006; Hoeller, 2014). Hoeller (2014) described this shift toward low-wage faculty as the "Walmartization" of academe. Rather than hire salaried full-time workers with long-term job security, colleges and universities are opting to hire NTT workers and pay them much less. However, as Bland et al (2006) warned, even if these cost savings prove to be shortsighted, campuses that have adapted to the lower costs of adjuncts are unlikely to revert back to hiring tenure-track faculty.

This trend is especially distressing given the demographics of NTTF and the institutions they serve. Women are 10 to 15% more likely to be hired off the tenure track, thus exacerbating the income disparity (i.e., 27%) between men and women faculty (Gappa, Austin, Trice, 2007). Additionally, nearly 73% of underrepresented minority faculty hold NTT positions (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). It is also important to note that NTTF are most prevalent at two-year institutions; in fact, they comprise 82% of all instructors at public two-year institutions (Maisto, 2014). Such institutions are more likely than their four-year colleges and universities to serve low-income and first-generation students, as well as students of color (American Association of Community Colleges, 2015).

We write this paper in the wake of the first ever National Walk-Out Day (February 25, 2015), when many adjunct and NTTF activists staged walk-outs, teach-ins, and rallies, in hopes of drawing attention to their second-class treatment and subpar working conditions (Flaherty & Mulhere, 2015). Participating faculty hailed from dozens of diverse American institutions, including more than two dozen Carnegie community-engaged campuses. It is possible that, at many such campuses, faculty were simply acting in solidarity with NTTF at less justice-oriented institutions. However, it is just as likely that the NTTF at these community-engaged institutions were dissatisfied with their own teaching and learning conditions. If the latter is true, it could

be symptomatic of a major discrepancy between community-engaged institutions' commitment to their surrounding communities and their commitment to their own faculty and staff. This is especially unfortunate given that many NTTF are also members of the very communities community-engaged institutions seek to help. These circumstances raise the question of whether these institutions deserve accolades for community engagement unless they are committed to promoting social justice both off and on campus. This means that, in addition to providing support to surrounding communities, community-engaged institutions should also commit to providing an equitable work environment for their faculty and staff, regardless of their rank or appointment type.

We recognize that NTTF are not a monolithic group. For example, 28% of NTTF hold full-time positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). The experiences of these full-time faculty likely differ from those of the remaining 72% who hold part-time NTTF appointments. Moreover, the status and pay of NTTF vary widely across disciplines and institutions. In some fields, such as business or economics, well-paid "celebrity" faculty are more common. For example, in 2013, General David Petraeus was offered $200,000 to act as a visiting professor at the Macaulay Honors College of the City University of New York (Peralta, 2013). Such instances are rare, however. Few institutions—community-engaged or not—provide adequate compensation and/or supports for their NTTF. As this paper demonstrates, this lack of support has negative repercussions for faculty and students alike. It also limits NTTF's ability to fully participate in their institution's community engagement efforts.

Methodology

This research was informed by our review of extant literature about policies and practices affecting NTTF, as well as an analysis of 2010 and 2015 applications for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Our goal was to review a representative sample of applications; thus, we selected eight applications from various institutional types (two community colleges, two regional comprehensive institutions, two liberal arts colleges, and two large research institutions) and geographical regions. Our sample included both public and private institutions. Each institution's application was read closely for information pertaining to the contributions of and supports for NTTF (e.g., faculty reward systems, access to resources, professional development).

We also reviewed the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application itself. Our goal was to determine the extent to which its questions were inclusive of NTTF. By

acknowledging gaps in the current application, we were able to make literature-informed recommendations for the 2020 edition.

Conceptual Framework

In the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application, NTTF were all but invisible. Campuses were not asked to report NTTF-specific data or examples, and few voluntarily did so. Encouraging institutions to recognize and acknowledge their "invisible" faculty is a critical first step, but it is not enough. To be truly community engaged, campuses must also facilitate and encourage the full participation of their NTTF. Thus, in this section, we introduce Sturm's (2006, 2010) "full participation" framework, which provides an important context for the literature review and recommendations that follow.

Sturm's Full Participation Framework

According to Sturm (2006), "full participation" is an affirmative, institutional perspective focused on creating settings that enable people—regardless of their identity, background, or position—to realize their capabilities, meaningfully engage in institutional operations, and ultimately succeed. It includes "the institutional conditions that enable people in different roles to flourish ... [and] covers the continuum of decisions and practices affecting who joins institutions, whether they feel respected and valued, how their work is conducted and supported, and what kinds of activities count as important" (Sturm et al., 2011, p. 4). The full participation framework highlights the ways in which institutional conditions shape individuals' commitment to institutional activities. It emphasizes that, when individuals feel they are valued, their work supported, and their activities meaningful, they are able to fully participate in the work of their environment.

Sturm's (2006, 2010) full participation framework has been employed to conceptualize how university structures promote or inhibit the diverse work of university faculty and administrators. However, much of higher education lacks the architecture to support Sturm's full participation. Indeed, women and racial minorities consistently report that institutional structures prevent them from fully engaging in university activities (Sturm, 2006, 2007). For example, it is well documented that faculty of color engage in more interdisciplinary work than their White peers (Baez, 2000; Milem, 2004; Stanley, 2006); yet, the appointment, promotion, and tenure process rarely allows interdisciplinary centers to submit meaningful commentary

during the review process. This makes it difficult for faculty of color to feel like they and their research activities are valued, supported, and meaningful.

