Outside the Margins: Promotion and Tenure with a Public Scholarship Platform

Mary Hutchinson
Penn State University, Lehigh Valley

Engagement and outreach scholarship has been encouraged among faculty to address the challenge of bringing university resources to meet the needs of society. However, a divide persists, especially apparent at research-focused universities, between the encouraging rhetoric about engagement and the actual reward structure through the promotion and tenure process. This article culls the literature on engaged scholarship to explore this divide, tracing the origins, evolution, and principles for success involved in linking scholarship to community needs in the context of a research-focused institution. The article advocates a two-pronged approach to garner support and respect for this research platform.

Surely, American higher education is imaginative and creative enough to support and reward not only those scholars uniquely gifted in research but also those who excel in the integration and application of knowledge, as well as those especially adept in the scholarship of teaching.

Ernest Boyer

Introduction

The theory and practice of community engagement and public outreach are indebted to Boyer's (1990) breakthrough monograph, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Kezar, 2000). Boyer "hoped to change how academia views scholarship in all the missions of research institutions—learning, engagement, and research. . . [by] apply[ing] the standards of good scholarship across all the missions of the research university, not just its research mission" (Richmond, 2001, para 10). Boyer (1990) described his belief in scholarship not as "an esoteric appendage," but as a vital part of "what the profession is all about" (p. 1). That he was not calling for an overhaul of the promotion and tenure system (as some have, e.g., Chait, 1997; Levitt, 2007; Williams & Cici, 2007) is important, particularly in relation to universities focused on research. Instead, what Boyer called for was the need "to define the work of faculty in ways that enrich, rather than restrict, the quality of campus life" (Boyer, p. 1). Marek (2003) described Boyer's "broadened definition of scholarship" as the "ways in which many faculty members might, and do, use their skills and interests far beyond the traditional scope of scholarship defined as publication in refereed venues" (p. 45).

So, what was Boyer's (1990) new vision of scholarship? What was proposed was "a more comprehensive, more dynamic understanding of schol-

arship. . . [that] might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions" (p. 16):

1. The scholarship of discovery includes research that "contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university" (p. 17).
2. The scholarship of integration involves "making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way. . . work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research" (pp. 18-19).
3. The scholarship of application "moves toward engagement and asks questions about how knowledge can "be responsibly applied to consequential problems" or how it can "be helpful to individuals as well as institutions" (p. 21).
4. The scholarship of teaching is viewed as "a dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning" (p. 23).

As Barker (2004) pointed out, Boyer himself later on "argued that his own framework should be further broadened to include the scholarship of engagement. . . [which] consists of (1) research, teaching, integration, and application scholarship that (2) incorporates reciprocal practices of civic engagement into the production of knowledge" (p. 124). Boyer's plea did not go unnoticed. In fact, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the independent policy and research center which developed the trademark "Carnegie Classification for Institutions of Higher Education," added in 2006, "The Elective Classification on Community Engagement" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.). This engagement "was defined broadly 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'" (Driscoll, 2008, p. 39). Institutions apply for this classification in order to be recognized for their engagement work; as of 2010, 115 institutions (61 public; 54 private) representing 34 states received this designation (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.).

This work led to calls for change across institution types, including a number of notable research institutions, such as Michigan State University and Portland State University. In 2010, one prominent research university published a pamphlet promoting the necessity of instituting a "University-wide dialogue" about "a model of scholarship for the 21st century that equitably recognizes the full range of teaching, research, and service scholarship" (Hyman et al., 2000, p. i). The proposed scheme set forth a multidimensional model that integrated Boyer's four general views of discovery, integration, application and teaching. The authors called for the need to expand both faculty and

administrators' perspectives to recognize the value of outreach scholarship to the university and to society. Notably, ten years after this publication, in a new forward entitled "Still a Work in Progress," one of the authors stated that "outreach and engaged scholarship can reflect legitimate and credible scholarship; [however], much work is still needed. . . to reasonably align with our rhetoric regarding engagement and the culture of scholarship" (Hyman, et al. 2000, p. ix).

