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Executive Summary: The Guide

This guide is a resource for state Campus Compacts or member campuses wishing to embark on a journey of supporting community engaged faculty in the rewards process. It includes resources for creating and implementing campus plans to change faculty rewards processes and policies and to support faculty in preparation for tenure review. It also includes a step-by-step explanation of how this workshop was planned and implemented in New England. In addition to wanting to share the knowledge that came out of a successful endeavor, we want to provide other Compacts with tools that will facilitate their undertaking of this effort. The Guide is specific, and includes handouts, resources, and marketing materials. The hope is that others will feel free to adapt what is offered here for their own use, while continuing to add to the knowledge base shared with the field.

Setting the Context

In 1990 Ernest Boyer, in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, reconceptualized the three legged stool of faculty work – research, teaching and service – to better align faculty work with the engaged mission of the institution. He created an integrated model of scholarship that included discovery, application, integration and teaching. Now, some twenty years later, as different forms of scholarly activity have emerged through the engagement model, we hear the use of terms like “engaged research,” “engaged learning” and “engaged scholarship” to describe faculty work. Though engaged scholarly activities have become more common, the structures that support and reward faculty work have not caught up. Judith Ramaley (2009) notes that “unless institutions as a whole embrace the value and validity of engagement as legitimate scholarly work and provide both moral support and concrete resources to sustain it, engagement will remain individually defined and sporadic.” One key requirement is that faculty reward systems legitimize faculty community engaged scholarship by creating opportunities for documentation, peer review, and, where needed, faculty development.

Several national initiatives have addressed different dimensions of the issue:

1. Imagining America has an emphasis on arts, humanities and design, and provides an excellent analysis of dimensions of the problem and its relationship to diversity in faculty rewards processes.
2. *The Carnegie Foundation* has an elective classification for community engagement that looks at many dimensions of campus/community engagement.

3. *Community Campus Partnerships for Health* emphasizes materials to help faculty prepare for review, and more global support for faculty development with respect to engagement.

Campus Compact supports member campuses with the integration of engaged pedagogies and scholarship into the fabric of their institutions. This support happens at many levels and in many ways. We support long-term change in the faculty rewards processes and policies and, in the short-term, Campus Compact supports community-engaged junior faculty in the preparation of their cases for review under old processes and policies. In May of 2009, the Campus Compact state offices in Northern New England embarked on a year-long project to support campuses with both long and short term approaches to faculty rewards work. We started with an action planning institute for campus teams, and followed up with grant funding for implementation of action plans. We partnered with other national initiatives to provide resources and guidance. We share the approach and resources here with our fellow Compacts and member campuses.
The Workshop

The New Paradigms for Faculty Rewards workshop was a two-day institute held in the conference center of the University of New Hampshire on May 27-28, 2009. Our primary facilitators were Cathy Burack of the Heller School at Brandeis University, partner in Campus Community Partnerships for Health’s faculty rewards initiative; and Tim Eatman of Syracuse University and David Scobey of Bates College, both partners in Imagining America’s Tenure Team Initiative.

This section details the planning and design, implementation and follow-up activities associated with carrying out the workshop.

Planning and Design

Given the proximity of the New England states as well as the region’s colleges and universities, this initiative was a collaboration among the Northern New England Campus Compacts, with one state (Maine Campus Compact) taking the lead. As noted earlier, the initiative itself was part of a grant funded project by the Davis Educational Foundation.

Things to consider in the planning phase:

1. **Timing:** The workshop was held from Wednesday to Thursday in late May (after graduations and before faculty were likely to be gone for the summer). Planning began in the preceding December.

2. **A Planning Team:** An initial planning team was convened and included the executive directors and program directors from the participating Compacts. This group spent about a month establishing the initial focus and goals of the workshop, and then reached out to knowledgeable people in the region who could assist with planning and with workshop facilitation.

3. **Space:** The institute was designed to support campus teams in developing action plans. Thus it was important to secure a meeting space that included a large meeting room that could accommodate all participants, smaller breakout rooms, space for food delivery and dining, and plenty of wall space for flipcharts.
4. **Location:** The location was accessible by all participating institutions by car. Thus no travel plans, except for one facilitator, were part of the overall planning. However, overnight lodging was needed for most participants.

5. **Cost:** The approximate budget for the workshop was $10,000. This included small stipends for facilitators, materials, audio/visual, food and hotel for participants. Each team was asked to pay $150.

6. **Planning Meetings:** The executive director of the lead state Compact in this initiative took responsibility for creating planning meeting agendas and “to-do” lists that would be discussed by phone and shared through email. The expanded planning team did not meet in-person until the actual date of the workshop.