We argue that NTTF, who are increasingly women and racial minorities (Gappa et al., 2007), are also constrained by current institutional arrangements and face steep hurdles to fully participate in university activities, specifically community engagement. Because "achieving full participation requires a critical assessment of the obstacles facing groups at various institutional locations that shape inclusion and advancement" (Sturm et al., 2011, p. 4), we reviewed NTTF literature to identify relevant institutional barriers. Our analyses of these barriers informed our recommendations regarding the Carnegie Community Engagement application. In the following section, we explain how these barriers are manifested and how a revised Carnegie application can illuminate them as obstacles to NTTF's full participation.

NTTF and Community Engagement: Relevant Policies and Practices

NTTF face a number of barriers that restrict their ability to fully participate in community engagement efforts (Kezar, 2012; NFM, 2014). Many of these challenges are the result of ineffective or substandard institutional policies and practices. In this section, we identify 10 key areas of improvement and propose revisions to the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application.

We believe that, by asking institutions to report on adjunct-specific data points and thoughtfully weigh their responses during the application process, Carnegie could catalyze necessary reforms. This would not be the first time institutions have adjusted their behavior based on external data requests. In fact, many "prestige-seeking" institutions, hoping to advance in regional and national rankings, actively adjust their behavior based on what is evaluated by the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings (Brewer, Gates, & Goldman, 2002; Gnolek, Falciano, & Kuncl, 2012). We believe that asking institutions to report data about NTTF to Carnegie would similarly motivate them to reflect on and improve their current policies and practices.

Recruitment and Hiring

Faculty should be hired based on their individual qualifications and their ability to serve an institution, its students, and the surrounding community. For example, at Jesuit University, all tenure-track applicants must write a letter explaining how they could contribute to the institution's mission. Some institutions, like La Cima Community College, have even begun to

include community engagement and/or service-learning experience in their minimum qualifications for faculty positions. Such changes can help prospective faculty identify good-fit institutions, while also helping community-engaged institutions identify good-fit faculty.

Unfortunately, the recruitment and hiring process for NTTF is often decentralized, unsystematic, and harried (Maisto, 2014). For instance, it is not uncommon for NTTF to be chosen based on their schedule availability, rather than their merit or ability to enhance the campus community. By asking institutions to describe how community-engagement credentials factor into their tenure-track and NTT faculty hiring processes, Carnegie could spur institutions to reconsider their recruitment and hiring practices.

Job Security

Short-term contracts and unpredictable course loads contribute to the constant turnover of NTTF (Maisto, 2014). They also impede the full participation of NTTF in campus community-engagement efforts. As Maslow's (1987) hierarchy of needs suggests, people must have their basic needs met (e.g. food, housing, safety) before they can focus on higher-order needs, such as community involvement. Thus, faculty who are concerned about their financial and career stability may lack the mental and emotional energy needed to fully participate in community engagement work.

Short-term contracts also run counter to best practices for community partnerships, which are most effective when long-term relationships and formal obligations exist between faculty and community partners. Short-term, episodic, and uncoordinated NTT faculty hiring undermines the potential for establishing effective, sustained, and respectful partnerships.

By offering multi-year, renewable contracts, institutions can help NTTF feel confident that their basic needs will be met, freeing them to participate more fully in community engagement efforts. Thus, we recommend that the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application ask institutions about their protocols for renewing NTTF contracts and assigning course loads.

Compensation and Benefits

In 2009, *Money* magazine ranked "college professor" number three on its "50 Best Jobs in America" list (Hoeller, 2014). However, this ranking ignores the frustrations of adjuncts and NTTF, who are 7% less likely than tenured/tenure-track faculty to be satisfied with their

salaries, 14% less likely to be satisfied with their benefits, and 9% less likely to be satisfied with their jobs overall (Hoeller, 2014).

These frustrations are warranted. Most NTTF are only compensated for their teaching time (Hoeller, 2014). Of the 12 Carnegie applications we reviewed, just two—those of Northwest and Cedarwood—alluded to any kind of research funding for NTTF. Time spent holding office hours, sitting in meetings, preparing for class, or participating in professional development is almost always off the clock. As a result, the average NTTF member earns just one third as much as tenured and tenure-track professors and is far less likely to receive pay raises, benefits, or promotions (Caruth & Caruth, 2013).

The situation is even direr for adjunct faculty, many of whom are intentionally kept at part-time status. In 2014, the average annual earnings for adjunct faculty was $25,000, and the median was just $22,000 (NFM, 2014). Thus, to earn as much (on average, $47,500) as their full-time faculty counterparts, the average adjunct would need to teach 17 courses per year.

As Margaret Vojtko's story demonstrates, benefits can be just as important as pay; yet, only 25% of adjunct faculty receive *any* kind of employment benefits. Too often, NTTF are forced to supplement their meager earnings with public services and supports, such as Medicaid, earned income tax credits, child tax credits, and food stamps (NFM, 2014). Such supports are critical for a functioning civil society; however, America's finite tax dollars should not be used to subsidize the exploitation of highly skilled workers to the tune of $13,645 a year per underemployed faculty member. Non-tenure-track faculty are community members, too. Just like their off-campus counterparts, they deserve adequate employment benefits.

It is also important to recognize that poorly compensated faculty may be forced to teach at multiple locations, inhibiting their ability to participate fully on any one campus. In a recent survey of contingent faculty, 48% of respondents reported working at two institutions, 27% at three, and 13% at four or more (NFM, 2014). Under such tumultuous conditions, few NTTF would be able to develop robust community engagement projects.