This article explores two areas of public scholarship as it functions in a research university context. First, it culls the literature to explore the divide in research-focused institutions between the encouraging rhetoric about public scholarship as it typically functions in the research university environment and the actual reward structure through the promotion and tenure process. This investigation focuses on the culture and rewards for engaged scholars generally, as opposed to exploring this literature through a specific disciplinary lens. Second, the article examines the principles for success involved in linking scholarship to community needs in the context of a research-focused institution and advocates a two-pronged approach to garner support and respect for this research platform.

The Gap between Rhetoric and Application

It has now been over two decades since Boyer's seminal work was published. Where do things stand in higher education institutions that not only promote but reward scholars for this integrated approach to research, particularly in universities who articulate mission-based goals for engagement? Sometimes the gap between rhetoric and application is expansive. Indeed, some recent research supports the premise that getting tenure in colleges and universities with public and outreach scholarship as the centerpiece of a faculty member's work remains a challenge at best, particularly in research-focused universities. However, as Vogelgesang, Denson, and Jayakumar (2010) stated, "faculty commitment to community can transcend a non-conducive reward structure" (p. 467). The following sections trace the origins and evolution of engagement scholarship in research-focused institutions and address what a public scholar can do to increase the chances for success in the promotion and tenure process.

The Evolution of Engagement

The rhetoric/application divide was evident even among early pioneers in engagement and outreach scholarship. Data collected in a case study examining the "tensions" between research and teaching among a group of "committed undergraduate teachers" at a "research-intensive" institution indicated issues surrounding the legitimacy of this scholarship:

A major point of agreement among the interviewees was that re-search outranked teaching in the university's faculty reward system, and that externally funded research and publication in appropriate outlets were essential for not only promotion and tenure but also for maintaining esteem in the eyes of one's peers. According to one natural scientist, one not doing the right type and amount of research would "never be accepted as a legitimate, card-carrying member of the faculty." (Serow, 2000, p. 453)

The rhetoric/application divide has been particularly apparent in the field of service-learning (a vital pinion in the outreach edifice). Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan (2002) found in some institutions that "faculty members are specifically told that engaged scholarship will not get them tenured or promot-ed – yet at the same time [they] are encouraged to have community involve-ments and develop pedagogies such as service-learning" (p. 7). Hellebrandt (2006), in a study of service-learning research, ascertained that "while service-learning scholarship is important," it has not necessarily been recognized in the promotion and tenure process:

Indeed, even if tenure and promotion are not strong motivators for faculty to teach a service-learning class, institutional resistance to recognize and reward faculty service-learning scholarship with ten-ure or promotion is very likely to have a negative impact on depart-ments' engagement efforts. (p. 924)

In the general field of engagement scholarship, Braxton, Luckey, and Hellend (2002) ascertained that despite all the attention, "findings strongly in-dicate that the scholarship of discovery [the more traditional forms of research] persists as the most legitimate and preferred objective of faculty scholarly engagement across the spectrum of institutions of higher education" (p. 104).

In "Fulfilling the Public-Service Mission in Higher Education: 21st Century Challenges," Jaeger and Thornton (2006) touched upon one of the reasons that public and outreach scholarship is discouraged for tenure-track faculty:

For most faculty at research institutions, excellence in research, publication prestige, and adequate teaching and institutional service are the hallmarks of a successful dossier. . . . With policies in place to reward public service in the tenure process, faculty still did not pursue this work because they did not believe that the review com-mittees, which most highly value research, would follow the policies. (p. 35)

Bloomgarden and O'Meara (2007) also noticed this trend in their study of

faculty with "a commitment to community work." They discovered that "none of the faculty members interviewed for this study made a local community challenge an agenda item for their research. . . . All of this was true despite the fact that this institution has gained national recognition for its commitment to engagement" (p. 13).

The focus on "publishing productivity" appears to be the main draw-back to engaging in alternative forms of scholarship, particularly at institutions that privilege "traditional scholarly products (e.g., peer-reviewed journal arti-cles and scholarly books) over products more commonly resulting from com-munity-based efforts (e.g., reports, presentations, position papers, curriculum and professional development materials, grant applications)" (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007, p. 7). A 2006 report from the Modern Language Association accentuates this state of affairs, noting that "over 62% of all departments report that publication has increased in importance in tenure decisions over the last ten years" (p. 10). Edgerton (2005) underscored this finding:

