

# THE ENGAGEMENT EXCHANGE

NCSUE  
NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE FOR THE  
STUDY OF UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

## Summary of the 2001 Revisions to the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Form at Michigan State University

### Expanding the Definition of Scholarship to Include Engagement

*Authors:*

*Chris R. Glass  
Diane M. Doberneck  
John Schweitzer*

*National Collaborative for the  
Study of University Engagement*

*Michigan State University*

### INTRODUCTION

In the early 1990s, simultaneous calls for a redefinition of scholarship and a realignment of faculty roles and rewards sounded throughout the academy. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, as well as several other national organizations, convened conversations and generated landmark reports urging institutions of higher education to recommit their resources to the public good (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1999, 2000). Leading higher education scholars explored, expanded, and extended definitions of what should count as scholarship. For example, Ernest Boyer opened a national dialogue around multiple definitions of scholarship—namely discovery, teaching, integration, and application (1990), and, ultimately, engagement (1996). Similarly, Lee Shulman (1998) and R. Eugene Rice (1996) focused attention on the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999), and other scholars (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Lynton, 1995) worked to promote institution-wide reforms to support these expanding definitions.

At the same time, the American Association for Higher Education hosted an annual conference on faculty roles and rewards to bring these issues to the fore. Reforms of faculty assessment, especially reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes, were made in response to expanding definitions of scholarship and refined standards of quality in the documentation of faculty work. As a result, campuses nationwide and abroad changed their promotion and tenure language and put other institutional supports in place to encourage and reward multiple forms of scholarship (Berberet, 2002; Diamond, 1995; Diamond & Adam, 1995, 2000; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; O'Meara, 1997, 2002; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Rice & Sorcinelli, 2002).

## MSU'S INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO NATIONAL TRENDS

Michigan State University (MSU) developed its own institutional response to these national trends. In 1993, a committee of faculty and administrators authored a seminal report, *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society* (Provost's Committee on University Outreach, 1993). Since that time, outreach and engagement at MSU has been defined as “a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.” The Provost's Committee also distinguished between professional service and engaged scholarship, noting that “just as in the case with teaching and research, there are outreach and non-outreach forms of service” (p. 4).

**Outreach and engagement at MSU has been defined as “a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.”**

Other significant initiatives at MSU have provided seed funding for outreach research (1991-2009); addressed planning and evaluating quality outreach (1996); developed faculty outreach portfolios (2000); revised the reappointment, promotion, and tenure form (2001); and created the annual outreach and engagement measurement instrument to document institutional impact (2005). For details about these initiatives, see Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach, 1996, rev. 2000; Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Rauhe, & Rosaen, 2000; Office of the Provost, 2001; Church, Zimmerman, Bargerstock, & Kenney, 2003; Lunsford, Church, & Zimmerman, 2007.

This edition of *The Engagement Exchange* summarizes revisions MSU made to its reappointment, promotion, and tenure form and reports findings of a recent institutional research study that examined faculty response to the revisions. We share our experience and findings in order to inform faculty and institutional leaders who are considering how to revise reappointment, promotion, and tenure priorities, policies, and forms on their own campuses.

## 2001 REVISIONS TO MSU'S REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE FORM

In 2001 Michigan State University revised its Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (RP&T) form (Form D) to encourage the reporting of scholarly outreach and engagement. A university committee composed of faculty members, University Outreach and Engagement staff, Academic Governance, and the Provost's Office thoroughly reviewed the form, engaged in the national dialogue at AAHE, and, after much deliberation, made the decision to embed opportunities to report scholarly outreach and engagement throughout the form (as opposed to adding a separate section for outreach and engagement).

This decision to embed scholarly outreach and engagement (versus to add in a special section) reflected the institution's definition and commitment to outreach and engagement as forms of scholarship, cutting across institutional missions—teaching, research, and service. As a result of this decision, the entire form, including instructions, needed to be reconsidered and revised.

While the post-2001 revised RP&T form and its instructions are available online (Office of the Provost, 2001), we have written this research brief to explain how and why the form was changed. The instructions, the administrator's section, and the faculty section of Form D were all revised to reflect the new national and institutional priorities on scholarly engagement.