If institutions want to recruit and retain a talented pool of instructors, they must provide *all* of their faculty with some semblance of a living wage. When possible, NTTF should also be compensated for select out-of-class work, particularly community engagement. An expectation that all faculty participate in community engagement efforts—such as at La Cima Community College—rings hollow and unjust if faculty themselves are struggling to get by on limited finances. Moreover, would-be community engagement leaders could easily become discouraged and resentful if they are "voluntold" to perform unpaid work for their employer(s).

We recognize that not all institutions have the resources to compensate their faculty at rates commensurate with their credentials and experience. That being said, those who *can* pay should. Suggested reforms include offering a single salary and pay-raise scale for all professors, paying NTTF for nonteaching duties, and prorating the pay of part-time faculty to the teaching pay received by full-time faculty (Hoeller, 2014). We recommend that, in its next application cycle, Carnegie ask institutions about their compensation for NTTF teaching, non-teaching, and community engagement efforts, as well as the benefits NTTF receive.

Access to Resources

To participate fully in their campus communities, NTTF must have sufficient access to institutional resources. However, many NTTF lack bare essentials, such as office space, clerical support, and supplies (Hoeller, 2014), and even NTTF who report having such resources often have compromised access (Maisto, 2014). A survey of such faculty (NFM, 2014) revealed that, two weeks before their classes started, just 45% had library privileges, 35% had office space, and 32% had curriculum guidelines. Moreover, 34% said that they had not received sample syllabi for the courses they were teaching.

Without basic resources, NTTF will struggle to spearhead or even participate in meaningful community engagement work. As Sturm and colleagues (2011) explained, full participation requires "the institutional conditions that enable people in different roles to flourish." Thus, NTTF who are denied these conditions may feel ambivalent about devoting more of their time and energy to an institution that shows little regard for their needs. Consequently, we recommend that Carnegie require campuses to detail the extent to which institutional resources supporting faculty community engagement are available to NTTF.

Promotion and Evaluation

NTTF are far less likely than their tenured or tenure-track peers to receive opportunities for promotion (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). Few are given full evaluations (Maisto, 2014), and even when evaluated, there are few bonuses for exemplary performance, and NTTF rarely have any kind of appeals process (Hoeller, 2014). Moreover, whereas tenured or tenure-track faculty evaluate NTTF, NTTF are rarely, if ever, allowed to provide feedback on the teaching of tenure-track faculty. This can exacerbate strained relationships between the two factions.

All NTTF deserve full—and fair—evaluations. Such evaluations provide an opportunity for institutions to recognize good teaching, as well as community engagement efforts. They also

contribute to a more just work environment, wherein NTTF feel like their work is acknowledged, important, and factored into decisions about contract renewals and promotions.

It is also essential that faculty reward systems "count" community engagement toward promotion and tenure decisions. At one institution we reviewed (Cedarwood), one third of faculty who received tenure in the previous five years taught some form of service-learning curriculum. However, it is unclear whether their use of service-learning methods directly impacted their chances of receiving tenure.

The current Carnegie application already asks a number of questions about the ways in which community engagement is factored into faculty reward systems. However, none of these questions explicitly mention NTTF. As such, we suggest that Carnegie require institutions to describe their promotion, evaluation, and or contract renewal processes for NTTF.

Professional Development and Training

Non-tenure-track faculty can be very effective teachers (Morton, 2012; Thyer, Myers, & Nugent, 2011). They are often able to infuse their teaching with real-world perspectives, teach courses during off-peak hours (enabling institutions to serve more students), and focus on their teaching rather than pressures to publish (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). However, the overwhelming majority of NTT and adjunct faculty lack the professional development and training provided to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Clark et al., 2011; Dolan et al., 2013; Halcrow & Olson, 2008; Morton, 2012). In a recent survey, 89% of NTTF said they received no professional support from their respective institutions (NFM, 2014). Without meaningful professional development, these faculty are more likely than their tenured or tenure-track peers to rely on traditional pedagogical methods (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). This is significant because students report higher levels of engagement when their instructors employ active and experiential learning techniques (Umbach & Wawryzynski, 2005).

Several of the institutional applications we reviewed offered a wide range of professional development and training opportunities to their tenured and tenure-track faculty. However, given that NTTF now represent the majority, campuses that want to maximize the number of students who receive exposure to rich, community-engaged curriculum and instruction must find ways to provide relevant professional development and training opportunities to their NTTF as well. This professional development can take many forms. For example, the Center for Community and Civic Engagement at La Cima Community College helps recruit and train faculty. Additionally, the district-wide Center for Learning and Instruction sponsors "Service-

Learning" days for faculty, wherein faculty are trained to incorporate service-learning into existing courses and/or create new courses dedicated exclusively to service learning. Other suggestions include handbooks, workshops, webinars, brown-bag lunches, one-stop-shop resource centers, designated faculty coordinators/mentors, faculty interest/inquiry/innovation groups, and conference funding (Ballantyne et al., 2010; Clark et al., 2011; Dolan et al., 2013; Jacobson, 2013; Morton, 2012).

Neglecting to provide these supports may negatively impact NTTF morale, retention, and productivity, as well as student learning (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). It is imperative therefore that future Carnegie application cycles encourage and reward institutions that make NTTF professional development a priority.

Academic Freedom

The American Association of University Professors' 1940 "Statement of Principles" clearly articulates the importance of ensuring academic freedom for higher education faculty (Hoeller, 2014). However, this freedom has been contingent on faculty members' tenure status. In recent years, many NTTF have reported that their lack of academic freedom inhibits their ability to use innovative curricula and pedagogies, such as those employed in service-learning courses (NFM, 2014). It also prevents some from holding their students to rigorous academic standards, out of fear that doing so will negatively impact their course evaluations.