> At the same time, it's clear. . . that there has been lots of confusion at the campus level about what the various dimensions of scholarship really entail, and how these should be documented and evaluated. The discussion seems to have resulted in a somewhat more inclu-sive view of what activities and products deserve to be regarded as scholarly. But this view, in most cases, simply lies on top of existing practices. It has not generated new practices. Nor has there been any letup in the pressure to do research. (p. xiii)

In an earlier study of whether or not it was possible to fulfill the obliga-tions of the modern day scholar in the areas of research, teaching and service, Fairweather (2002) found that only 22% of the faculty were able to truly meet these expectations (p. 43). Fairweather discovered that "simultaneously achieving high levels of productivity in teaching and research – the com-plete faculty member – is relatively rare" (p. 44). Jordan, Wong, Jungnickel, Joosten, Leugers, and Shields (2009) agreed:

> In an era when community-engaged approaches to teaching, research and service scholarship are touted as pathways to eliminating the gap between theory and practice, and a valuable approach to addressing pressing societal challenges, community-engaged scholars still have to work harder than their more traditional institutionally-focused peers to vie successfully for promotion and tenure. (p. 81)

These conditions may lead untenured faculty at research-focused institutions to eschew public scholarship endeavors if they believe that tenure and promo-tion decisions are based primarily on the "narrow and specific definitions of scholarship, namely the production of publishable, disciplinary-based research"

(Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007, p. 15). The impact of this decision can be detrimental, however, not only to faculty, but to institutions and the communities they serve:

> Today's system of tenure and promotion extracts a high price. It is costly to communities, as it deprives them of relationships with educational partners. It is costly to faculty artists and scholars who find it difficult to make their public and community-based intellectual and artistic work count at tenure time. And it is costly to students looking to the curriculum for opportunities for significant public work. (Cantor & Lavine, 2006, para. 6)

Even when higher education institutions acknowledge outreach scholarship in their promotion and tenure process, that does not always equate to change. O'Meara (2005), in a study involving Chief Academic Officers to assess "the impact of policy efforts to encourage multiple forms of scholarship in faculty roles and rewards" (p. 479), found that the data "did not consistently show that initiating formal policy reform increases faculty chances of success in promotion and tenure decisions" (p. 505). Although O'Meara stated that "interpreting these findings...is slippery and must be done carefully" (p. 505), her conclusions nevertheless underscore the disconnect that exists between the rhetoric of higher education and the actual practice of recognizing and rewarding engagement scholarship in promotion and tenure reviews. As Cantor and Lavine (2006) boldly asserted,

> . . . higher-education leaders claim that [they] want creative scholars who are also committed to the public good. [They] brag about the fabulous work of [their] engaged faculty, whose ranks frequently include professors of color and women in underrepresented fields— just the kinds of scholars [they'd] like to attract and keep. But often that engagement is not what gets them promoted. (para. 6)

Hurtado and Sharkness (2008) also uncovered this detachment: "Assessments of the quality of scholarship. . . do not always reward new kinds of scholarship; in many cases, traditional tenure review processes discourage innovation and serve to reinforce existing disciplinary paradigms" (para. 1). Driscoll (2005), an outreach scholar in her own right and a consulting scholar for the Carnegie Foundation, stated that "there continues to be an unspoken message that these products and results [of alternative forms of scholarship] must be accompanied by traditional, refereed publications to be rewarded as scholarship" (p. 42). Driscoll continued that this focus on research publication productivity has undoubtedly had an impact on engagement scholarship:

> It is not uncommon for administrators to advise new faculty to wait until after they have been granted tenure before pursuing the scholar-

ship of civic engagement. There is a spirit (even on engaged campuses) of being 'safe,' of staying within the box of traditional scholarship to protect academic positions. With that kind of message, one can hardly blame a new scholar for deciding that pioneering work is too risky. (p. 42)

Jacoby and Hollander (2009) concurred with this finding: "In most universities . . . engaged scholarship. . . is not valued as highly as traditional discipline-based research" (p. 229).

