

Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship: A State University System Approach

John Saltmarsh and John Wooding

Abstract

The need for new and revised structures to reward new forms of scholarship is being examined nationally and globally. It is also being examined on campuses that make up the University of Massachusetts system, all which are classified by the Carnegie Foundation for Community Engagement. This paper reports on the collective exploration by the five campuses of the University of Massachusetts to understand whether the existing academic policies sufficiently and appropriately rewarding community engagement and publically engaged scholarship enact the core mission of the University of Massachusetts to effectively generate knowledge, address social issues, and fulfill its academic and civic purposes.

Introduction

To be candid, I believe that my ‘traditional’ scholarship alone (read: grants and papers) should be strong enough for a positive tenure decision. I am still deciding on how to incorporate my engagement work into the portfolio I put together. I would like to have it be a major part of my essays on my research, teaching, and five-year plan that form part of my package, but am still not sure if this is the best strategy. I will be putting these documents together in the fall, and my strategy is to wait and see how the landscape looks at that point in time, and act accordingly.

These are the words of a faculty member in the natural sciences who is coming up for tenure review and is ambivalent about how to present her community engaged scholarship (CES). They capture the struggle over scholarly identity and the cultural politics of navigating academic systems, especially those that fail to recognize and support the kind of scholarship that defines the faculty member as a scholar. This is a common dilemma. It occurs on campuses across the U.S. when a new generation of faculty produce knowledge through new forms of scholarship encounter academic systems that fails to recognize or reward their work and prevents them from thriving as scholars. It may even end their academic careers.

The value of civic engagement and community-engaged scholarship is widely acknowledged and frequently advocated by students and faculty at universities in the U.S and internationally. Over the last several decades, recognizing the variety of forms of scholarly research and academic achievement has become commonplace on many campuses. In the U.S., the Carnegie Foundation offers a community engagement classification that assesses and validates community engagement as one critical measure of a university’s identity and success (Driscoll, 2008; Sandmann, 2009). Many faculty stress community involvement, internships, and various forms of experiential learning in their courses and view them as critical components of a university education. Across the country, numerous faculty engage in community-engaged research, work with local organizations, local businesses, and city and town governments, solve problems and help to collect data and information. Additionally, there exists a considerable literature—by and for faculty—documenting the scholarship and pedagogical impact of civic engagement strategies and the promotion of community-engaged research (Moore, 2014).

Too often, however, such activities are not rewarded or supported in the recognition and promotion process of faculty in higher education (Saltmarsh, et. al., 2009; Saltmarsh, et al., 2015; Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Faculty and universities are still judged primarily by the research profile of their individual and

combined achievements. This profile exclusively rewards traditional models that assume that all valid knowledge of the physical and social world is obtained by faculty pursuing their research agendas, and getting validation for that work in the form of peer-reviewed publications, successful grant applications, and recognition in national and international discipline-based associations.

While some universities are recognizing emerging forms of scholarship in ways that challenge this traditional model, there are powerful counterforces that undermine higher education's commitment to community engagement. The decline in funding for state universities and the competition over fewer and fewer funding opportunities have pushed many institutions to return to a narrow model of excellence built on traditional ideas about academia's function and role. Increasingly, universities are engaged in a prestige race in which the winners are defined by the presence of star faculty (i.e., those who publish widely, obtain large grant-funded research projects, and who receive wide public acclaim for their research), and by their success at recruiting top students and placing them in high paying, high skill careers. Administrators focus on encouraging these traditional activities as they seek funds from wealthy sponsors, alumni, foundations, and grant funding institutions to replace dwindling state support. The recognition of faculty committed to community engagement is often counterbalanced by institutional striving for higher prestige through narrow and restrictive measures of excellence.

Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship

As I'm sure you are aware, there have been recent reports issued by professional, academic organizations such as MLA and AHA, which call for senior faculty and administrators to update their institutional evaluations of digital/online publications, public scholarship, and written work generated by faculty's civic engagement. I seriously doubt—based on the unofficial [departmental personnel committee] report I have seen—that these recent recommendations were considered, and thus my work in these three categories was not given adequate consideration under 'research, professional and creative activity'.