Non-tenure-track faculty are more effective when they can advocate for themselves and their students without fear of retaliation (NFM, 2014). Moreover, institutions cannot expect NTTF to participate fully in their campus engagement efforts until all faculty are provided with the security and peace of mind that academic freedom brings. Without the full participation of NTTF, community-engaged institutions will never be able to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of their community engagement efforts. As such, Carnegie should use the Community Engagement Classification application as a means to encourage and reward institutions that commit to providing some degree of academic freedom to their NTTF.

Unionization

Faculty working conditions are inextricably linked to student learning conditions (Maisto, 2012). Thus, NTTF must have the ability to advocate for adequate working conditions (e.g., fair salaries, formalized grievance procedures, predictable course loads) without fear of retaliation. Faculty unions give NTTF this ability. They also provide NTTF with the security

they need to develop innovative curricula and establish institutional roots while facilitating open communication among NTTF, tenured, and tenure/track faculty, and administrators (Burgan, 2006; Hoeller, 2014; Maisto, 2012).

Some scholars, like Hoeller (2014) and Rhoades (1998), have expressed skepticism about faculty unions' ability to work in the interest of NTTF. They fear that tenured and tenure-track faculty—who are often overrepresented on bargaining teams—will always act in their own interest, effectively ignoring the plight of their NTT colleagues. However, faculty unions at several postsecondary institutions have successfully secured better working conditions for their NTT colleagues. For example, the Massachusetts Community College Council recently raised NTTF pay (including pay for campus meetings and training sessions) and offered job protections to its 5,000 part-time faculty members (Brownlee, 2015). Similarly, Klamath Community College established a grievance process, workload limits, pay raises, and email addresses for its NTTF. The union at Eastern Washington University was able to tie faculty salaries to market rates, resulting in raises as high as $18,0000. Additionally, in 2014, adjunct faculty at Tufts University gained the right to form a union affiliated with the Service Employees International Union (Flaherty, 2014); as a result, many Tufts adjuncts became eligible for higher pay and extended contracts, as well as an opportunity to interview for full-time positions at the university.

According to Halcrow and Olson (2008), America's NTTF are like "fine wine at discount prices" (p. 1) which can be poured down the drain whenever problems arise (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). Such faculty disempowerment is incongruent with community engagement principles. By inquiring about faculty union membership, Carnegie can help ensure that all faculty have a valued voice at their respective institutions.

Shared Governance

The shared governance model—which brings together the voices of faculty, administrators, and trustees—is a signature feature of academe (Olson, 2009). However, few NTTF are invited to participate in departmental meetings or campus committees, in which they could contribute ideas for community engagement, as well as general recommendations (Maisto, 2014). Those who do participate are rarely compensated for their service (Heoller, 2014). This is disconcerting, given the number of NTTF with significant community engagement experience. Often, these individuals have deep insight into community needs as well as effective community engagement strategies.

Sturm (2006) explained that, to elicit full participation of their faculty, institutions must allow their employees to engage meaningfully in institutional operations. This engagement is impossible for NTTF unless they are permitted to have a voice at both the departmental and institutional levels. Carnegie can encourage this engagement by asking institutions whether their NTTF are invited and paid to participate in campus decision-making bodies.

Faculty Reward Systems

While many faculty are personally motivated to participate in community engagement, these efforts should still be acknowledged fully and valued by faculty reward systems (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). As Sturm et al. (2011) explained, faculty need to feel "respected and valued," and often this is linked directly to "what activities count as important" in the eyes of the university (p. 4). Ward (2005) agreed: "No matter how clear the mission statement or presidential proclamation to connect the campus with the community, [if community engagement is] unrewarded or seen by faculty as distracting from the pursuit of those kinds of things that count on a dossier, either those public service efforts will be set aside, or the faculty member will be" (p. 229). Unfortunately, faculty of all ranks have reported that community engagement is not rewarded formally by their institutions' reward systems (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Aguirre, 2000). To remedy this, institutions must align their reward systems with their rhetoric about community engagement (NFM, 2014).

Since faculty cannot receive credit for their community engagement efforts if it is not documented, we recommend that in addition to requiring institution to specify what mechanisms exist for tracking student and/or faculty participation in community engagement work, the 2020 Carnegie application should also ask campuses to describe how, if at all, these tracking mechanisms vary by faculty rank and/or tenure status.

Similarly, although in previous application cycles institutions have been asked to cite specific examples from faculty handbooks or other policy documents of how they reward community engagement, they have not been required to tease out how, if at all, these rewards vary across faculty ranks and or tenure statuses. Including these clarifying questions on future applications would make it easy for both Carnegie and classification-seeking campuses to identify discrepancies and gaps in their existing reward system policies.

Discussion

Sturm's (2006, 2010) theory of full participation calls for institutions to critically assess organizational practices and policies that determine who is—and who is not—included in the prevailing definitions of institutional operations. There is already a substantial body of higher education research that describes how underrepresented faculty groups, such as racial minorities and women, are systematically disadvantaged by organizational practices, policies, and cultures (Acker, 1990, 2006; Sturm, 2006). However, we assert that NTTF, too, have been discounted from many dominant understandings of faculty careers in higher education, as evidenced by our literature review.

Fortunately, there is an emergent call to action from numerous higher education stakeholders and policy organizations to reduce these barriers. As Hoeller (2014) observed, "The contingent faculty movement is a civil and human rights movement. The time has come for direct action. Higher education is not simply another commodity produced by American factories. It is the building block of our culture and our democracy" (p. 151). We join this call to action and offer our recommendations for the 2020 Community Engagement Classification application. Incorporating these recommendations will enable Carnegie to catalyze several positive changes relating to NTTF.