7. **Existing knowledge:** The workshop made use of resources and literature from related national projects and initiatives. Time was built into the planning phase to identify and acquire these resources.

8. **Publicity:** Two professionally developed brochures were sent via email (as a .pdf) and post to chief academic officers at member campuses in the three states. The first, a “Save the Date,” and was sent in December and included the Imagining America report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and the Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*; the second was a fuller announcement that was sent in February (see page 9) and included application instructions. Compact websites also carried information on the event.
Criteria for Selection of Participants:

Registration information in the brochure included this information: “This workshop has been created with a team approach in mind. Please put together a team of four, including someone who has authority over the tenure and promotion process (Dean or Chief Academic Officer preferred), and a senior faculty member well-versed in engaged scholarship. You may also want to include someone responsible for community partnerships. If you have questions regarding the composition of your team, please contact your state program coordinator.” In addition to identifying team members, institutions were also asked to submit:

- a statement of intent, including any challenges the team is facing,
- a letter of support from a Chief Academic Officer, and
- a time line (or a rough sense of one) for the work.

Each state Compact reviewed the applications from their state. Institutional readiness was the primary criterion for selection because of the initiative’s emphasis on institutional change.

Implementation

The Facilitators Agenda for the workshop can be found on page 10. Overarching goals for the workshop were to provide institutional teams with time and support to reflect on current levels of support for engaged faculty and assess what is needed, allow for the exchange of content and knowledge, provide campuses with resources and information about like initiatives and resource people, and have teams identify concrete “next steps” through an action planning process.

Prior to the workshop campuses were asked to read the Executive Summary of Scholarship in Public, Kotter’s “Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail” (Harvard Business Review, March-April 1995) and to review the Faculty Rewards Institutional Assessment Rubric (see page 27).
Building a Movement: From Campus to National

Activities in the workshop maintained a dual focus on the unique situation at each institution, while also drawing out commonalities between institutions and with the goals/work of national initiatives. Thus, in the meeting packet participants received the compiled Statements of Intent (see page 15) so that they could see the issues and plans identified by the other participating institutions. Teams also engaged in a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis of their campus faculty rewards systems (see page 26). This campus-specific exercise was expanded to include information from the Imagining America Report, and identification of shared SWOTS across campuses. Using a “sticky wall” (SWOTS on large post it notes will do the trick), the discussion of SWOT themes moved from campuses to identifying issues within the context of building a change movement (e.g., expansion/revision of promotion and tenure policies).

In brief, the SWOT began with individuals filling out the SWOT worksheet. Individuals shared their worksheets with their team members. Each team was asked to select their top three SWOTS in each category and these were posted on the “sticky wall.” Once all the teams’ SWOTs were posted, similar groupings were created under each category and discussed. For example, at the regional level identified Strengths included mission embedded, leadership and community partnerships; Weaknesses included lack of shared understanding, silos, hard to assess; Opportunities included Carnegie, and grant opportunities; and Threats included lack of resources and leadership.

Meeting Needs: Information and Resources

At the end of the first day, campus teams were given the opportunity to submit a “Just in Time” Workshop Request Form (see page 33), where teams could request a mini-workshop that would be held the following morning. These forms were reviewed by the facilitators. For example, one group requested an “Engaged Department Workshop” and added the comment, “Assume a whole department is interested in and doing some engaged scholarship; what would “advanced” training in engaged scholarship be?” Three workshops that were created to respond to requests were:

- Assessing Faculty Community Engaged Scholarship
- Engaged Scholarship: Definitions, Traditions, Claims and Problems
- Developing Promotion and Tenure Processes: Models, Methods and Myths
These workshops, and requests for workshops, enabled the workshop planners and facilitators to meet short term needs that arose in the context of campus teams working together, and allowed for the identification of future offerings by the Compacts throughout the coming academic year.

Another resource that was provided to teams was a notebook of collected materials on faculty rewards. The notebook was titled, “Faculty Rewards Resources for Engaged Departments.” It began with a table of contents, and contained selected bibliographies, articles and examples of promotion and tenure guidelines. One notebook was provided to each team. A list of the contents can be found on page 48.

Moving Forward

Facilitators joined campus teams as the teams completed their action plans. On the final day of the workshop campus teams were paired with one another and asked to present their work plans. A facilitator was assigned to each pair of teams. The “Critical Friends” process (see page 37) was used to enable teams to critique one another’s plans and to provide valuable feedback.

In the final session of the workshop teams were able to learn more about available grant funds for which they could apply, and to request further workshops and resources they would like the Compacts to offer.
**Workshop Materials and Resources**

The following source material is included in this guide:

1. **Brochure**: program brochure used to recruit campus participants

2. **The Facilitators agenda**: This was the internal agenda, and shows details about each section.