The revised RP&T packet:

1. emphasizes multiple definitions of scholarship;
2. promotes the use of evidence to document the quality of that scholarship;
3. embeds opportunities to report outreach and engagement throughout the form;
4. distinguishes among service to the university, to the profession, and to the broader community;
5. includes new questions focused on scholarship of integration; and
6. broadens the list of examples of scholarship to include outreach scholarship in each section.

### *1. Multiple Definitions of Scholarship*

The instructions for Form D were revised to include language about multiple definitions and forms of scholarship, with an emphasis on universal attributes of high quality scholarship. For example, the revised instructions include this statement about scholarship (p. 1):

*The essence of scholarship is the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge, including creative activities, that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields. What qualifies an activity as scholarship is that it be deeply informed by the most recent knowledge in the field, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate, and criticism. Consistent with the fact that there are multiple forms of scholarship, the attached forms provide the opportunity to document, provide evidence for, and assess faculty scholarship in the functional areas of instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader community, as well as in cross-institution mission.*

## 2. Use of Evidence to Document Quality Scholarship

The instructions for Form D and Form D itself were both revised to emphasize documented evidence of quality scholarship. For example, the revised instructions include the statement, “All faculty activities and accomplishments must be judged upon their quality, which requires both continuing improvement and continuous engagement.” Faculty and administrators are urged to consult MSU’s *Points of Distinction* (Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach, 1996, rev. 2000), a document about indicators of quality scholarship across four dimensions—scholarship, significance, impact, and context.

The administrator’s section of Form D was also revised to include new language about the quality of scholarship and to provide examples of how quality might be documented in each area of faculty scholarship. For the sections on instruction, research and creative activities, and service, the new form reads, “The evaluation should address the scholarship, significance, impact, and attention to context of the faculty member’s accomplishments.” Examples for each section are included on the form and are summarized here in Table 1.

## 3. Outreach and Engagement Embedded Throughout the Form

At multiple points throughout the new form, faculty members are encouraged to report scholarly outreach and engagement activities. For example, in the instructional section, the old form asked faculty to report “a record of teaching activities.” The revised form added new questions for faculty to report on noncredit instruction, list additional instructional works, and provide other evidence of instructional activity. Each of these new questions includes examples of scholarly activities, such as “certificate programs, conferences and seminars, global content delivered either to domestic or international groups” as well as instructions to include activities “within and outside of the university.”

TABLE 1

**Administrator’s Sections of Michigan State University Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (Form D)\***

Section	Examples of Quality Scholarship Included on Form
<b>III-A. Instruction</b>	SIRS forms; peer evaluations of instruction; evaluations by affected groups; teaching portfolios, including course syllabi, examinations; websites, etc.; publications and presentations related to pedagogy; guest lectures and visiting/adjunct appointments; grants received in support of instruction; and instructional awards or other forms of professional/alumni recognition
<b>III-B. Research and creative activities</b>	Publications, presentations, poster sessions, websites, etc.; performances and exhibits; scores, showings, recordings, and curatorial activities; citations of one’s work by others; evaluations by peers and affected groups including comments by outside evaluators, journal editors, referees, etc.; grants received in support of research; and research awards or other forms of professional/alumni recognition
<b>III-C-1. Service within the academic community</b>	Committee accomplishments (policies, reports, organizational changes); evaluation by committee colleagues/ chairperson or organizational executive officers; and service awards or other forms of professional/alumni recognition
<b>III-C-2. Service to the broader community</b>	Publications, programs offered; presentations, performances, exhibits, broadcasts, websites, brochures and other print materials, and collection development; grants received in support of community activities; evaluations by affected groups including comments by outside evaluators, conference organizers, and/or media representatives

\*Source: Office of the Provost. (2001). *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action [Form D]*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: [http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty\\_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm)

Similarly, in the research and creative activities section, faculty members are encouraged to report outreach and engaged scholarship in three new embedded ways. First, the examples of research activities include “papers and presentations for learned professional organizations and societies” and “reports and studies.” Second, in their list of research/creative works, faculty members are encouraged to designate research and creative activities that include a significant outreach component with a double asterisk. Finally, a new question was added to allow faculty members report on “other evidence of research activities including the formation of research-related partnerships with organizations, industries, or communities,” with directions to include evidence of peer recognition “within and outside the university.”