This is from a woman of color at state university to her Dean in a memo prompted by problems with her promotion and tenure review. This situation points to a deep organizational problem, shared by many other universities. There are an increasing number of scholars coming into the academy, often much more diverse in every way from the faculty currently on campus, who have significant interest in emerging forms of scholarship: digital and web based publication and dissemination, complex interdisciplinary research projects, and community-engaged scholarship. At the same time, the reward policies don't provide criteria that value and guide the evaluation of these forms of research, investigation and problem solving activities now very much part of a new scholarship. When institutional policies are silent on engagement, they create disincentives for faculty to undertake community engagement across their faculty roles and often punish them when they do. Silence perpetuates what O'Meara has identified as academic "inequality regimes" of power, privilege, and oppression (2015). As Tierney and Perkins observe, "the professional reward structure needs to shift. Institutions need a diversity of routes to academic excellence and some of them will pertain to being involved outside the ivory tower... Academic work needs to have an impact in order to provide society's return on investment... For that to happen, the reward structure and those practices that socialize faculty need to shift in a way that supports engagement rather than disdains it" (2015).

At Tulane University, with leadership from the Provost and faculty, a white paper on *Academic Review and Engagement at Tulane University* was released in 2013 stating, "given the centrality of engagement to Tulane's mission and to the ongoing strategic planning process, we cannot continue to sustain a culture of academic review that is silent on engagement" (Tulane University, 2013). This is a strong statement, stressing concerns by top administrators at Tulane. This kind of leadership is extremely important as it is not enough to claim, as many campuses do, that faculty undertaking emerging forms of scholarship, like

CES, are getting through the reward and promotion system. When policies and criteria are silent on engagement, early career faculty are left to suffer the injustices of arbitrary and often capricious processes that cause real harm, personally and professionally – and institutionally.

Some campuses, and some campus leaders, will no longer be silent on engagement. At Syracuse University, with strong administrative leadership and faculty commitment, the faculty and administration went through a four- to five-year process that led to a revision of the promotion and tenure guidelines resulting in language that explicitly incorporates community engagement into the reward policies of the campus. The faculty handbook now reads:

Syracuse University is committed to longstanding traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship. Syracuse University recognizes that the role of academia is not static, and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. The University will continue to support scholars in all of these traditions, including faculty who choose to participate in publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may involve partnerships of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, creative activity, and public knowledge; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address and help solve critical social problems; and contribute to the public good (Syracuse University, 2009).

Similarly, as part of a strategic planning process, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) formed in 2009 a Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices. The task force recommended that emerging forms of scholarship be considered in tenure and promotion processes. Specifically:

1. Faculty engagement with the public outside the traditional scholarly community should be valued and evaluated during the tenure and promotion process. Faculty “engagement” refers to scholarly, creative or pedagogical activities for the public good, directed toward persons and groups outside UNC-CH.
2. New forms of scholarly work and communication made possible primarily by digital technology should be included in evaluations of scholarship.
3. Work across disciplinary lines should be supported. Expectations of all involved parties should be articulated at the outset, and referred to as tenure and promotion decisions are made (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 2009, p. 2).

In its *Academic Plan 2011* UNC-CH set forth the strategic priority of building engaged scholarship into the core culture of the campus. The plan stresses that

...because the tenure and promotion policies and criteria for most units on campus do not recognize engaged scholarship, the University should adopt the recommendations of the May 2009 University-wide Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices, which call for the inclusion of engaged scholarship and activities in departmental tenure and promotion policies and criteria. Following these recommendations, each academic unit should review and revise its tenure and promotion criteria to include engaged scholarship and activities appropriate for their discipline (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 2011).

Across the country, many campuses are at some stage of reconsidering and revising their reward structures, providing recognition for new forms of scholarship and the scholars who are producing it. And

this is critical as new young scholars, with training, goals, and values significantly different from traditional models begin their careers in our academic institutions. And they will be the life blood of the future of the academy. The young scholar we quote at the beginning of this section is part of a larger phenomenon changing higher education: a substantial number of faculty doing CES, across their faculty roles, their disciplines, and their departments.

