

# DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR DEPARTMENTS AND COLLEGES ABOUT ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP IN PROMOTION AND TENURE

Diane M. Doberneck, Chris R. Glass, and John H. Schweitzer

National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement  
University Outreach and Engagement, Michigan State University

*September 2009, revised September 2011*

---

## INTRODUCTION

In 2001, Michigan State University revised its reappointment, promotion, and tenure form to encourage faculty members to report engaged scholarship during the review process. While such revisions in institutional policies are necessary, they are not sufficient for shifting academic culture at college and department levels, where the significant decisions about reappointment, promotion, and tenure often reside. On-going discussions between tenure track faculty members and administrators about how scholarly outreach and engagement is interpreted and valued in their disciplines, departments, and colleges is critical.

Based on this study's findings and the literature associated with engagement and promotion and tenure, we recommend the following guide as a set of discussion points to be used with junior faculty, faculty mentors, promotion and tenure committee members, department chairs, and college promotion review committee members. By using the principles of dialogue, it is possible to create common understandings that create a supportive climate for engaged scholarship.

1. **Outreach and engagement activities are scholarly**; that is, they are both informed by theory and evidence-based practice and the source of new knowledge and practice. The merit of scholarly outreach and engagement activities should be evaluated by clear standards of rigor and quality, just as other forms of scholarship are judged in the academy. What counts as scholarly outreach and engagement in your discipline, department, and college? What criteria do you use to judge its quality?
2. **The language associated with scholarly outreach and engagement varies by discipline**; that is, the ways of describing scholarly outreach and engagement are wide-ranging, including translational research, service learning, public humanities, civic engagement, university-community partnerships, etc. How are outreach and engagement activities described in your discipline, department, or college? What words do you commonly use to refer to scholarly outreach and engagement activities?

3. **Faculty members collaborate with their community partners in a variety of ways;** that is sometimes faculty scholarship may be described as highly engaged—with community partners collaborating at all stages of the scholarship—and other times faculty scholarship may be responsive to their community but engaged in a more limited way. This range in the degree of engagement reflects elasticity in collaboration—with faculty members making appropriate choices given the community, the context, the research problem, etc. How do you describe the different degrees of community engagement faculty members in your discipline, department, and college are involved in?
4. **Scholarly outreach and engagement activities contribute to the public good of a variety of communities beyond the campus;** that is, engaged faculty partner with different kinds of communities. For example, some communities are defined by geography (such as neighborhoods or cities), circumstance (such as surviving a disaster, belonging to the same school district), identity (such as gender, ethnicity/race), kin (such as families and family systems), affiliation (such as political party or interest group), faith (such as members of a specific religion), or profession (such as practicing professionals in a field, entrepreneurs, or specific types of businesses)—to name a few. What publics are natural partners for faculty in your discipline, department, or college to collaborate with?
5. **Faculty members collaborate with the public through different types of activities;** that is, faculty may partner with communities through research (such as applied research or community-based research), teaching and learning (such as service-learning or non-credit instruction), service (such as technical assistance, expert testimony), or economic development activities (such as patents, licenses, new business ventures). What are the common types of scholarly outreach and engagement activities in your discipline, department, and college?
6. **Scholarly outreach and engagement activities generate a range of scholarly and public products or artifacts;** that is, the evidence of engaged scholarship takes the form of peer-reviewed journal articles and conference presentations as well as other forms of scholarly work product (such as technical bulletins, evaluation reports, public performances or workshops). What are acceptable forms of evidence of scholarly outreach and engagement in your unit?
7. **Faculty members are motivated to collaborate with the public on scholarly outreach and engagement activities for a number of reasons;** that is, faculty members may be motivated because it advances practice in their field, supports student learning and student development, gives back to a community they have connections to—to name a

few reasons. What are common reasons faculty are motivated to pursue engaged scholarship in your discipline, department, or college? How do these different motivations shape scholarly engagement?

8. **Scholarly outreach and engagement activities are integrally connected to faculty responsibilities**; that is engaged research, instruction, service and commercialized activities may be viewed as part and parcel of faculty members' responsibilities and not as separate or added-on activities. In addition, there is often an interplay between engaged scholarship and a faculty member's other responsibilities. In your discipline, department, or college, how might faculty integrate their engaged scholarship and the rest of their faculty responsibilities?
9. **Faculty participation in scholarly outreach and engagement activities changes over the career span**; that is, faculty members collaborate with communities in different ways at different stages of their career. How do individual preferences and departmental (or disciplinary) expectations for faculty involvement in scholarly outreach and engagement change over time in your discipline, department, and college?
10. **Faculty members improve their engaged scholarship through conversation, collaboration and reflection with other engaged scholars**; that is, faculty members learn from one another the techniques needed to collaborate effectively and respectfully with their public(s), the strategies for publishing engaged scholarship in peer-reviewed journals, and other community and academic skills needed to be successful engaged scholars. Where do faculty members in your department find other engaged scholars to sharpen their engagement skills with and from?