3. **Compiled statements of intent**: These are institutional examples from the workshop registration process.

4. **SWOT Worksheets**: The pre-workshop SWOT analysis

5. **Institutional self assessment worksheet and rubric**: The tool institutions used to identify the extent to which faculty engagement is supported by the institution.

6. **Carousel Brainstorming instructions**: An exercise to activate participants' prior knowledge of a topic or topics through movement and conversation

7. **“Just in time” workshop request form**: Participants used this to identify content needs and request a session.

8. **Critical Friends instructions**: A tool that was used to review institutional plans

9. **Faculty Rewards Action Plan Worksheet**: Used to record action plan steps

10. **Post workshop grant application**

11. **Reference list of literature**: Articles and materials that were provided to participants
Brochure

(for a full copy of the 6-page brochure, which includes facilitator information and an application, please click on this link)
Facilitators’ Agenda

New Paradigms for Faculty Rewards: An Action Planning Workshop

May 27-28, 2009, University of New Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-WORKSHOP: Registration/Applications from Campus Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bring teams together for planning prior to institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop initial statement of intent for their campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepare for the workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Facilitators’ Agenda Continued

#### Day 1

**A. Registration and Welcome, 9:30 – 10:00, munchies available**

**B. Setting the Stage, 10:00 – 11:30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acknowledging UNH &amp; some inspiration for group 10-10:15</td>
<td>Short speech/welcome from CAO or Pres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debby Scire, New Hampshire CC and Bruce Mallory, Provost UNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Trust 10:15 – 10:45</td>
<td>Split into two groups. Each person says their name and the ‘essence’ of what they do in a sentence or two.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Gibans McGlashan, Vermont CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Why are we here – building community 10:45-11:30</td>
<td>• History of the initiative: Something with compiled statements of intent</td>
<td>Compiled statements of intent</td>
<td>Liz McCabe Park, Maine CC • Tim Eatman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Lunch: 11:30 – 12:30**

**D. Refining the Statements of Intent, 12:30 – 3:00 (Includes break)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Laying the Groundwork 12:30 – 1:15</td>
<td>Framing of SWOT analysis – 20 min + discussion</td>
<td>• Rubric • SWOT sheets.</td>
<td>Cathy Burack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SWOT analysis at the local, institutional level 1:30 - 2:15</td>
<td>In campus teams, discussions of their own reward systems’ Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. Fill out worksheets individually, then as a group</td>
<td>• SWOT worksheets – small for individual work and large for posting later • Rubric</td>
<td>Cathy + Resource people assigned as recorder/facilitators for each group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Overview of the field
   2:15 – 3:00
   Birds eye view of the Imagining America report. 20 minutes overview + discuss
   • Imagining America Report
   David Scobey

4. SWOT analysis of the field, 3:00 – 3:30
   Full group: posting sticky notes on a sticky wall starting with campus SWOTS, and building towards the movement level
   • Sticky wall (from Cathy)
   Cathy Burack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Goals and Objectives, 3:45 – 5:45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Define excellence in community engaged/public scholarship reward processes 3:45 – 4:45
   Carousel:
   • Easels, pads, markers,
   Tim Eatman
   Liz McCabe Park

2. Request workshop topics 4:45 – 5:30
   Team time: identify concerns and opportunities and fill out workshop request sheets
   • Worksheets,
   • Just in Time workshop requests
   Tim Eatman

3. Identify workshops for the morning, pick pairs for afternoon. 5:30 – 6:00
   Just facilitators and organizers
   Just in Time Workshop request forms, SWOT sheets on the walls
   PDs, EDs and facilitators

F. Dinner and Team Time, 5:30 on for teams, 6:00 on for organizers and facilitators
**Facilitators’ Agenda Continued**

### Day 2

**G. Breakfast, 7:30 – 8:30**

**H. Just In Time Mini Workshops: 8:30 – 9:45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meet specific information needs of campus teams</td>
<td>Workshops on topics identified through yesterday’s work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Eatman, David Scobey, Cathy Burack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Action Planning, 9:45 – 12:00, snacks available, lunch at noon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting the Stage for Planning 9:45 – 10:00</td>
<td>Framing talk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Preliminary Action Plan 10:00 – 1:00                              | Team time                                                                                                                                      | • Carousel write ups  
• Faculty Rewards Rubric  
• SWOT worksheets  
• Action planning worksheets | 1 facilitator per group                                                   |

**K. Critical Friends Feedback 1:00 – 3:00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Substantive feedback on action plans                              | • Introduction of Critical Friends process  
• Critical Friends pair share and feedback sessions | • Critical Friends protocol  
• Action plans                                                                  | 1 facilitator per pair                                                   |
### L. Wrap Up, 3:00 – 3:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feedback and Evaluation</td>
<td>• Ask participants to write down questions we should ask</td>
<td>• Index cards</td>
<td>Debby Scire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full group: ask what further workshops they would like to see</td>
<td>• Easel pad and markers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Next Steps</td>
<td>Grant overview with deadlines</td>
<td>RFPs</td>
<td>PDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compiled Statements of Intent

Rosemary Smith College

Rosemary Smith College is a young institution, founded in the early 1970’s. It is only within the last decade that the familiar structure of faculty roles, responsibilities, and rewards common to most institutions of higher education has been in place.