The data on this is clear. For example, in the late 1990s, the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, attending to significant trends in American higher education, added new questions to their Faculty Survey. A number of these were aimed at assessing faculty involvement in civic engagement in their scholarship and teaching, and their perceptions of the institutional environment's support for their work. In 2004-2005, these questions appeared for the first time. An example: the survey asked, whether, in the previous two years, the faculty member "collaborated with the local community in teaching/research?" In the 2013-14 survey, 48.8% of faculty at all undergraduate campuses indicated that this was, indeed, what they were doing (Hurtado, et al., 2011). At public university campuses 50.4% of faculty stated that they had undertaken such collaborations. Among tenure track faculty, 51.1% said the same thing. The percentages are impressive: for female faculty it is 52.4%, for Hispanic faculty 55.2%. And by all institutional types, all faculty ranks, both sexes, and all race/ethnicity groups, the data indicates increases in the percent of faculty indicating community engagement in their teaching and research in every dimension from when the question was first asked a decade earlier (Saltmarsh and Hartley, forthcoming 2016). This is a significant finding. Over *half of all faculty* claim to be engaged in community-based scholarship and engagement and yet very few of our institutions recognize, legitimate or reward these activities—or know how to.

Given our concerns about lack of *real* recognition for civic engagement at many of our academic institutions, the lack of understanding and recognition of new forms of scholarship (interdisciplinary, digital, community based, etc.), and the lack of support for younger faculty from diverse and multi-cultural backgrounds who bring to the academy innovative and creative approaches to scholarship, we have been exploring what has been happening at the campuses that make up the University of Massachusetts system. In what follows we take a look at current policies, challenges and possible ways forward for this public university. We believe these issues and barriers to community-engaged scholarship at the University of Massachusetts are typical of what is going on at most of our institutions of higher learning and the campuses within most state university systems. Discussing them here, with some suggestions of how things might be improved, provides a means for developing further discussion about the significant issues facing advocates for greater and more authentic community-engaged scholarship—especially in institutions of public higher education.

University of Massachusetts

Across the five campuses of the University of Massachusetts system, academic policies are specified in various documents approved by the Board of Trustees and through faculty union collective bargaining contracts. Many of these documents are decades old or contain legacy language, reiterated through subsequent documents. Changing this language typically requires discussions with union leadership, senior administrators, faculty, trustees and senior officers of the university system's president's office. It is a daunting process. The five campuses of the University of Massachusetts system are Amherst, Boston, Dartmouth, Lowell, and the Medical School; there is single system President and individual campus Chancellors. The university faculty are fully unionized. The campuses have different bargaining units and the independence of each campus is cherished and protected. Each has its own chancellor and provost.

Most of the policy documents articulate community involvement as an area to be recognized as part of a faculty member's service obligations. This is typical and widespread—that is, community involvement is recognized as service activity, and in the context of a research university, the norm is that research and

scholarship and creative activity count the most, teaching and learning count less than scholarship, and “service” counts the least. None of the UMass policy documents specifically articulate community engagement as a part of the faculty’s teaching role or research, scholarship, and creative work. There are signs of change: as is happening at other institutions nationally, some of the campuses in the system—in particular UMass, Amherst and UMass, Boston—are exploring ways to create policies that are no longer silent on advocating or rewarding CES.

Findings

Our concern for finding better ways to recognize the work of University of Massachusetts faculty who pursue emerging forms of scholarship, including community engagement—and who encourage their students in community engagement—prompted a one-day seminar on the evaluation and reward structure for university faculty’s community engagement activities. The seminar was an opportunity to share current campus practices and processes for bringing about institutional change, to reflect on the state of current reward structures, and to consider ways to effect meaningful cultural change.

The purpose of the seminar was to explore and examine a wide range of faculty rewards (including promotion criteria, awards, faculty development support, and policies at various levels) that provide incentives and recognition to faculty for undertaking CES. Throughout our discussions, we considered community-engaged scholarship as the advancement of knowledge focusing on social issues through relationships between those in the university and those outside the university: relationships that are grounded in reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes. Such relationships are by their very nature trans-disciplinary (knowledge transcending the disciplines and the university) and asset-based (valid and legitimate knowledge exists outside the university). While the goal of “public scholarship” is for academics who create knowledge to move it beyond the ivory tower, the goal of “publicly engaged scholarship” is for academics to move beyond the ivory tower to create knowledge (Saltmarsh and Hartley, 2011).

The need for new and revised structures to reward new forms of scholarship is being examined nationally and globally. It is also being examined on campuses that make up the University of Massachusetts system. All of the campuses in the University of Massachusetts system are classified by the Carnegie Foundation for Community Engagement, and at the time of the seminar were in the process of applying for re-classification. As a part of the re-classification process, campuses address the following question: “In the period since your successful classification, what, if anything, has changed in terms of institutional policies for promotion that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?”