## CLOSING COMMENTS

Faculty members who pursue scholarly outreach and engagement as part of their faculty responsibilities come to engagement from a variety of different personal motivations and disciplinary perspectives. Their success as engaged scholars relies on their capacity to navigate the (sometimes competing) institutional priorities, college and departmental mandates, and disciplinary obligations, in light of their individual strengths as scholars and collaborators with their respective communities or publics.

On-going dialogue in departments and colleges about successful strategies for engaged scholars to interpret and represent their scholarly outreach and engagement in the promotion and tenure process is one of the most important ways to advance engaged scholarship.

## REFERENCES

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9(1): 5-17.
- Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. A. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 13(2), 5-18.
- Bohm, D. (1997). *On Dialogue*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 114, pp. 43-52. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Diamond, R. M. & Adam, B. E. (2000). *The Disciplines Speak II: More statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work for faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Diamond, R. M. & Adam, B. E. (1995). *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work for faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 14(4), 5-35.
- Ellinor, L. & Gerard, G. (1998). *Dialogue: Rediscover the transforming power of conversation*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Ellison, J. & Eatman, T, K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.
- Enos, S. & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Building partnerships for service learning* (pp. 20-41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40(3), 286-300.
- Gilchrist, A. (2007). *The well-connected community: A networking approach to community development*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Bristol UK: The Policy Press.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(1), 7-30.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2009, November). Summary of the 2001 revisions to the reappointment, promotion, and tenure form at Michigan State University: Expanding the definition of scholarship to include engagement. *The Engagement Exchange*, 1. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. Available at: [http://www.ncsue.msu.edu/files/EngagementExchange\\_No.1\\_Jan2010.pdf](http://www.ncsue.msu.edu/files/EngagementExchange_No.1_Jan2010.pdf).

- Glass, C. R., & Fitzgerald, H. E. (2010). Engaged scholarship: Historical roots, contemporary challenges. In H.E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship contemporary landscapes, future directions, volume 1* (pp. 9-24). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Glassick, C. E., Humber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship reassessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Holland, B. A. (2004). Analyzing institutional commitment to engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4, 30-41.
- Ife, J. (2002). *Community development: Creating community alternatives—Vision, analysis, and practice*. Melbourne, Australia: Longman.
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York, NY: Currency.
- Jordan, C. (Ed.). (2007). *The community engaged scholarship review, promotion, and tenure package*. Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Available at: <http://www.ccpb.info/>.
- Kaner, S., Lind, L., Toldi, C., Fisk, S. & Berger, D. (1996). *Facilitator's guide to participatory decision-making*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Marsh, G. (1999). The community of circumstance—a tale of three cities: Community participation in Lewisham, St. Kilda, and Knox. In D. A. Chekki (Ed.), *Research in Community Sociology: Vol. 9. Varieties of community sociology* (pp. 65-86). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Mattessich, P., Monsey, B., & Roy, C. (1997). *Community building: What makes it work—A review of factors influencing successful community building*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Michigan State University. (2006, revised 2009). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University. Available at: [http://www.outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod\\_2009ed.pdf](http://www.outreach.msu.edu/documents/pod_2009ed.pdf).
- Newmann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- North Carolina State University. (2006). *Values North Carolina State holds dear and six associated realms of faculty responsibility*. Available from: [http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/scholarship\\_engagement/engagement.html](http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/scholarship_engagement/engagement.html).
- North Carolina State University. (2010). *Integrating learning, discovery, and engagement through the scholarship of engagement: Report of the scholarship of engagement task force North Carolina State University*. Available at: <http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/documents/SET2010.pdf>.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2008). Motivation for Faculty Community Engagement: Learning From Exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12(1):7-29.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Jaeger, A. J. (2006). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: Barriers, facilitators, models, and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 11(3): 3-26.

- Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp>
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Schirch, L., & Camp, D. (2007). *The little book of dialogue for difficult subjects: A practical hands-on guide*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York, NY: Crown Business.
- Stanton, T. K. (2008). New Times Demand New Scholarship: Opportunities and Challenges for Civic Engagement at Research Universities. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice* 3(1):19-42.
- Thornton, C. H. & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). The role of culture in institutional and individual approaches to civic responsibility at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education* 79(2): 160-182.
- Wade, A. & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 15(2): 5-16.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### **Diane M. Doberneck, Ph.D.**

Researcher, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement and Adjunct Assistant Professor, Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program  
Em: connordm@msu.edu

### **Chris R. Glass**

Doctoral candidate in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education Department  
Em: crglass@msu.edu

### **John H. Schweitzer, Ph.D.**

Professor Urban Affairs, Center for Community and Economic Development and frequent contributor to research at the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement  
Em: schweit1@msu.edu

### **Suggested citation for this document:**

Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011, September). *Discussion guide for departments and colleges about engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement.

© Board of Trustees, Michigan State University 2011