#### 4. *Service to the University, the Profession, and the Broader Community*

In both the administrator’s and faculty member’s sections of the revised Form D, clear distinctions among service to scholarly and professional organizations, service within the university, and service to the broader community are made. This clarification, the committee felt, was especially important in making the distinction between work faculty do as service, which may or may not be related to their scholarly expertise and may or may not be of benefit to audiences external to the university (i.e., faculty member serving on an internal admissions committee). Calling attention specifically to these two facets of scholarly outreach and engagement (based on scholarly expertise and for direct benefit to external audience) was important enough to the committee to create different questions for faculty to respond to. As a result, in the section on service, faculty members are asked to respond to these three questions, which include examples and calls to cite evidence (Table 2).

TABLE 2

#### **Service Within the Academic and Broader Community: Faculty Sections of Michigan State University Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (Form D) \***

Section	
<b>IV-C-1a. Service to scholarly and professional organizations</b>	List significant committee/administrative responsibilities in support of scholarly and professional organizations (at the local, state, national, and international levels) including: elected and appointed office held; committee memberships and memberships on review or accreditation teams; reports written and submitted; grants received in support of the organization; editorial positions, review boards and ad-hoc review requests; and programs and conferences planned and coordinated, coordinated or served on a panel or chaired a session. Include evidence of contributions (e.g., evaluations by affected groups or peers).
<b>IV-C-1b. Service within the University</b>	List significant committee/administrative responsibilities and contributions within the University. Include service that advances the University’s equal opportunity/affirmative action commitment. Committee service includes: appointed and elected university, college, or department ad hoc or standing committees, grievance panels, councils, task forces, boards, or graduate committees. Administrative responsibilities include: the direction/coordination of programs or offices; admissions; participation in special studies or projects; collection development, care and use; grants received in support of institution, etc. Describe roles in any major reports issued, policy changes recommended and implemented, and administrative units restructured. Include evidence of contributions (e.g., evaluations by affected groups or peers).
<b>IV-C-1c. Service within the broader community</b>	As a representative of the University, list significant contributions to local, national, or international communities that have not been listed elsewhere. This can include (but is not restricted to) outreach, MSU Extension, professional and clinical programs, international studies, and urban affairs programs. Appropriate contributions or activities may include technical assistance, consulting arrangements, and information sharing; targeted publications and presentations; assistance with building of external capacity or assessment; cultural and civic programs; and efforts to build international competence (e.g., acquisition of language skills). Describe affected groups and evidence of contributions (e.g., evaluations by affected groups; development of innovative approaches, strategies, technologies, systems of delivery; patient care; awards). List evidence, such as grants, of activity that is primarily in support of or emanating from service within the broader community.

\*Source: Office of the Provost. (2001). Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action [Form D]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: [http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty\\_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm)

5. *New Questions Focused on Scholarship of Integration*

Influenced by Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), both the administrator’s and faculty member’s sections were expanded to include a new question about the “scholarship of integration.” The new form describes integration as ways that scholarship cuts “across the mission functions of the university— instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader community.” Administrators are asked about the candidate’s “special foci,” and faculty members are asked about “integration across multiple mission functions” (Table 3).

6. *Outreach Scholarship Included in Each Section*

Because scholarly outreach and engagement are described by faculty in different departments with different language, the committee working to revise the form felt that lists of examples throughout the form would better serve as illustrations than simply adding the phrase outreach scholarship. While lists of examples were added to both the administrator’s and faculty member’s sections of the form, Table 4 lists examples from the faculty section of the form.

TABLE 3

**Scholarship of Integration: Michigan State University Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (Form D)\***

Section	
<b>ADMINISTRATOR’S SECTION</b> <b>III-D.</b> <b>Additional reporting</b> Summary evaluation of candidate’s special foci by department chairperson or school director	Where appropriate, evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly activities and contributions across the functional areas of instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader community. While the faculty member’s accomplishments may be reported under any of the functional areas or on the additional reporting pages, this space provides opportunity for special comments where the faculty member’s work shows integration across the functions or has had a particular focus. This is also the appropriate place for discussion of any contributions or accomplishments that do not naturally fit elsewhere.
<b>FACULTY SECTION</b> <b>IV-D-2.</b> <b>Additional reporting</b> Integration across multiple mission functions	Discuss ways that your work demonstrates the integration of scholarship across the mission functions of the university—instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader community.