Community Engagement with Full Participation

The Carnegie Foundation currently defines community engagement as the "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie, 2015). The Community Engagement Classification channels this understanding and operationalizes the requirements of engagement through a variety of qualitatively rich criteria items related to faculty careers such as professional development, tenure, and promotion.

Yet, many of these questions are firmly grounded in assumptions surrounding tenure-track faculty careers and do not take into consideration—or make mention of—the unique circumstances of vulnerable NTTF populations. As such, we ask, can institutions truly be community engaged if they subject their NTTF, who are increasingly women and minorities and constitute as much as 76% of all faculty, to substandard policies and practices? Sturm and colleagues (2011) noted, "Campuses advancing full participation are engaged campuses that are both in and of the community, participating in reciprocal, mutually beneficial partnerships

between campus and community" (p. 4). That is, colleges and universities supporting surrounding communities are also *of* those communities and must support institutional actors who commit to these efforts. As such, they must purposefully design structures that encourage and enable NTTF to engage in community engagement.

We recognize that transformative social and cultural change of this size takes time. Additionally, given the nascence of the NTTF movement, many institutions have only recently begun to collect data related to NTTF careers. Therefore, it may be difficult, at least initially, for institutions to collect and report the NTTF data we recommended Carnegie capture in the application cycle. Differences in resources, size, organizational culture, and institutional type may also have an effect. For example, better resourced institutions may be better able to collect and report this data than less resourced institutions.

In light of these realities, Kezar (2013) recommended that institutions utilize context-based solutions rather than top-down recommendations. This is ideal, as the full participation framework details that institutions have unique architectural systems for inclusion. Top-down changes that do not take into consideration current institutional arrangements could do more harm than good. Kezar (2013) further suggested that resource-strapped institutions begin their reform process by going after the "low-hanging fruit." For example, community colleges may find it easier to improve socializing mechanisms for NTTF such as orientation, professional development, and mentoring rather than to increase pay.

Limitations

There are two notable limitations to this paper. First, our recommendations are grounded in the belief that "if you build it, [they] will come." We feel that the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification is an ideal tool for inciting institutions to rewrite policies and reconsider practices that create barriers for NTTF to commit to community engagement efforts. Yet, many institutions do not collect systematic data about their NTTF, and many more may not document their NTTF's community engagement practices. If these recommendations are adopted, institutions may have difficulty at first answering NTTF-related inquiries on the revised classification application. However, we maintain that these recommendations are essential since they will place Carnegie at the forefront of instigating positive change for NTTF. While it may prove difficult—at least initially—for some institutions to "come" once the application is "built," these first steps are essential for creating a culture that allows NTTF to participate fully in institutional community engagement efforts. In order to alleviate this

limitation, we recommend that Carnegie alert classification-seeking institutions to upcoming application changes as soon as possible so that campuses have time to start collecting the necessary data.

Secondly, we recognize that numerous factors (e.g., campus size, institutional type, endowment size) will affect institutions' ability to track and support NTTF in time for the 2020 application cycle. For example, a highly selective, well-endowed research university may be better able to develop and/or strengthen NTTF supports and collect NTTF data than a small regional comprehensive institution. Carnegie should take such factors into consideration when reviewing applications for the 2020 cycle.

Implications and Conclusion

The original intent of the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification process was to catalyze meaningful institutional transformation (Giles, Sandmann, & Saltmarsh, 2010). Our recommendations further that goal by ensuring that institutions consider the ways in which today's new faculty majority of NTTF can contribute to community engagement efforts. The benefits of these recommendations extend beyond NTTF to individuals both inside and outside higher education institutions.

Implications for Students, Faculty, and Institutions

Our suggested revisions to the 2020 Community Engagement Classification application would promote student engagement, increase faculty stability, sustain community partnerships, and better align institutional values with practices. With greater access to faculty who have training in high-impact pedagogies and more resources to offer, students could better engage in service-learning with the surrounding community. Moreover, student learning outcomes improve when students can practice what they learn in the classroom through civic action (Warren, 2012).

With increased support from their institutions, NTTF could produce better quality teaching and provide better service to students. As mentioned earlier, encouraging NTTF to take initiative in fulfilling their respective institution's mission becomes easier when these faculty feel that their positions are stable and their work is appreciated (Maslow, 1987; Sturm et al., 2011). By offering NTTF multi-year, renewable contracts, comprehensive benefits and compensation, and opportunities to participate in governance, institutions demonstrate their commitment to and appreciation of NTTF's work. Moreover, *all* faculty benefit from

professional development events, which facilitate the exchange of best practices for conducting community-engaged learning experiences.

Institutions improve and students benefit when faculty strive collectively for self-improvement. As an institution embraces its commitment to *all* of its faculty, it further embraces a mission of community engagement. By aligning values of service and equity with efforts both on and off campus, an institution serves as a model for surrounding communities. The 2020 Community Engagement Classification application can incite behavior that allows NTTF to participate fully in university functions. Campuses that demonstrate a commitment to NTTF participation will be appropriately distinguished with the community-engaged status.

Implications for Higher Education

By adopting our recommendations, the Carnegie Foundation will not only impact individual institutions but also the broader landscape of higher education. Moreover, we believe that the structural and cultural shifts that are spurred by these application changes will lift the national stigma ascribed to non-tenure track careers. Considering that women and people of color are overrepresented among NTTF, treating NTTF fairly could make higher education a leader in efforts to advance social justice for these populations. As institutions strive for equity in their practices, higher education begins to model the ethics taught to postsecondary students.