The College does not offer tenure. Instead, the College enacts a system of successive contracts (one-year, two-year, three-year and then six-year) that provide a measure of the freedom and confidence traditionally provided by tenure.

The College enacted a system of compensation at about the time it was implementing its current structure. The compensation model has been problematic from its inception and was rejected, in 2005 by the College’s administration. Since that event, the faculty and the Provost have sought to develop and define a new compensation model that recognizes not only the traditional triad (as reinterpreted by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*), but also merit as it is conceived in the interest of the institution’s mission and strategy.

Given the potential tensions that exist with a new faculty compensation model that started without faculty input, that needs to balance various models for faculty scholarly activities to promote faculty engagement as well as promote the College’s branding efforts, and that needs to address current economic issues facing both the faculty and the College, an effort to develop a new model has not yet come to fruition.

At the same time, the College has worked to develop alternate models for full-time faculty to meet different strategic needs. These models challenge traditional norms and expectations and will require the College to consider with care how it can assure fidelity to institutional mission and purposes, affirm

1 These Statements of Intent have been edited to protect the identities of the institutions.
the historic responsibilities of full-time faculty, and meet a shared expectation of equity. The College is interested in expanding the interpretation of Boyer’s idea of “scholarship of application” to create engaged scholarship models that serve both faculty interests and the College’s strategic mission.

The College hopes to have in place a new model by the end of next year.

********************************************************************************

Amazing University

Amazing University will attend this Campus Compact Workshop: “New Paradigms for Faculty Rewards: An Action Planning Workshop to Support Engaged Faculty. Attendance in this action planning workshop will assist our currently existing long term strategy to help advance engaged scholarship and engagement at AU. We will form a planning team that consists of key leadership from the faculty senate, two academic deans, a department chair and faculty, each of whom are participating in the workshop.

We will work closely with the faculty senate to study and determine what needs to change in the tenure and promotion guidelines. We have already begun to assemble guidelines from the University of Memphis, NC State University and Northern Kentucky University—all of whom address engaged scholarship in their tenure and promotion guidelines.

**Timeline:**

Summer 09: Collect Data from other universities on tenure/promotion guidelines

Fall 09: Initiate study group and begin work with faculty senate leadership; identify and utilize outreach scholars academy alums (72 faculty) to promote engaged scholarship agenda with the faculty senate

Spring 09: Bring in key speaker in one of the disciplines; continue work with the Faculty Senate

Summer/Fall 10: Bring forward proposal

********************************************************************************
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**Stupendous University**

The Office of Community Partnerships at the Stupendous University has been engaged in supporting service-learning courses and community-based research since 2001. In that time, we have seen the number of service-learning courses grow and the interest in community-based research rise; yet we have not seen concurrent attention to the roles and rewards of the faculty who are pursuing these forms of engaged scholarship. Some departments have begun to formally recognize this work, and yet other departments openly discourage it, but there is no campus-wide consensus on how this work will be valued within the tenure process. Our unique challenge, perhaps, is that we are a small research university – we must work within the framework of that kind of institution, perhaps bringing to light key conflicts between “traditional scholarship” and the scholarship that this work creates. As a university, we are also somewhat decentralized, having many different departments and therefore departmental promotion processes. Our goal for this institute is to shed light on the possibilities for recognizing faculty work on engaged scholarship, while also validating the existing structures and expectations in which this work is situated. We hope to hear from other campus the strategies and approached that have worked, especially at research-focused institutions, and to take back with us some steps that can be taken to infuse engaged scholarship into our institutional guidelines. We have questions like: does it need to happen within each department? How much power does the academic leadership have in making these changes? What arguments or research help to illustrate the validity of this work? Etc. We hope that time to think with each other, to hear from experts, and to engage with other campuses will bring to light some key action steps that we can take when we return to UBS. Upon returning to campus, we anticipate forming a task force as a sub-committee of the advisory committee and working with that task force to create a plan of action for bringing clarity to the RPT process at SU for engaged scholars. We anticipate a 2-year plan of action.