Part of the problem may be with the current criteria for determining promotion and tenure decisions. In a review of "national and institutional resources" as well as promotion and tenure guidelines at five large state research universities, Jordan et al. (2009) revealed three significant findings:

1. [T]he various RPT [review, promotion and tenure] criteria. . . lacked key competencies of CES [community engaged scholarship] necessary to establish a common language and understanding between community-engaged scholars and RPT committees
2. [E]xisting definitions of CES seemed, at times, to miss the spirit of CES and demonstrated a lack of recognition of the community as a valid source that could evaluate the competency of a community-engaged scholar
3. [T]he field lacked tools and resources for both community-engaged scholars and RPT committees. (p. 67)

This data presents a picture of why it might be difficult for engagement scholars at research-focused institutions, regardless of their disciplines, to be recognized for their work. Indeed, O'Meara (2005) discovered that in "traditional institutions" (those that rewarded more conventional forms of scholarship), only 36% of "engagement scholars were reported to be successful" in the promotion and tenure process (p. 498). Despite these statistics, Vogelgesang, Denson, and Jayakumar (2010), in their study of the role that institutions play in supporting engaged scholarship and strengthening faculty commitment to this kind of research, found "interesting patterns and trends suggesting that institutional support can encourage faculty to practice engaged forms of scholarship" (p. 465).

Recently, great strides have been made in what O'Meara (2005) called "reform institutions," i.e., "campuses that initiated formal reforms to encourage multiple forms of scholarship" (p. 501), but numerous more traditional institutions still struggle to make sense of this type of scholarly work. As Ellison and Eatman (2008) stated, "particularly in research universities, the words 'public' and 'scholarship' continue to live on different planets" (p. xi). Nevertheless,

there are approaches that public scholars can take to increase the success for linking scholarship to community needs in the context of a research-focused institution.

What is a Public Scholar to Do?

A number of institutions have worked hard to try and change policies so that engagement scholarship becomes a more recognized and rewarded research agenda, and there exist faculty who have benefitted from these changes (for discussions about research-focused universities, see Evans, Grace, & Roen, 2005; Langseth, Plater, & Dillon, 2004; Rueter & Bauer, 2005; Sandman, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009). Much of this push can be credited to the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, which "affirms that a university or college has institutionalized engagement with community in its identity, culture and commitments" (Driscoll, 2009, p. 5). Evidence from the 2006 applications for this classification indicated "shifting institutional identity so that community engagement is both deep and pervasive across the institution is a long and difficult process" (Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, & Buglione, 2009, p. 34). Nevertheless, "most [institutions] felt they could articulate a clear way that engagement could be included, evaluated, and counted in a promotion and tenure application process" (Holland, 2009, p. 93), although "the level of institutionalization is difficult to measure in part because the nature of community engagement itself challenges some of the traditional values and indicators of academic prestige and performance" (p. 86). Saltmarsh et al. (2009) found that institutions making headway had revised policies and procedures that "exhibit a quality of establishing conceptual clarity around community engagement, address engagement across the faculty roles, and are grounded in reciprocity" (p. 29).

Junior faculty who want to immerse themselves in this kind of scholarship, particularly if they are in research-focused institutions, need to be aware of the obstacles that exist but also the possibilities for overcoming them. Eschenfelder (2009) asserted that "despite the extensive workload and rigor," engaged scholarship has "tremendous benefits to the community [and] rich accounts that can result from such research" (p. 1). And, as Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan (2001) stated, "those faculty who do succeed in building scholarship around community-based learning provide models to colleagues and more importantly promote institutional change around faculty roles and rewards" (p. 49). The answer for garnering support and respect for a public scholarship platform and increasing the odds of a successful promotion and tenure review may be in understanding and undertaking a two-pronged approach that involves both audience and advocacy.

Audience

Public scholars at research institutions need to be aware of the importance of addressing an audience who may or may not understand their work. One of the more influential earlier works is the guidebook developed by Driscoll and Lynton (1999), *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Service and Outreach*. As Rice stated in the book's foreword, Lynton's work, in particular, "led the way in recognizing that in order to reconnect the generating of academic knowledge to the needs of a knowledge-dependent society we would have to broaden our understanding of what counts as scholarly work for faculty and what is rewarded" (p. ix). The authors argued that this requires "adequate documentation processes," which consist of "a combination of narrative, explanatory, and illustrative material that allows the faculty member's peers to understand his or her purpose and process as well as the outcomes" (p. 7).

Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) also devoted a chapter in their book to the importance of documentation, particularly for scholars who are having their work evaluated under the rubric of Boyer's scholarship of discovery. Recognizing that "a scholar's research is best represented by peer-reviewed publications and standard indicators of its reception in the scholarly community: grants, book reviews, awards, invitations to speak, and the like" (p. 48), they acknowledge that the key to success is providing persuasive and tangible evidence of scholarly work:

> . . . the reflective essay that we propose would pay more attention to the context and process of the project, to help colleagues, especially those in other fields, understand the goals guiding the work, the preparation, the choice of methods, the significance of results, the various ways in which the findings have been presented, the steps taken for reflection and critique. (p. 48)

They believe that "the presentation of scholarship is a public act [that] must ultimately be known and understood by at least the members of that special audience" (p. 32). Public scholars need to find ways to showcase their work in such a way to make it recognizable to others, particularly those faculty who know little about outreach and engagement. These researchers emphasize that "presentation involves a sense of audience and careful attention to the best ways of reaching each of its members" (p. 32). In other words, "quite simply, scholars must communicate well" (p. 32).

However, it must also be understood that "all engagement is not scholarship" (Baker, 2001, p. 10). Therefore, it is imperative that engaged scholarship "be held to the same basic standards as research scholarship" (Baker, p. 144) and be guided by "qualitative standards," such as those proposed by

Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997): "Public Scholarship should include goals, appropriate methodology, adequate preparation, benefit to audiences/ partners, impact, peer-review, and have an evaluation component" (Baker, p. 144).

Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan (2002) proposed a multifaceted approach to presenting engagement scholarship that includes planning, documentation, behavior, and process. They advocate that faculty "be mission driven" and tailor their work toward what the institution states as its mission (p. 7). These engagement scholars discuss the need to adapt the narrative of the dossier in very precise and unambiguous ways, making sure to address the "connections" to the institutional mission while at the same time "framing" the work around Boyer's model of scholarship (p. 7).

In addition to making sure a faculty member's vision and the mission of the institution are aligned, these researchers suggest "creating linkages" – the idea of making "clear links" between the narrative of the dossier and "traditional scholarship" (p. 8). Because the legitimacy of public scholarship is sometimes called into question (Braxton, Luckey, & Hellend, 2002; Diamond, 2005; Kezar & Rhoads, 2001; Serow, 2000), it is important to present a picture to faculty with more traditional research paradigms that this engagement scholarship employs the same kinds of scientific rigor and methodology. This picture should clearly "demonstrate how your community engagement is relevant to your discipline, and how this work contributes to scholarship in your field" (Gelmon & Agre-Kippenhan, 2002, p. 8).

Peters, Jordan, Alter, and Bridger (2003), in a paper examining "the craft of public scholarship in land-grant education," identified a number of "skills and commitments" that public scholars must have in order to be successful. They discussed the "dual nature" of this type of scholarship that on the one hand uses knowledge and theory to "help citizens and communities address public problems," and on the other, helps to advance "knowledge and theory" in the scholar's discipline or field (p. 83). The capacity to sustain this dual focus requires "the ability to communicate their work so as to create genuine critical dialogue about its premises and findings, and the ability to transpose public problems into the problematics of their disciplines" (p. 84).

Calleson, Kauper-Brown, and Seifer (2005) support this notion of focusing on what the institution deems important, urging faculty to "pay attention to how [their] personal vision fits with the mission of the institution and department where [they] work" ("Personal Mission and Individual Vision," para. 1). These three researchers, who were part of an initiative to develop a "toolkit" that helps faculty to "carefully plan and document" engaged scholarship, are clear about the downside of not making these connections, stating that scholars "may face burnout trying to meet demands for advancement that do not fit with

[their] own needs for meaningful work" or may experience the feeling of investing too much time and "energy to trying to reshape the institution to allow greater expression of [their] own vision" ("Personal Mission and Individual Vision," para. 1).