Since the Carnegie application centers on community engagement, institutions must remember that they are tasked with preparing students to be civically engaged local, national, and global citizens. Community engagement enables brilliant minds to address social issues while also developing students in the areas of problem solving, collaboration, critical and creative thinking, and intercultural knowledge. By better supporting NTTF, institutions allow these faculty to engage further in valuable pedagogical methods that prepare students to be civically minded.

We hope that asking institutions to provide NTTF-specific data will make them more conscious and considerate of these faculty in years to come. We ask, if these recommendations are implemented and *all* faculty fully participate, how might a truly community-engaged campus look different? Not only will the campus be richer in ethos and innovation, but the students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community members will be connected and produce knowledge in ways that cannot currently be fully actualized.

REFERENCES

Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(1), 5-17.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-158.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society, 20*(4), 441-464.

Aguirre, A. (2000). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 27*(6). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Altbach, P., Berdahl, R., & Gumport, P. (2005). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

American Federation of Teachers (n.d.). Our history. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/highered/about-higher-education/our-history

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). Promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty: What higher education unions can do. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED511576.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2015). Students at community colleges. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages/ studentsatcommunitycolleges.aspx

Ballantyne, S., Berret, B., & Harst, W. (2010). Fulltime faculty perceptions of leadership in adjunct faculty to maintain Franciscan identity. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, *9*, 1-9.

Bland, C. J., & Bergquist, W. H. (1997). The vitality of senior faculty members: Snow on the roof—fire in the furnace. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *25*(7). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*, 89-123.

Brewer, D., Gates, S. M., & C. A. Goldman. (2002). Conclusions: The implications of prestige seeking. In *In Pursuit of prestige: Strategy and competition in U.S. higher education* (pp. 133-152). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Brownlee, E. (2015). *Unions and non-tenure faculty*. [PowerPoint slides].

Burgan, M. (2006). *What ever happened to the faculty?: Drift and decision in higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2015). Elective community engagement classification, first-time classification documentation framework. Retrieved from http://nerche.org/images/stories/projects/Carnegie/2015/2015_first-time_framework.pdf

Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Adjunct faculty: Who are these unsung heroes of academe? *Current Issues in Education*, *16*(3), 1-11.

Clark, H. G., Moore, B. A., Johnston, L. B., & Openshaw, L. (2011). Using adjuncts in social work education: Challenges and rewards. *Social Work Education, 30*(8), 1012-1021.

Dolan, D. M., Hall, M. S., Karlsson, C. R., & Martinak, M. L. (2013). Five years later: Maryland adjuncts tell us (again) who they are and what they want. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 61*(1), 35-45.

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2012). American higher education in transition. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 26*(1), 193-216.

Flaherty, C. (2014). A model emerges. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/10/28/tufts-adjuncts-tout-pay-and-job-security-gains-first-union-contract

Flaherty, C, & Mulhere, K. (February 26, 2015). Day of protest. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/02/26/adjuncts-deem-national-walkout-day-success

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Giles, D., Sandmann, L. R., & Saltmarsh, J. (2010). Engagement and the Carnegie classification system. In H. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape: Vol. 2. Community-campus partnerships* (pp. 161-176). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Gnolek, S. L., Falciano, V. T, & Kuncl, R. W. (2012). Modeling change and variation in *U.S. News & World Report* college rankings: What would it really take to be in the Top 20? *Research in Higher Education, 55*(8), 761-779.

Halcrow, C., & Olson, M. R. (2011). Adjunct faculty: Valued resource or cheap labor? *FOCUS On Colleges, Universities & Schools*, *6*(1), 1-8.

Hoeller, K. (Ed.). 2014. *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Hoeller, K. (2015, February 16). Unions need to step up for equality. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Unions-Need-to-Step-Up-for/190053/

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy, 25*(5), 507-537.

Jaeger, A. J. & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of contingent faculty on degree completion. *Community College Review, 36*(3), 167-194.

Jeandron, C., Robinson, G., & American Association of Community Colleges. (2010). Creating a climate for service learning success. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED513943

Kezar, A. (2012). Needed policies, practices, and values: Creating a culture to support and professionalize non-tenure track faculty. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority* (pp. 2-27). New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013). Non-tenure track faculty's social construction of a supportive work environment. *Teachers College Record, 115*(12), 1-47.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2013). The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship.* Retrieved from http://agb.org/trusteeship/2013/5/changing-academic-workforce

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(2), 185-196.

Maisto, M. (2012). Taking heart, taking part: New faculty majority and the praxis of contingent faculty activism. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority* (pp.190-204). New York: Routledge.

Maisto, M. (2014). *The new faculty majority and civic engagement.* (PowerPoint slides).

Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.; R. Frager, J. Fadiman, C. McReynolds, & R. Cox, Eds.). London: Longman.

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, *58*(4), 141-147.

Milem, J. F. (2004). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence of racial dynamics in higher education.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Morton, D. R. (2012). Adjunct faculty embraced: The institution's responsibility. *Christian Education Journal, 9*(2), 398-407.

New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (2015). Carnegie community engagement classification. Retrieved from http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=601

New Faculty Majority. (2014). *The just-in-time professor. A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education. House committee on education and the workforce. Democratic staff.* Retrieved from http://democrats-edworkforce.house.gov/imo/media/doc/1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf

Olson, G. A. (2009, July 23). Exactly what is "shared governance"? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/

O'Meara, K. (2007). Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 22* (pp. 121-179). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. Smart & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 26*. (p. 161-220). New York: Springer.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is… How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal Of Community Service Learning*, *16*(1), 17-32.