**TIMELINE:**

May, 2009 – Attend Faculty Rewards Institute

Summer 2009 – Process learning from institute into campus context, develop action goals for 2009-2010 academic year

Fall 2009 – Present learning from institute to faculty leadership and administration
Fall 2009-Spring 2010 – Work with Advisory Committee Sub-committee on proposed action steps around faculty rewards, promotion, and tenure.

May 2010 – Revisit action plan and evaluate progress; consider sharing both on-campus and in engaged scholarship networks.

Fall 2010 – Initiate plans for Year 2 of RPT initiative.

************************************************************************

Mapleleaf College

Mapleleaf College is poised to explore and to build capacity for faculty rewards for community-engaged scholarship. The faculty Committee on Instruction has recently voted to approve community-based learning as a pedagogical approach. The College has hired a Director for Community and Learning whose role it is in part to assist faculty to develop and refine community-based learning courses, and a number of faculty members have instituted or adapted courses or expressed interest in doing so. And the campus center for service and community-based learning has instituted a small grants program for faculty wishing to incorporate service or community-based research into their courses. Campus partners include the Center for the Advancement of Learning (CAL). An all-campus coordinating Council on Service and Engagement includes some faculty members, including representatives from the disciplines of engineering, education, women’s studies, and sociology.

Mapleleaf has also established an Office of Outreach to help faculty meet the rising expectations of external funders that academic researchers demonstrate the broad significance of their research through outreach to schools, community groups and policy makers. Community-engaged learning has significant potential for leveraging the broader impacts criterion into a sustainable approach for integrating research, teaching and learning at Mapleleaf change to made-up name. The Outreach Office is equipped to partner with others at Mapleleaf to realize this potential. In addition to acting as a liaison between Mapleleaf and the broader community, the Outreach Office is working to foster sustainability for outreach, to track these activities, to develop best-practice standards and protocols and to use assessment to catalyze change.
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Each of these initiatives has significant institutional support and has met with early success. We think that this will continue, but only if the reward structure recognizes the existence of and legitimacy of rigorous community-based learning research and outreach associated with research and grants. We propose with this workshop to explore further the assessment rubric for building capacity for faculty rewards for community-engaged scholarship. We believe that this will need to be a very slow, measured process at an institution like Mapleleaf, but that there is potential for such recognition and reward down the line. We would like to learn how to self-assess and to measure our progress according to the rubric presented in the "Building Capacity" workshop.

**Timeline:**

* Year 1, Workshop, 5/09; resource people to campus (Ed Zlotkowski, recent reviewer on community-based learning, to CAL) to consult on engagement, discipline-based community engagement, rewards; discuss rewards with Dean of the Faculty, Provost's Office

* Year 2--Present to new Mapleleaf president; appropriate committees on engagement and reward; incorporate a significant community-based learning component into at least one grant-funded research proposal in the sciences

______________________________________________________________

**Local University**

LU is working to reconfigure promotion and tenure guidelines (teaching, scholarship, and service expectations for assistant, associate, and full professor). We are also working, in parallel on developing an evaluation process that allow faculty members to assess where they are, where they want to be and how they can get to where they want to be.

**Timeline**

Implementation is to be over the next 18 months.

______________________________________________________________
Marvelous College

Marvelous College has a strong history of faculty engagement in service learning. One of the obstacles we face in attracting our newer faculty members to service learning is that the promotion and tenure system does not reward engaged scholarship and teaching, per se. Academic scholarship is the primary consideration in the promotion and tenure process. Teaching effectiveness is examined, however it is not a primary consideration towards the rewarding of promotion and tenure unless it is less than satisfactory. The service component is a secondary consideration.

Conversations with faculty at all levels reveal that without adequate reward for the work required to develop successful service learning experiences, they are unlikely to include them in their courses. Even faculty with a passion for engaged student work are reluctant to include it in their courses. This is particularly true for faculty who do not yet have tenure.

It is important for us as a team to examine the possibilities surrounding inclusion of engaged scholarship in the rank and tenure process. This is particularly true for an institution whose primary mission is undergraduate education.

The goals for our team will be:

1. To investigate the tenure and reward system for Colleges which are similar.
2. To examine our current structure in light of our findings.
3. To revitalize our service learning activities through a series of workshops.
4. To propose a model for inclusion of rewards for engaged teaching and scholarship to the rank and tenure process.

Approximate time line:

- May 2009 Team attends workshop at UNH and begins its work
- Summer 2009 Team meets on a regular basis to work on our goals.
- Early August 2009 Team presents preliminary findings to the Rank and Tenure committee.
• Late August 2009  Based on discussion with Rank and Tenure, present to the faculty on Faculty Day.