The central problem the seminar addressed is that most universities lack a system of incentives and supports for faculty who undertake (or are considering) CES addressing broad social impact. The policies and cultures that shape faculty behavior for career advancement have not kept pace with changes in knowledge production and dissemination. Campuses are attempting to address new and rapidly changing internal and external environments, including (1) increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty, (2) creating space for new perspectives on advancing knowledge, and (3) addressing the need for organizational change so that universities are publically accountable and have greater legitimacy (Sturm, et al, 2011). In such an environment, community engagement, publically engaged scholarship, and university-community partnerships are increasingly important ways for universities to effectively generate knowledge, address social issues, improve the human condition, and fulfill their academic and civic purposes. The central question was whether the existing academic policies sufficiently and appropriately enact the core mission of the University of Massachusetts, an “integrated tripartite mission of discovery (a public trust), education (a moral vocation), and engagement (a societal obligation)” (Williams, 2014). The

vehicles by which these issues are considered at UMass are varied and diverse. We address several of them below.

Annual Faculty Reports. The existing process for reporting and documenting faculty activity is an opportunity to signal the importance of community engagement across faculty roles. Annual Faculty Reports function primarily as a means for (1) collecting information about faculty activity on an annual basis, and (2) assessing faculty productivity for purposes of distributing merit pay. Annual Faculty Reports also serve to define faculty workload and are properly shaped in concert with the union that serves as the bargaining unit for the campus. The example from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, of having a committee of the faculty senate work with the union and the office of the Provost to implement revisions to the Annual Faculty Report, highlights the importance of this process as one way of providing recognition for community engagement. The revised Annual Faculty Report at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst now includes community engagement as an area for reporting in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. For faculty doing community engagement, they now have a way to report—and be recognized for—their community engagement across the faculty roles.

The unit that serves as the voice of faculty governance on the campus (typically the faculty senate) can serve a role in the recognition and rewarding of community engagement. It is critical that community engagement, as core academic work, fall under the purview of faculty, and not be perceived as being imposed upon the faculty by administration. An example of this exists at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, with the Faculty Senate Council on Public Engagement and Outreach, which is one of a number of councils of the faculty senate and is charged with coordinating engagement activities and policies.

Explicit Policy Criteria. While Ernest Boyer started a national conversation about reconsidering how we define scholarship in the 1990s, the conversation continues in new and perhaps more urgent ways. Boyer raised the issue of interdisciplinary scholarship in 1990 (Boyer, 1990), and the scholarship of engagement in 1996 (Boyer, 1996), but didn't foresee the prominence of digital scholarship in some disciplines and for some scholars. The key goal here is to open up space for new forms of scholarship to be adequately, appropriately, and fairly rewarded. None of these new forms of scholarship should be considered as additions to traditional forms of scholarship; if they are, then they will in fact be added on to existing faculty scholarly expectations. This creates a further burden on faculty already facing increasing workload and expectations.

Having community engagement specifically articulated in reward policies is essential. It may be that the most effective, short-term way for campuses in the system to accomplish this is through interpretive policy statements issued by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or Provost) on the respective campus. There is no substitute for leadership on this issue from the chief academic officer. For instance, in its report, the University of Massachusetts, Boston's Working Group to the Provost articulates specific recommendations for how that policy document could be written. For the long-term, a comprehensive revision of Trustee policy documents would be in order, as some of these documents date back to 1976. While policy revision is essential, it is not sufficient. Campus leaders will need to have a long-term commitment to aligning policies across campuses (and across Colleges and Departments) and to provide professional development and guidance for (1) faculty in the tenure pipeline on how to present their engaged scholarly work, and (2) faculty on personnel review committees on how to evaluate community-engaged scholarly work, and for Department Chairs.

Research Prestige. One of the seminar participants provided an observation that resonated strongly with participants at the seminar—that across the system, there is a “savage ambition” to keep elevating the research profile of each campus (based, largely, on faculty winning large federal and state grants or foundation support for their activity, and publication in prestigious journals), and that this striving can inhibit innovation and recognition of emergent scholarly work. Too often, improving the “research

profile” means growing and supporting traditional scholarship while not recognizing the values of community-engaged research and scholarship. It is important that academic leaders, particularly provosts and deans, across the system nurture an academic culture that values community engagement as scholarship that raises the profile of campuses, brings about an understanding that community-engaged research contributes to broader social impacts across the Commonwealth, and demonstrates tangible public accountability. Campus and system leaders can advance community engagement as an added value to the University. National recognition, and community engagement as core faculty work, should be viewed as contributing to the prestige of the campuses and the system. Such scholarship is valued, appreciated and understood by the Commonwealth’s citizens and their legislators. An explicit and well-publicized commitment to engaged scholarship and service to the community builds strong support among voters, political representatives and key administrators in the state.