\*Source: Office of the Provost. (2001). Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action [Form D]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: [http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty\\_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm)

TABLE 4

**Scholarly Outreach and Engagement Activities: Faculty Sections of Michigan State University Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (Form D)\***

Section	
<b>IV-A.</b> <b>Instruction</b>	On or off campus instruction; virtual university on-line courses; non-credit courses/ certificate programs; licensure programs; conferences, seminars, workshops, etc. Non-credit instruction may involve international, comparative, or global content delivered either to domestic or international groups, either here or abroad; curatorial and patient care activities with instructional components; instructional awards and peer recognition (within and outside of the university)
<b>IV-B.</b> <b>Research and creative activities</b>	Bulletins; monographs; exhibits; showings; scores; performances; recordings; reports; seminars; colloquia; patents; formation of research-related partnerships with organizations, industries, or communities; curatorial and patient care; evidence of peer recognition (within and outside of the university)
<b>IV-C-2.</b> <b>Service to the broader community</b>	Significant contributions to local, national, or international communities; outreach, MSU Extension; professional and clinical programs; international studies and programs; urban affairs programs; technical assistance, consulting arrangements (not outside work for pay); information sharing; targeted publications and presentations; assistance with building of external capacity or assessment; cultural and civic programs; efforts to build international competence

\*Source: Office of the Provost. (2001). Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action [Form D]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: [http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty\\_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm)

Representing the best national and institutional thinking at the time, these six major revisions changed the instructions, the administrators' and faculty members sections of the forms. The major section headings for the post-2001 Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action form are summarized in Table 5.

TABLE 5

**Summary of Michigan State University Post-2001 Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action (Form D)\***

<b>Instructions**</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasize "multiple forms of faculty scholarship" (<b>new</b>)</li> <li>• Emphasize "evidence of quality" for all scholarship (<b>new</b>)</li> </ul>	
<b>Section</b>	<b>Revisions</b>
<b>Administrator's section</b>	
<b>I.</b>	<b>Summary recommendation by chair and dean (cover sheet)</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Summary information about appointment and overall statement by chair and by dean</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Summary evaluation by chair:</b> <b>A. Instruction</b> <b>B. Research and creative activities</b> <b>C. 1. Service within academic community</b> <b>2. Service to broader community (new)</b> <b>D. Special foci (new)</b>
<b>Faculty candidate's section</b>	
<b>IV.</b>	<b>A. Instruction:</b> 1. Undergraduate and graduate credit instruction 2. Noncredit instruction ( <b>new</b> ) 3. Academic advising 4. List of instructional works 5. Other evidence of instructional activity <b>B. Research and creative activities:</b> 1. List of research and creative works (new option to flag items with a significant outreach component) 2. Quantity of research/creative works produced 3. Number of grants received 4. Other evidence of research/creative activity <b>C. Service within the academic and broader community:</b> 1. a. Service to scholarly and professional organizations b. Service within the university 2. Service to the broader community ( <b>new</b> ) <b>D. Additional reporting:</b> 1. Evidence of other scholarship ( <b>new</b> ) 2. Integration of multiple forms of scholarship ( <b>new</b> ) 3. Other awards/evidence ( <b>new</b> ) <b>E. Grant reporting:</b> 1. Instruction 2. Research and creative activity 3. a. Service to academic community b. Service to broader community ( <b>new</b> ) <b>Additional materials submitted by candidate:</b> 1. Faculty statement or reflective essay 2. Curriculum vitae
<b>Other**</b>	<b>Additional materials submitted by candidate:</b> 1. Faculty statement or reflective essay 2. Curriculum vitae

**Sources:**

\*Office of the Provost. (2001). Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action [Form D]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/forms/FacultyForms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm>

\*\*Office of the Provost. (2001). Faculty guide for reappointment, promotion and tenure review. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>

**FINDINGS FROM INTERNAL  
STUDY ON THE 2001 REVISIONS**

In 2006, researchers at MSU’s National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement conducted institutional research on the effects of the 2001 revision to the reappointment, promotion, and tenure form. We accessed and analyze Form D from tenure-track faculty who successfully underwent promotion and tenure review between 2002 and 2006. With a focus on successful faculty, we purposefully excluded Form Ds from those who underwent third year reappointment reviews, were unsuccessful in promotion and tenure, were no longer employed at the university, and/or were no longer in tenure-track positions. We received consent from 46% of the faculty members who fit the study’s criteria, with a final count of 173 forms that were included in the study. The study’s population was not statistically different—gender, race, rank, and primary college—from MSU’s tenure track population during the study period. The results are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6