• Fall Semester  Continue work and present to the Faculty Senate by the end.

Something Else College

Background

Something Else College is in the midst of several major self-assessment and strategic planning initiatives. We are currently progressing through the NEASC re-accreditation process and are involved in an Branding Development Initiative. In addition, a Strategic Planning Task Force committee is at work revising the college’s strategic plan and faculty are engaged in ongoing conversations related to curriculum revision as well as updating the general studies outcomes of the college.

These initiatives have brought many people together from across campus to dialogue about a wide array of topics including how we define ourselves as an academic institution and how we might want to change in the future. Many of these discussions are alive with the language of civic engagement (alternately expressed through a variety of terms such as experiential or community-based learning, global citizenship, engaged scholarship, service-learning, and so forth) recognizing, as our Provost recently noted, that “growing bodies of research suggest that civic engagement tends to create engaged campuses because it encourages student commitment to learning, close student/faculty interactions, team work that brings students together across difference, and the kinds of reflection that changes campus culture.”

Overall, there seems to be fairly general agreement on our campus that opportunities for civic engagement through academic work can align well with the college’s mission and tradition; however, there is less agreement about how this can or should be supported on a variety of levels including faculty review, tenure, and/or promotions processes. We want to take the opportunity to explore this topic at the May conference.
Intent & Timeline

As we increasingly recognize the broader benefits of innovative pedagogies and engaged scholarship in higher education, we at Something Else College do well to ask: How are we attracting and retaining highly engaged teachers and scholars? How might this help us attract and retain students who desire to be similarly engaged? How can administration and staff support civic engagement efforts, opportunities for experiential learning, and an increase in faculty/student collaboration? What incentives can feasibly be put into place (at the departmental or institution-wide levels) to demonstrate a desire for a long-term commitment to these efforts?

Further questions (gathered from faculty) we would like to explore at this conference: Can/should there be agreement on a working definition for “engaged scholarship”? Are we happy with the current balance between teaching excellence and scholarship at Helping Hand? Should we encourage more overlap between the two? Do we want more service-based scholarship? Are there particular emergent themes at the college that we should stress in our scholarship, or are we happy with the follow your academic interests model and the academic freedom that comes with that? Are there things emerging from the current image development (marketing) plan that perhaps should influence our scholarship? Can we better market a particular strength if a larger core group of faculty includes a component of that theme into their scholarship or perhaps better articulates a facet that already exists?

Ultimately, there is a desire for participants of the conference to return to campus with information about what other comparably-sized peer and aspirant institutions are doing differently or better than we do. Our intent is to use the information gleaned from the conference to inform the discussion and planning related to the NEASC process and the development of a five-year plan. A number of faculty members are eager to participate in a follow-up meeting with the attendees after the conference has taken place (perhaps in June). We view a collective conversation as being a necessary extension of the conference and include it in our time line for the work to be done.

************************************************************************
Small College

Small College, under the academic leadership of a new provost who joined our campus community in 2007, is on the cusp of developing truly exciting, cutting-edge programs and services for our student body. Concurrent with this, we are now moving forward to establish our first-ever faculty-led “Rank and Promotion” committee to support our small but rapidly expanding faculty in the process of professional advancement on all levels. We have recently voted on and into existence a five-member R&P Committee which will begin a two-day training to be facilitated by The College’s associate dean for special projects in mid-June, following the upcoming 1½ day Faculty Rewards Conference under the aegis of the state Campus Compact.

While our institution has recently made a major commitment to service learning, community service, and other forms of civic engagement, we [the faculty] are also very much in the beginning of the learning curve with regard to the integration and incorporation of this element into and across our curriculum. Currently less than 10% of our fulltime faculty, and even less of our adjunct faculty, have successfully utilized service learning and civic engagement projects within their courses and related academic learning and teaching experiences. Yet, from the president through all levels of academic administration and instruction, the word on moving forward in this regard has been nearly universally positive. At the moment, therefore, we stand betwixt and between: a college whose mission and vision accentuates the value and meaning of service learning in all its forms, and a faculty without much active experience in this realm.

We see the rapid movement to establish a working permanent faculty committee within the college to focus specifically on faculty life and development – including all aspects of a “rewards” system – as a big step forward in this direction. The movement in this direction was first set forward when our new provost joined our academic community nearly one year ago, and proceeded to invite speakers in to help our faculty think through various aspects of its professional development and advancement, and the associate dean for special projects picked up on this in January of this year when he generated a proposal to both the higher administration of the college and the faculty to create a faculty-led committee to develop and recommend appropriate policies, guidelines, protocols, and support to faculty wishing to advance in rank professionally.