Barge and Shockley-Zalabak (2008) reinforce the idea of making one's scholarship, whether it is community-based or more conventional, an extension of or support for the overall goals of the institution:

> Scholarship, whether engaged or more traditional, occurs within the context of larger institutions where traditions, values, and constraints influence all forms of activity. To advance our argument for increased engaged scholarship requires us to examine opportunities and constraints within the academic institutions and professional associations in which engaged scholarship is most likely to be situated. (p. 259)

Jordan (2007) also advises faculty to package engaged scholarship in a way that will allay any concerns about it. The idea is to encourage faculty to focus their career statements or narratives "to illustrate how CES enhances the rigor of their research or teaching, the reach of their work, community impact, and student outcomes" (p. 10). In addition, faculty need to "document their work to be scholarly, in that it creates, advances, or extends knowledge" (p. 10). These illustrations of scholarly rigor, reach, impact, outcomes, and advances are crucial because they enable both internal and external reviewers of an outreach scholar's dossier to make connections with this engagement work.

Advocacy

Few people would deny the importance of garnering support from others who can help to advance an agenda. Junior faculty engaged in public scholarship most likely have these kinds of advocacy skills, as they are in close contact with communities whose mission is directly tied to affecting change. The overall goal for these faculty, then, is to promote their work internally through both traditional and non-traditional venues. In most cases, junior faculty will need to gain backing from faculty whose research paradigm is more traditional. Although it is challenging for public scholars to present their work in comprehensible terms to more conventional-minded faculty, it nevertheless can be done. Driscoll and Lynton (1999) advocate for the development of a "shared campus knowledge base," whereby faculty and administrators, through common readings and discussions, can become "familiar" with service and outreach scholarship (p. 83). Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan (2002) recommend becoming your own advocate, stating that "going through the tenure and promotion process is like writing your dissertation – no one else cares about it nearly as much as you do" (p. 9).

Additionally, engagement scholarship involves time demands that are not typical for more traditional researchers. In reality, "commitment to the process of developing relationships with communities and working through an iterative process of developing useful products can take years" (Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005, p. 320). One strategy for dealing with the demands of engagement and the requirements for publication are to involve others in the research process. Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe, and Rosaen (2000) encourage public scholars to find non-traditional ways to work with their community partners:

> Among the strategies we used to foster this process were involving community members in disseminating information (for example, as conference co-presenters or co-authors), writing about the process of our work, conducting and disseminating formative evaluations, and documenting the scholarship in our outreach work. (p. 49)

Calleson, Kauper-Brown, and Seifer (2005) suggest that public scholars develop an integrated approach to community-based scholarship, focusing on the integration of the three pillars of promotion and tenure: research, teaching, and service. In addition, they cite the critical importance of mentoring as a crucial means of "developing and sustaining community-engaged scholarship and gaining the confidence to navigate the promotion and tenure process." The idea of mentoring in professional settings is not new. As Landis (1990) stated, "mentoring provides a systematic process for orienting protégés to their professional roles and responsibilities while they learn the ropes within their particular organizations" (p. 26). Although the "personal reasons for forming these relationships vary from individual to individual" (p. 27), the mentor/protégé relationship is integral in the public scholarship arena because it provides the mechanism through which faculty develop skills in "both navigating the demands of promotion and tenure at a particular institution" as well as "exploring and gaining entree and proficiency in a scholarly field" (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, & Seifer, 2005, "Mentoring at a Distance," para. 1). Mentoring not only offers faculty an avenue for gaining insight and access to other more established scholars, but it can connect them to a professional network of community-based researchers. The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health provides a database of faculty mentors and portfolio reviewers for public scholars interested in establishing more formal structure to this relationship (Calleson, Kauper-Brown, & Seifer, 2005).

Ellison and Eatman (2008), in a discussion about "pathways for public engagement at different career stages" (p. 21), offer a hypothetical example of the kinds of activities in which an untenured faculty member might participate in order to be successful in the promotion and tenure process. Once they have made the commitment to this kind of scholarship, they should begin "building a

knowledge for public scholarship" through the process of mapping the "people, programs and pathways" within the campus community that will provide faculty with the kinds of support they need over the next six years of the tenure process (p. 14).