Research Grants. Each of the campuses in the system provides internal funding opportunities for faculty research. The more campuses create funding opportunities for community-engaged research, and the more the campuses invest in these opportunities, the more incentives that are created for faculty to undertake community-engaged research; and for faculty already doing community-engaged research, they will find greater support for their research. An example of this kind of research opportunity is at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, which revised the guidelines for a longstanding “Public Service Grant.” The revised guidelines now articulate and fund community-engaged research:

As a public urban research university, one way, and possibly the best way, to foster outstanding public and community service is through community-based research and engaged scholarship...Publicly engaged scholarship involves collaborative, reciprocal partnerships that couple university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to sharpen and enrich research to increase public knowledge and better inform community service (Warren, et. al, 2014).

ScholarWorks. Each of the campus libraries has adopted ScholarWorks as a way of electronically disseminating faculty scholarship. ScholarWorks can be an important mechanism for highlighting community-engaged scholarship. An example of this is at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, which has created specific search functions that compile community-engaged scholarship and at the same time provide a platform for faculty doing community engagement, making their work more visible. This is another incentive for faculty and another means for signaling to faculty that community-engaged scholarship is valued and taken seriously.

Chief Academic Officer Leadership. As we have noted, in order for community engagement to be valued as core academic work, the Provost plays a central role in providing the leadership for the recognition and support of community engagement, diverse faculty and to innovate diverse approaches to new forms of scholarship. If there is ambiguity about the value of community engagement or inconsistent messages about it from the Provost, then deans, chairs, and faculty will be unsure about whether it is something they should embrace and advance. More than any other campus administrator, it is the Provost who sets the tone for where community engagement fits as an institutional priority for faculty and how it will be valued. Such a commitment can change a culture, as administrators and senior faculty recognize that these forms of scholarship are recognized, supported and rewarded. And changing the culture is critical.

Strategic Plan. Community engagement should be a clearly identifiable part of academic goals of the strategic plan for the campus. If community engagement is not included in the strategic plan, it will not be seen as an institutional priority, and if it is not an academic goal, then it will not be seen as the work of the faculty. Beyond vague and lofty references to public purpose and civic commitment in mission statements, and references to the importance of the campus to Massachusetts’s communities in the

campus vision statements, what is needed is the structuring of community engagement as core academic work as a priority with clear benchmarks for implementation.

Award for Community Engaged Scholarship. At both the campus level and at the system level, one way to signal the importance of community engagement is through an annual faculty award. What currently exists is a set of awards that recognize excellence for each of the segmented faculty roles – teaching, scholarship, and service. These are important, but they do not capture community engagement and the way that community-engaged scholars often integrate their faculty roles doing engaged scholarly work across teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. Historically, at UMass, there are numerous examples of faculty receiving the “service excellence” award for their community service but without recognition that their service work with the community was linked to and improved their teaching and learning role, and that both their service and teaching were linked to their research. An award that recognizes excellence in community engagement provides an important public symbol, celebrating faculty who integrate their faculty roles in deep collaboration with community partners.

Recommendations

Based on the seminar discussion and in light of activities currently ongoing across the campuses that make up the University of Massachusetts system, we proposed the following recommendations with the goal of improving and enhancing the reward structure for faculty who engage in community-engaged research and education. The recommendations were formulated for the University of Massachusetts system. They are revised below to apply to any state system.

1. Systems Office. It is critical that the system President’s Office embrace and advocate for the importance of innovative research and teaching and, in particular, for community-engaged research and education. Academic work now embraces digital publications, social networks, public presentations, training and support for community activities with public, private, and not-for-profit institutions. In short, the array of activities now considered part of an academic career transcends traditional publication and research. In order to embrace these innovations and to recognize the value of community-engaged scholarship, we recommend that the system do the following:

- Review and revise system-wide documents that relate to faculty work and expectations throughout the system to insure that they recognize and explicate new forms of scholarship, research, and pedagogy.
- The system President’s Office should make the achievement of the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification visible as a demonstration of the public accountability of the University and as a way to advance deeper community engagement across the system.