Currently Small College does not have tenure, and it is unlikely that this will change within the next few years. In addition, Small does not yet grant sabbaticals to faculty. As well, there are no faculty
members at the highest rank of full professor. These considerations all have potentially negative ways of impacting and influencing faculty life, development, and advancement. We see two ways of immediately addressing these timely and appropriate concerns: (1) to have the associate dean for special projects – also an associate professor – attend the CC training on Faculty Rewards in late May of 2009, and (2) based on this training, to facilitate a two-day professional development training for the Faculty Committee on Rank and Promotion. Following this training in mid-June, it is anticipated that The Committee will come forward with all of the protocols, documentation, standards, and appropriate communications necessary for the committee and the faculty and administration to move forward with clear and straightforward information that will help to grow and develop our faculty.

It is our fervent hope that the upcoming state CC Faculty Rewards workshop/training will “kick off” related activities on and across our campus over the next several months, and will be instrumental in helping us to configure and constitute ways through which we will develop appropriate “cutting edge” policies for faculty advancement and professional development at Small College. We are excited about the manifold opportunities that we have in front of us to creatively utilize our faculty’s energies, professional needs and nuances, and desires for professional advancement.

*************************************************************************
**SWOT Analysis Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the strengths and weaknesses of your campus’ current Faculty Rewards process, as they relate to Community Engaged Scholarship?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You may want to consider campus leadership, number of, and rank and seniority of, community-engaged faculty, campus culture, campus definitions of public scholarship, faculty rewards policies, range of acceptable products of scholarship and funding, scholarly community partnerships, importance of community-engaged scholarship in hiring, preparation of Jr. Faculty, P&amp;T committee’s knowledge of engaged scholarship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your campus’ opportunities and threats as they relate to Community Engaged Scholarship?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider both internal and external opportunities and threats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Self-Assessment –

Faculty Rewards and Engaged Scholarship


Institutional teams were asked to complete the Faculty Rewards Rubric for Institutional Self-Assessment prior to attending the Institute. Please click here for a full copy of the rubric.

About the Rubric

Background: This tool is designed to assess the capacity of a faculty rewards system at a given higher educational institution (or unit therein) to embrace community engagement and community-engaged scholarship, and to identify opportunities for action. This assessment builds upon existing and validated prior work. It is intended to serve as a baseline for follow-up assessments, enabling institutions to track their progress and focus their work, while developing a longitudinal profile of their developing capacity for a faculty rewards system supporting community engagement and community-engaged scholarship over time.

The Self-Assessment: The self-assessment is constructed around four dimensions:

1. Leadership for Faculty Rewards (3 elements)
2. Campus Culture (5 elements)
3. Faculty Rewards Policies (7 elements)
4. Faculty Rewards Processes (6 elements)

For each element of each dimension, four "levels" are articulated which represent a summary of the literature and knowledge on institutional best practices with respect to commitment to community engagement and community-engaged scholarship. It is not expected that a given institution would necessarily align on the same level throughout the entire self-assessment. Rather, the results of the assessment can be used to offer a profile of where the institution is at presently, and where opportunities for change might be identified.
Definitions: Three terms used in this self-assessment are particularly important to define:

By “community engagement” we mean applying institutional resources (e.g., knowledge and expertise of students, faculty and staff, political position, buildings and land) to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities. The methods for community engagement of academic institutions include community service, service-learning, community-based participatory research, training and technical assistance, capacity-building and economic development.

By "community-engaged scholarship" we mean “teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community and has the following characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor and peer-review.”

The word “institution” is used as a generic term for the level of the organization on which the self-assessment is focused (e.g., a department, college, school, university).
Institutional Self-Assessment cont.

Discussion questions included in the Rubric

1. Leadership for Faculty Rewards
   1.1 To what extent do institutional leaders/senior administrators value community-engaged scholarship?
   1.2 To what extent do community-engaged faculty serve as institutional leaders or in influential roles?
   1.3 On average, what is the rank and seniority of community engaged faculty?

2. Campus Culture
   2.1 Is there a definition of community-engaged scholarship?
   2.2 To what extent is community-engaged scholarship valued in faculty appointments regardless of tenure, and/or clinical, teaching, or practice?
   2.3 To what extent is community engagement acknowledged as an essential component of research?
   2.4 To what extent is community engagement acknowledged as an essential component of education/teaching?
   2.5 To what extent are community-engaged faculty in tenured or tenure-track appointments?