**Faculty and Administrators’ Reports of Scholarly Outreach and Engagement at Michigan State University, 2002-2006\***

<b>Percent of faculty reporting...</b>	
90%	One or more scholarly outreach and engagement activities
47%	Scholarly outreach and engagement activities in all three functional areas—instruction, research and creative activities, and service
<b>Types of scholarly outreach and engagement...</b>	
<b>Publicly engaged instruction</b>	
14%	Credit instruction
70%	Noncredit instruction
69%	Public understanding
<b>Publicly engaged research and creative activities</b>	
6%	Creative activities
30%	Business, industry, and commodity group research
47%	Nonprofit, foundation, and government research
39%	Other engaged research
<b>Publicly engaged service</b>	
56%	Technical assistance and expert testimony
8%	Patient and clinical services
35%	Other engaged service
<b>Publicly engaged commercialized activities</b>	
13%	Commercialized activities
<b>Stars to indicate “scholarly outreach and engagement” on list of research and creative activities...</b>	
When <b>faculty members</b> were given the opportunity to use double stars to indicate a research or creative activity that included scholarly outreach and engagement:	
33%	Used single star to indicate peer review and double star to indicate scholarly outreach and engagement
36%	Used single star to indicate peer review
31%	Did not use single or double stars
<b>Service to the broader community...</b>	
When <b>faculty members</b> were given the new opportunity to report service to the broader community:	
77%	Reported scholarly outreach and engagement activities
10%	Reported activities that did not clearly meet the MSU definition of scholarly outreach and engagement
12%	Chose not to answer this new question
<b>Scholarship of integration...</b>	
When <b>administrators</b> were given the new opportunity to report on the scholarship of integration:	
25%	Reported integrated scholarly outreach and engagement activities
19%	Reported integrated scholarship, without mentioning scholarly outreach and engagement
55%	Chose not to answer this new question
When <b>faculty members</b> were given the new opportunity to report on the scholarship of integration:	
56%	Reported integrated scholarly outreach and engagement activities
21%	Reported integrated scholarship, without mentioning scholarly outreach and engagement
23%	Chose not to answer this new question

\*Source: Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. (In preparation). *MSU promotion and tenure study. Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review.*

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Each institution should consider revisions to its reappointment, promotion, and tenure process in light of current scholarship and its own mission, identity, and commitments. MSU's 2001 revisions clearly reflected a blending of the best national and institutional thinking at the time. Ideas from Boyer's scholarship as well as the internal Provost's Committee on University Outreach framed the new emphasis on scholarly, cross-cutting outreach and engagement activities as part of a faculty member's traditional work.

Scholarly outreach and engagement activities cut across an institution's three missions— instruction, research and creative activity, and service. This cross-cutting nature should be reflected in the opportunities for administrators and faculty members to report their scholarship in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure forms and processes. Embedding opportunities to report engaged scholarship throughout the form is one way of promoting the cross-cutting nature of scholarly outreach and engagement.

Efforts should be made to distinguish among the many valuable contributions faculty make to communities as individual citizens (volunteerism or *community service*; not based on scholarship), their *academic service* to disciplines and the University (not for audiences external to the academy), and their *scholarly engagement* for the benefit of communities (based on expertise). Outreach and engagement are, after all, scholarly endeavors involving both the “act of engaging (bringing universities and communities together) and the product of engagement (the spread of discipline-generated, evidence-based practices in communities)” (CIC Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 2005).

As interdisciplinary scholarship continues to increase, opportunities for faculty to report on the scholarship of integration will continue to be important. Ensuring a separate space for the innovative, cutting-edge work of faculty that does not easily fit into the tripartite categories of instruction, research and creative activities, and service goes a long way to recognize multiple forms of scholarship.

Institutional leaders should consider a revision in the promotion and tenure forms as an opportunity to convene campus-wide conversations about important scholarly issues— such as multiple forms of scholarship; documentation of quality; integration of instruction, research and creative activities; and service—as well as scholarly outreach and engagement. All of these elements affect the campus norms associated with promotion and tenure.