In light of this significant achievement and the value community engagement brings to the University as a whole, including the major contribution it provides as an indication to the wider public of the valuable role the University plays in contributing to the daily lives of people, we recommend that the system President’s Office create an initiative on Community Engagement that encourages and facilitates community engagement across the system. As part of the initiative, we would also recommend the following:

- The creation of an Advisory Board comprising selected faculty from each campus.
- Sponsorship of the following activities:
 - An annual system-wide meeting on best practices for community engagement, showcasing current examples of innovative scholarship and community engagement.
 - An annual system-wide award for Community Engaged Scholarship.

- An Annual Grant Program to aid and stimulate community-engaged scholarship.
- An Annual professional development opportunity that would provide faculty and senior administrators from all campuses the chance to learn about innovative scholarship and community engagement.

2. *Campus Initiatives.*

- The Chancellor and Provost on each campus should initiate a campus-wide conversation about community-engaged scholarship.
- The Chancellor of each campus should establish an annual award recognizing community engagement integrated across the faculty roles. Such an award could be framed in this way:

The Chancellor's Award emphasizes community-engaged scholarly work across faculty roles. The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of faculty roles in which teaching, research/creative activity, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member's expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution. Community-engaged scholarship (1) involves academic projects that engage faculty members and students in a collaborative and sustained manner with community groups; (2) connects university outreach with community organizational goals; (3) furthers mutual productive relationships between the university and the community; (4) entails shared authority in the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the results, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer review; (5) results in excellence in engaged scholarship through such products as peer-reviewed publications, collaborative reports, documentation of impact, and external funding, and (6) is integrated with teaching and/or with service activities (Warren, et.al, 2014, pp. 6 , 38.).

- The campus Chancellor should support the attendance of the Provost and, with the Provost, Academic Deans, at the Engagement Academy for University Leaders in order to develop leadership on campus-community engagement (<http://www.cpe.vt.edu/engagementacademy/eaul/index.html>).
- The Provost on each campus should work with the Faculty Senate (or Faculty Council) to establish a "Public Engagement Council" as a faculty committee to advance community engagement on the campus. This can be modeled on the Public Engagement Council of the Faculty Senate at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- The Provost on each campus should work with the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Union to revise policy documents such as the union contract and Annual Faculty Reports to specifically include community engagement as core faculty work.
- The Provost on each campus should issue a set of guidelines for the inclusion of community engagement in tenure and promotion such that community engagement is incorporated in each of the three categories considered in personnel matters concerning tenure and promotion—that is, scholarship, teaching, and service. It should be considered one important way to contribute to the university's mission in each area, but not as a required practice for all members of the faculty. In other words, one significant way to contribute to scholarship in a field is through community-engaged scholarship.
- The Provost should work with the campus office for teaching and learning to offer workshops for senior faculty who serve on personnel review committees aimed at developing expertise in evaluating community-engaged scholarship. Additionally, the campus office for teaching and

learning should offer workshops for junior faculty on documenting community-engaged scholarship in their tenure and promotion applications.

Conclusion

We have noted above the ways in which faculty, research, and measures of recognition are beginning to change in academia. At the same time universities, particular public institutions, are under intense pressure to cut costs, adapt to expensive new technologies, promote the prestige of their campuses, and offer programs of study that enhance their students marketability in an increasing tight job market. All these forces tend to endorse and encourage traditional scholarship and rewards. Although much has been achieved in promoting and recognizing both the diversity of scholarship and the value of community engaged research, there has been little change in the reward structures currently in place for faculty. Campus mission statements, policy statements and collective bargaining agreements are still largely silent on these matters. In addition, senior faculty who make many of the judgments about promotion and tenure for faculty (the key reward structure on our campuses) are either unaware, uninformed, or hostile to the kind of scholarship many new, community-engaged faculty are undertaking. To change these things requires a change not only in the stated goals of systems, campuses, colleges and department but also the active promotion of these activities by system presidents, chancellors, provosts and all senior administrators. Without a synergy of commitment and engagement, we will be unable to support and keep young innovative faculty, serve our students, enhance positive social change, or fulfill our mission to serve the society in which we live and work—the fundamental purposes of a public state system of higher education.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge that the seminar leading to the findings for this article was funded with a grant from Bringing Theory to Practice. The report for the funder was published as Saltmarsh, J., Wooding, J., & McLellan, K. (2014), titled: “The challenges of rewarding new forms of scholarship: Creating academic cultures that support community-engaged scholarship. A report on a Bringing Theory to Practice seminar held May 15, 2014. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.”