Jordan et al. (2009) strongly urge engaged scholars to take on the responsibility to "legitimize their scholarship" (p. 81). In order to fully accept this obligation, faculty need to do three key things:

1. They need to become change leaders in the transformation process (cf., Kotter, 1995),
2. They need to validate and create methodologies that demonstrate "scientific rigor" and community impact, and
3. They need to make the case that community-based scholarship "is much more effectively transitioned from theory into practice when it is done in context." (p. 81)

One way to make public scholarship more justifiable is to engage other faculty, particularly those who are not outreach scholars, to get involved in a research project. Ellison and Eatman (2008) encourage junior faculty to "join a campus-community project team" and "explore collaborative publication" (p. 14). Although this cross-disciplinary approach may be second nature in public scholarship, faculty should be aware of the concerns associated with these border-crossing activities. Hurtado and Sharkness (2008) state that "although the university should be an ideal environment for work across disciplines, properly valuing and rewarding such work has been a perennial problem" (para. 6). Nevertheless, engaging faculty outside the public scholarship arena may help them to see the value in this work and possibly lead them to acknowledge and reward these endeavors later on.

Another collaborative idea is for public scholars to find other tenured faculty interested in engaged research and establish connections with them. This might be a challenge for faculty who do not have access to peers working in public spaces, but opportunities exists beyond the walls of the institution. Indeed, there are a number of professional associations devoted to public scholarship where like-minded faculty can meet and develop networks of support, which is particularly important at the sixth-year review.

Conclusion

The promotion and tenure process, particularly at research-focused universities, is challenging at best, but especially so for those faculty involved in public scholarship. Higher education institutions have made some progress over the years since Boyer (1990) urged them into "a more comprehensive, more dynamic understanding of scholarship" (p. 16). This is important prog-

ress and we should not let that go by unnoticed. In the nomenclature of the women's movement, for each scholar who gets recognized in part for what he or she does to work in tandem with the community to address societal problems and get rewarded for it, there is one more crack in the traditional promotion and tenure ceiling. Unfortunately, the panacea that Boyer had hoped to see is far from reality, particularly for junior faculty, who are often evaluated by tenured professors with more conventional research trajectories and perhaps little knowledge of what engagement is and how it fits into the tenure process. Despite these conditions, community engagement scholarship is important and this good work needs to continue. The faculty who are willing and able to toil outside the margins and get recognized for this research will serve as the foundation on which future public scholars can build and expand on this important work.

References

Baker, D.A. (2001). The evaluation of university-community engagement scholarship within the college level promotion and tenure process. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 123-137.

Barge, J. K. & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). Engaged scholarship and the creation of useful organizational knowledge, *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 251-265.

Bloomgarden, A. & O'Meara, K. (2007). Harmony or cacophony? Faculty role integration and community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(2), 5-18.

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

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

Braxton, J.M., Luckey, W. & Hellend, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains.* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/John Wiley Periodicals.

Calleson, D.C., Jordan, C. & Seifer, S.D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 80*(4), 317-321.

Calleson D.C., Kauper-Brown J. & Seifer S.D. (2005). *Community-engaged scholarship toolkit.* Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info

Cantor, N. & Lavine, S.D. (2006). Taking public scholarship seriously. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 June, B20.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.). Classification description: Community engagement elective classification. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php

Chait, R. (1997). Thawing the cold war over tenure: Why academe needs more employment options. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7 February, B4.

Diamond, R.M. (2005). Scholarship reconsidered: Barriers to change. In O'Meara, K. & Rice, R.E. (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (55-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community. In Sandman, L., Thornton, C.H., & Jaeger, A.J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions* (5-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community engagement classifications: Intentions and insights. *Change*, Jan/Feb, 39-41. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/elibrary/Driscoll.pdf

Driscoll, A. (2005). Tracing the scholarship of engagement through my professional memoirs. In O'Meara, K. & Rice, R.E. (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (39-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. & Lynton, E. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. [ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 441 392]

Edgerton, R. (2005). Foreward. In O'Meara, K.A. & Rice, R. E. (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (xii). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ellison, J. & Eatman, T.K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university.* Syracuse, NY: Imagining America. Retrieved from http://www.imaginingamerica.org/IApdfs/TTI_REPORT%20FINAL%205.2.08.pdf

Eschenfelder, B. (2009). *Addressing tenure and promotion challenges for engaged scholars*. Position paper for 7th Aspen Conference on Engaged Communication Scholarship. Retrieved from www.engagingcomm.com/Eschenfelder.pdf

Evans, D., Grace, J. & Roen, D. (2005). Signs of change at a research-extensive university: Promoting the scholarship of teaching and learning at Arizona State University. In O'Meara, K.A. & Rice, R. E. (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (209-229). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fairweather, J.S. (2002). The Mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26-48.