O'Meara, K. A., & Rice, R. E. (eds.). (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K. A., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83-96.

Pathe, S. (2014, March 31). Homeless professor protests conditions of adjuncts. *PBS News Hour*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/making-sense/homeless-professor-protests-conditions-adjuncts/

Peralta, E. (2013, September 11). Protesters hound David Petraeus before lecture at CUNY. *NPR*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2013/09/11/221477142/protesters-hound-david-petraeus-before-lecture-at-cuny

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S.M. (2009). The institutional home for faculty engagement: An investigation of reward policies at engaged campuses. In S. Billig, B. Holland, & B. Moely (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement. Advances in service-learning research* (pp. 3-30). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Sanchez, C. (2013, September 22). The sad death of an adjunct professor sparks a labor debate. *NPR*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/2013/09/22/224946206/adjunct-professor-dies-destitute-then-sparks-debate

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(4), 701-736.

Sturm, S. (2006). The architecture of inclusion: Advancing workplace equity in higher education. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, 29*, 247-334.

Sturm, S. (2007). The architecture of inclusion: Interdisciplinary insights on pursuing institutional citizenship. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, 30*, 409-424.

Sturm, S. (2010). Activating systemic change toward full participation: The pivotal role of mission-driven institutional intermediaries. *Saint Louis Law Journal, 54,* 1117-1137.

Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education (White paper). Columbia University Law School: Center for Institutional and Social Change.

Thyer, B. A., Myers, L. L., & Nugent, W. R. (2011). Do regular social work faculty earn better student course evaluations than do adjunct faculty or doctoral students? *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *31*(4), 365-377.

Umbach, P. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 91-123.

Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(2), 153-178.

Ward, K. (2005). Rethinking faculty roles and rewards for the public good. In A. Kezar and Associates (Eds.), *Higher education and the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Warren, J. L. (2012) Does service-learning increase student learning?: A meta-analysis. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *18*(2), 56-61.

Webb, A. S., Wong, T. J., & Hubball, H. T. (2013). Professional development for adjunct teaching faculty in a research-intensive university: Engagement in scholarly approaches to teaching and learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *25*(2), 231-238.

Welch, M., & Saltmarsh, J. (2013). Current practice and infrastructures for campus centers of community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *17*(4), 25-56.

APPENDIX

Below are questions from the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application for first-time classification seekers. Recommended additions for the 2020 application, informed by our review of NTTF literature, have been highlighted in yellow.

5. I. Foundational Indicators

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision?)
Quote the mission or vision:

6. I. Foundational Indicators

2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
Describe examples of campus-wide awards and celebrations that formally recognize community engagement:

7. I. Foundational Indicators

3.a. Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution's engagement with community?
Describe the mechanisms for systematic assessment:

3.b. Does the institution aggregate and use all of its assessment data related to community engagement?
Describe how the data is used:

8. I. Foundational Indicators

4. Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc) of the institution?
Describe the materials that emphasize community engagement:

9. I. Foundational Indicators

5. Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?
Describe ways that the executive leadership explicitly promotes community engagement, e.g. annual addresses, published editorials, campus publications, etc:

10. I. Foundational Indicators

1. Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?
Describe the structure, staffing, and purpose of this coordinating infrastructure

11. I. Foundational Indicators

2.a. Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?

If yes, is any of this funding used to recruit, train, and support NTTF (e.g. conference registration, travel expenses)?
Describe the source (percentage or dollar amount) of these allocations, whether this source is permanent, and how it is used:

2.b. Is there external funding dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
If yes, is any of this funding used to recruit, train, and support NTTF (e.g. conference registration, travel expenses)?
Describe the specific external funding:

2.c. Is there fundraising directed to community engagement?
Describe fundraising activities directed to community engagement:

2.d. Does the institution invest its financial resources in the community for purposes of community engagement and community development?
Describe specific financial investments:

12. I. Foundational Indicators

3.a. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?
Describe systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms:
Specify what mechanisms exist for tracking student and faculty participation.

3.b. If yes, does the institution use the data from those mechanisms?
Describe how the institution uses the data from those mechanisms:

13. I. Foundational Indicators

4.a. Are there systemic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement?

4.b. If yes, indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for *Impact on Students*:

4c. If yes, indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for *Impact on Faculty:*

4d. If yes, indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for *Impact on Community*

4e. If yes, indicate the focus of these systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms and describe one key finding for *Impact on Institution*

4f. Does the institution use the data from the assessment mechanisms?
Describe how the institution uses the data from the assessment mechanisms:

14. I. Foundational Indicators

5. Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?

Cite specific excerpts from the institution's strategic plan that demonstrate a clear definition of community engagement and related implementation plans:

15. I. Foundational Indicators

6. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?

Describe professional development support for faculty and/or staff engaged with community:

==What, if any, professional development or training opportunities exist to encourage NTTF participation in community engagement?==

==What, if any, incentives exist to encourage NTTF participation in community engagement?==

==What, if any, recognition do NTTF receive for participation in community engagement?==

16. I. Foundational Indicators

7. Does the community have a "voice" or role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?

Describe how the community's voice is integrated into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement:

17. I. Foundational Indicators

8. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?

Describe these specific search/recruitment policies or practices:

==How, if at all, do these policies apply to NTTF?==

18. I. Foundational Indicators

9. Are there *institutional level policies* for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

If needed, use this space to describe the context for policies rewarding community-engaged scholarly work:

19. I. Foundational Indicators

10.a. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of *teaching and learning*?