Institutional change is not as easy as a one-time revision in a form or a changed policy. For institutional reforms to be significant and enduring, they must be embraced by administrators and faculty members. For example, mentors of junior faculty, promotion and tenure committee members, department chairs, school directions, and college deans must be made aware of the new guidelines and have an opportunity to consider how they will be enacted in their respective units. As new individuals come into these positions, it is important that they be made aware of the new policies and guidelines as well. In short, institutional change requires ongoing dialogue about the values and priorities underlying any reforms in reappointment, promotion, and tenure to support scholarly outreach and engagement.

While changes in reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies and forms may go a long way to allow administrators and faculty to report their scholarly outreach and engagement, the decision to consider and value this type of scholarship in the promotion and tenure decision-making rests with faculty colleagues.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank MSU's faculty, department chairs, school directors, and deans who granted consent for the inclusion of their promotion and tenure forms in our study. In addition to recognizing the input of our fellow scholars at MSU's National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement, we would also like to acknowledge Diane Zimmerman and Robert L. Church (University Outreach and Engagement emeritus staff) who worked to revise the form in 2001 and initiated this study five years later in 2006; Angela Hunt and Shelly Wells (Academic Human Resources) who granted us access to the promotion and tenure forms; and Kirk Riley, Lynne Devereaux, Adina Huda, and Linda Chapel Jackson (University Outreach and Engagement staff) who assisted with consent, additional data, and professional presentations.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### Chris R. Glass, M.A.

Doctoral Candidate in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education and Graduate Research Assistant at the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement

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

Researcher, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement and Adjunct Assistant Professor, Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program

### John Schweitzer, Ph.D.

Professor of Urban Affairs, Center for Community and Economic Development, and frequent contributor to research at the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement

## CONTACT US

National Collaborative for the  
Study of University Engagement

Michigan State University

Kellogg Center  
Garden Level  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1022

Phone: (517) 353-8977

Fax: (517) 432-9541

Web: [ncsue.msu.edu](http://ncsue.msu.edu)

## REFERENCES

- Berberet, J. (2002). A new academic compact. In L.A. McMillin & J. Berberet (Eds.), *The new academic compact: Revisioning the relationship between faculty and their institutions*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach* 1(1), 11-20.
- Church, R. L., Zimmerman, D. L., Bargerstock, B. A., & Kenney, P. A. (2002/2003). Measuring scholarly outreach at Michigan State University: Definitions, challenges, tools. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 8, 141-152. Available from: <http://ncsue.msu.edu/publications/scholarly.aspx>
- CIC Committee on Engagement. (2005). *Engaged scholarship: A resource guide*. Champaign, IL: Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Available from: <http://www.cic.net/Home/Reports.aspx> [Reports/Other]
- Committee on Evaluating Quality Outreach. (1996, rev. 2000). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning and evaluating quality outreach*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: <http://www.ncsue.msu.edu/publications/points.aspx>
- Diamond, R. M. (1995). *Preparing for promotion and tenure review: A faculty guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (2000). *The disciplines speak II: More statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. (In preparation). *MSU promotion and tenure study*.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change* 31(5), 10-15.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Available from: <http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=305>
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (2000). *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Available from: <http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=305>
- Lunsford, C. G., Church, R. L., & Zimmerman, D. Z. (2007). Assessing Michigan State University's efforts to embed engagement across the institution: Findings and challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11, 89-104.
- Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Office of the Provost. (2001). *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action* (Form D). East Lansing: Michigan State University. Available from: [http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty\\_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm)
- O'Meara, K. A. (1997). *Rewarding faculty professional service* (Working Paper 19). Boston: University of Massachusetts, New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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>
- Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rice, R. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). Can the tenure process be improved? In R. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sandmann, L. R., Foster-Fishman, P. G., Rauhe, W., & Rosean, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, 32, 44-52.
- Shulman, L. S. (1998, October). *Fostering a scholarship of teaching and learning* (Lois McBee Lecture). Athens: University of Georgia, Institute of Higher Education.

### Suggested citation for this document:

Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. (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: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. Available from [ncsue.msu.edu](http://ncsue.msu.edu).