References

- Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1 (1), 11-20. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3824459>
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: intentions and insights. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 40 (1), 38-41. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.40.1.38-41>
- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.
- Hurtado, Sylvia, Kevin Eagan, John H. Pryor, Hannah Whang, & Serge Tran. (2012). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2010–2011 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California–Los Angeles.
- Moore, T. L. (2014). *Community-university engagement: A process for building democratic communities* (ASHE higher education report 40:2). John Wiley & Sons. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20014>
- O'Meara, K. (2015) Dismantling Inequality Regarding Scholarship. In Boyte, H. (Ed.) *Democracy's education: Public work, citizenship, and the future of colleges and universities*. Nashville, Vanderbilt University Press. pp. 126-130.
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2016). The inheritance of next generation engagement scholars. In M. Post, E. Ward, N. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publically engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education*, Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Saltmarsh, J., Warren, M. R., Krueger-Henney, P., Rivera, L., Fleming, R. K., Haig Friedman, D., & Uriarte, M. (2015 Winter) Creating an academic culture that supports community-engaged scholarship. *Diversity and Democracy* 18 (1). Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2015/winter/saltmarsh>.
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Temple University Press.
- Saltmarsh, J. Giles, D. E. Jr., O'Meara, K. Sandmann, L. R., Ward, E. & Buglione, S. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. Moely (Ed.) *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (Advances in service learning research, vol. 9). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions*. Jossey Bass.
- Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). *Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education* (White paper). New York: Columbia University Law School, Center for Institutional and Social Change.

Syracuse University. (2009). Areas of expected faculty achievement: Teaching, research, and service. In *The Faculty Manual* (18th ed.). Retrieved from <http://provost.syr.edu/faculty-support/faculty-manual/2-34-areas-of-expected-faculty-achievement-teaching-research-and-service/>.

Tierney, W. G., & Perkins, J. F. (2014). Beyond the ivory tower: Academic work in the 21st century. In G. Shaker (Ed.), *Faculty Work and the Public Good*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Tulane University. (2013). Academic review and engagement at: A white paper for discussion (Revised). Retrieved from <http://tulane.edu/provost/upload/Academic-Review-and-Engagement-February-2013.pdf>.

University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill. (2009). *Report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices* (Final report 5-8-09). Retrieved from <http://provost.unc.edu/files/2012/10/Taskforce-on-Future-Promotion-and-Tenure-Policies-and-Practices-FINAL-REPORT-5-8-09.pdf>

University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill. (2011). *Academic plan 2011*. Retrieved from <http://academicplan.unc.edu/>.

Williams, M. (2014). Remarks of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Marcellette Williams, to the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, June 4, 2014.

Warren, M., Saltmarsh, J., Krueger-Henney, P., Rivera, L., Uriarte, M., Haig Friedman, D., Fleming, R. K., Yadira Salas, D., & Ramos, L. (2014). *Advancing community-engaged scholarship and community engagement at the University of Massachusetts Boston: A report of the working group for an urban research-based action initiative*. Boston: University of Massachusetts, Boston. Retrieved from http://cdn.umb.edu/images/research/Report_on_Community_Engaged_Scholarship.pdf.

Author Information

John Saltmarsh is the director of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) (www.nerche.org) at the University of Massachusetts Boston as well as a faculty member in the Higher Education Doctoral Program in the Department of Leadership in Education in the College of Education and Human Development. He is the author, most recently, of the co-edited *Publicly Engaged Scholars: Next Generation Engagement and the Future of Higher Education* (2016).

John Saltmarsh, Director
New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)
College of Education and Human Development
University of Massachusetts Boston
100 Morrissey Blvd.
Boston, MA 02125-3393
Tel: 617-287-7743
Email: john.saltmarsh@umb.edu

John Wooding is the former Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs at UMass Lowell. He is the former chair of the Department of Regional Economic and Social Development and currently a member of the Department of Political Science. His most recent book, co-authored with Kristin Esterberg, is *Divided Conversations: Identities, Leadership and Change in Public Higher Education*.

John Wooding
Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Massachusetts, Lowell
201B Dugan Hall
883 Broadway Street
Lowell, MA 01854
978 934 4257
John_Wooding@uml.edu