Gelmon, S.B. & Agre-Kippenhan, S. (2002). *Promotion, tenure, and the engaged scholar: Keeping the scholarship of engagement in the review process.* Retrieved from https://www.usm.maine.edu/son/facultyhandbook/pdfs/promotionarticle.pdf

Gelmon, S.B., Holland, B.A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T. & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed:*

Evaluation of the professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hellebrandt, J. (2006). Spanish service-learning research from 1999-2003: Effects on faculty, department, community and discipline. *Hispania, 89*(4), 919-926.

Holland, B.A. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified community engagement institutions. In Sandman, L., Thornton, C.H., & Jaeger, A.J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions* (85-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hurtado, S. & Sharkness, J. (2008). Scholarship is changing, and so must tenure review. *Academe Online, 94*(5). Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/SO/Feat/hurt.htm

Hyman, D., Ayers, J.E., Cash, E. H., Fahnline, D. E., Gold, D. P. Gurgevich, E. A., Herrmann, R. O., Jurs, P. C., Roth, D. E., Swisher, J. D., Whittington, M. S., & Wright, H.S. (2000). *UniScope 2000: A multidimensional model of scholarship for the 21st century.* University Park, PA: The UniSCOPE Learning Community.

Jacoby, B. & Hollander, E. (2009). Securing the future of civic engagement in higher education. In Jacoby, B. & Associates. (Eds.), *Civic engagement and higher education: Concepts and practices* (227-248). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Jaeger, A. J. & Thornton, C.H. (2004). Fulfilling the public-service mission in higher education: 21st century challenges. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 84*(4), 34-35.

Jordan, C.M. (Ed.). (2007). *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package.* Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf

Jordan, C.M., Wong, K.A., Jungnickel, P.W., Joosten, Y.A., Leugers, R.C. & Shields, S.L. (2009) The community-engaged scholarship review promotion and tenure package: A guide for faculty and committee members. *Metropolitan Universities, 20*(2), 66-86.

Kezar, A. (2000). Higher education research at the millennium: Still trees without fruit? *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(4), 443-468.

Kezar, A. & Rhoads, R.A. (2001). The Dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A Philosophical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 148-171.

Landis, M.C. (1990). Mentoring as a professional development tool. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 38*(1), 26-30.

Langseth, M., Plater, W. & Dillon, S. (Eds.) (2004). *Public work and the academy: An administrator's guide to civic engagement and service learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levitt, S. D. (2007). The Freakonomics of tenure. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 23 March, B4.

Marek, J.E. (2003). "Scholarship reconsidered" Ten years after and the small college. *Profession*, 44-54.

Modern Language Association. 2006. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

O'Meara, K.A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(5), 479-510.

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

Peters, S.J., Jordan, N.R., Alter, T.R., & Bridger, J.C. (2003). The craft of public scholarship in land-grant education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 8*(1), 75-86.

Richmond, R.C. (2001). Keeping a broad perspective on research. E*valuating Research Productivity*, No. 105. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~masc/publications/2001whitepaper/richmond.html

Rueter, J. & Bauer, T. (2005). Identifying and managing university assets: A campus study of Portland State University. In O'Meara, K.A. & Rice, R. E. (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (187-208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D.E., Jr., Ward, E. & Buglione, S.M. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. In Sandman, L., Thornton, C.H., & Jaeger, A.J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions* (25-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sandmann, L.R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W. & Rosaen, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, *32*(1), 44-52.

Sandmann, L.R., Thornton, C.H., & Jaeger, A.J. (2009). *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions*. New Directions for Higher Education, Number 147. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Serow, R.C. (2000). Research and teaching at a research university. *Higher Education, 40*(4): 449-463.

Williams, W.M. & Ceci, S.J. (2007). Does tenure really work? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 March, B16.

Vogelgesang, L.J., Denson, N. & Jayakumar, U.M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(4), 437-472.

Author

Mary Hutchinson, D.Ed., is an assistant professor in ESL (English as a Second Language) Education at Penn State University, Lehigh Valley Campus. Hutchinson has published and presented as a public outreach scholar. Her research explores issues surrounding sociocultural diversity and civic engagement. Hutchinson is currently the Faculty Advisor for the Minor in Civic and Community Engagement.