==How, if at all, do these rewards vary by faculty members' rank and/or tenure status?==

Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

10.b. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of *scholarship*?

==How, if at all, do these rewards vary by faculty members' rank and/or tenure status?==

Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

10.c. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of *service*?
<mark>How, if at all, do these rewards vary by faculty members' rank and/or tenure status?</mark>
Please cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document):

20. I. Foundational Indicators

11. Are there college/school and/or departmental level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
Which colleges/scholars and/or departments? List Colleges or Departments:
What percent of total colleges/school and/or departments at the institution is represented by the list above?
Please cite three examples of colleges/school and/or departmental level policies, taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty scholarly work using community-engaged approaches and methods:
<mark>How, if at all, do these policies vary by faculty members' rank and/or tenure status?</mark>

21. I. Foundational Indicators

12. If current policies do not specifically reward community engagement, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
If yes, describe the current work in progress:

23. I. Foundational Indicators

1. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?
Describe how community engagement is noted on student transcripts:

24. I. Foundational Indicators

2. Is community engagement connected with diversity and inclusion work (for students and faculty) on your campus?
Please provide examples:

25. I. Foundational Indicators

3. Is community engagement connected to efforts aimed at student retention and success?
Please provide examples:

26. II. Categories of Community Engagement

1.a. Does the institution have a definition, standard components, and a process for identifying service learning courses?
Discuss how your institution defines service learning, the standard components for designation, and the process for identifying service learning courses:
1.b. If you have a process for designating service learning courses, how many designated, for-credit service learning courses were offered in the most recent academic year?

What percentage of total courses offered at the institution?
1.c. How many departments are presented by those courses?
What percentage of total departments at the institution?
1.d. How many faculty taught service learning courses in the most recent academic year?
What percentage of faculty at the institution?:
1.e. How many students participated in service learning courses in the most recent academic year?
What percentage of students at the institution?:
1.f. Describe how data provided in 1.b-3 above are gathered, by whom, with what frequency, and to what end:

27. II. Categories of Community Engagement

2.a. Are there *institutional (campus-wide)* learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community?
Please provide specific examples of institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

2.b. Are institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community systematically assessed?
Describe the strategy and mechanism ensuring systematic assessment of institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

2.c. If yes, describe how the assessment data related to institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community are used?

28. II. Categories of Community Engagement

3.a. Are there *departmental or disciplinary* learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community?
Provide specific examples of departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

3.b. Are departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community systematically assessed?
Describe the strategy and mechanisms ensuring systematic assessment of departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community:

3.c. If yes, describe how assessment data related to departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community are used:

29. II. Categories of Community Engagement

4.a. Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular (for credit) activities? Please select all that apply:
Student Research
Student Leadership
Internships/Co-ops

Study Abroad
For each category checked above, provide examples:

4.b. Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level in any of the following structures? Please select all that apply:
Core Courses
For each category checked above, provide examples:

30. II. Categories of Community Engagement
5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their curricular engagement achievements (research studies, conference presentations, pedagogy workshops, publications, etc.)?
Provide a minimum of five examples of faculty scholarship ==(by faculty of different ranks/appointment types)== from as many different disciplines as possible:

31. II. Categories of Community Engagement
1. Indicate which outreach programs are developed for community. Please select all that apply:
Tutoring
Extension Programs
Non-credit courses
Training programs
Professional development centers
For each category checked above, provide example:

32. II. Categories of Community Engagement
2. Which institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community?
Please select all that apply:
For each category checked above, provide examples:

33. II. Categories of Community Engagement
3. Describe representative examples of partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum = 15 partnerships). Please follow these steps:

34. II. Categories of Community Engagement
4.a. Do the institutional or departments promote attention to the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?
Describe the strategies for promoting attention to the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships:

4.b. Are there mechanisms to systematically collect and share feedback and assessment findings regarding partnerships, reciprocity and mutual benefit, both from community partners to the institution and from the institution to the community?

If yes, describe the mechanisms and how the data have been used to improve reciprocity and mutual benefit:

35. II. Categories of Community Engagement

5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnership activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, etc.)?

Provide a minimum of five examples of faculty scholarship (by faculty of different ranks/appointment types) from as many different disciplines as possible:

36. III. Wrap-Up

1. How do community engagement credentials factor into the NTTF hiring process?
2. What is your campus' protocol for renewing NTTF contracts and assigning course loads?
3. What compensation and benefits do NTTF receive for their teaching and nonteaching duties?
4. What institutional/campus resources (e.g. office space, clerical support) are available to NTTF?
5. Describe your institution's promotion and evaluation processes for NTTF.
6. What, if any, professional development and training—community engagement-related or otherwise—does your campus provide to NTTF?
7. How, if at all, do you ensure the academic freedom of your NTTF?
8. Do you have an active faculty union? To what extent are NTTF represented? Provide a minimum of three examples of how your campus' faculty union works in the interests of all faculty.
9. To what extent are NTTF encouraged to and compensated for participating on department/campus committees?

37. III. Wrap-Up

10. (Optional) Use this space to elaborate on any short-answer item(s) for which you need more space. Please specify the corresponding section and item number(s).

38. III. Wrap-Up

11. (Optional) Is there any information that was not requested that you consider significant evidence of your institution's community engagement? If so, please provide the information in this space

39. III. Wrap-Up

12. (Optional) Please provide any suggestions or comments you may have on the application process for the 2015 Elective Community Engagement Classification.

40. Request for Permission