3. Faculty Rewards Policies
   3.1 To what extent do review, tenure and promotion policies recognize community-engaged scholarship?
   3.2 What is the range of acceptable products of community-engaged scholarship?
   3.3 What is the range of acceptable funding sources for community-engaged scholarship?
   3.4 To what extent are scholarly community partnerships defined and valued?
   3.5 To what extent is the scope of community impact considered in the review process?
   3.6 To what extent is interdisciplinary scholarship recognized and valued in the review process?
   3.7 To what extent is a broad definition of peer review considered in the review process?
4. **Faculty Rewards Processes**

4.1 Faculty recruiting criteria include expertise in community engagement.

4.2 To what extent is the impact of engagement on students, the community, the faculty member and the institution documented and assessed?

4.2 To what extent are junior faculty encouraged to pursue community engagement (e.g., mentoring, stipends, faculty development)?

4.3 To what extent is training and/or orientation provided to review, promotion and tenure committee members?

4.4 In what ways do community partners participate in the review, tenure and promotion process?

4.5 In what ways are peer reviewers instructed to review a candidates portfolio?
**Carousel Brainstorming**

**Purpose:** To activate participants' prior knowledge of a topic or topics through movement and conversation.

**Description:** While Carousel Brainstorming, participants will rotate around the room in small groups, stopping at various stations for a designated amount of time. While at each station, participants will activate their prior knowledge of different topics or different aspects of a single topic through conversation with peers. Ideas shared will be posted at each station for all groups to read. Through movement and conversation, prior knowledge will be activated, providing scaffolding for new information to be learned in the proceeding lesson activity.

**Procedure:**

1. Generate X number of questions for your topic of study and write each question on a separate piece of poster board or chart paper. (Note: The number of questions should reflect the number of groups you intend to use during this activity.) Post questions sheets around your room.

2. Divide your participants into groups of 5 or less. For example, in a room of 30 participants, you would divide your class into 6 groups of five that will rotate around the room during this activity.

3. Direct each group to stand in front of a homebase question station. Give each group a colored marker for writing their ideas at the question stations. It is advisable to use a different color for tracking each group.

4. Inform groups that they will have X number of minutes to brainstorm and write ideas at each question station. Usually 2-3 minutes is sufficient. When time is called, groups will rotate to the next station in clockwise order. Numbering the stations will make this easy...
for participants to track. Group 1 would rotate to question station 2; Group 2 would rotate to question station 3 and so on.

5. Using a stopwatch or other timer, begin the group rotation. Continue until each group reaches their last question station.

6. Before leaving the final question station, have each group select the top 3 ideas from their station to share with the entire class.

“Just in Time” Workshop Request Form

Please use this form to request a mini-workshop from a facilitator, Campus Compact staff member, and/or other participants on a topic that would help your team. The mini-workshops will be held on Thursday, May 28 from 8:30-9:45 a.m.

Requested Topic:__________________________________________

Requested Facilitator (if any):___________________________________

Additional Comments:
### Action Plan Worksheet

Complete one Action Plan Worksheet for each set of objectives you plan to achieve. To begin, select the *most critical* components to address and complete a worksheet for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Action To Be Taken**  
*Each action should be a specific and measurable activity that can be completed within a defined period of time.* | **Evidence of Success**  
What are our indicators of success? What data will we collect and how will we collect it? | **Individuals To Be Involved** |
| **Lead Individual**  
Gathers the group & monitors timeline. | **Timeline**  
Date by which the Action should be completed. | |
## SAMPLE Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: Increase knowledge and understanding of community-engaged scholarship across various campus stakeholder groups.</th>
<th>Objective: Create campus-wide definition of community-engaged scholarship. Educate P &amp; T review committee members on definition, nature, documentation &amp; assessment of community-engaged scholarship.</th>
<th><strong>Action to be taken</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evidence of Success</strong></th>
<th><strong>Individuals to be Involved</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lead Individual</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timeline</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and draft a campus-wide definition of community-engaged scholarship.</td>
<td>Draft statement will be submitted to academic affairs councils and tenure and review committee members for feedback.</td>
<td>Complete Faculty Rewards team</td>
<td>Gary Getsthingsdone</td>
<td>Completed Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit approved definition of community-engaged scholarship for inclusion in Faculty Handbook and other campus publications.</td>
<td>New definition will be printed in campus publications and on Web sites.</td>
<td>Faculty Rewards team. Provost. Publications office.</td>
<td>Jill Justdoit</td>
<td>Completed Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and develop agenda for tenure and review committee training meeting.</td>
<td>Documents, powerpoints, etc for training are developed.</td>
<td>Faculty Rewards team. Tenure and Review Committee.</td>
<td>Gary Getsthingsdone</td>
<td>Completed Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement training for tenure and review committee members on community-engaged scholarship.</td>
<td>At least 8 members of the tenure and review committee will attend the training.</td>
<td>All members of the tenure and review committee.</td>
<td>Jill Justdoit</td>
<td>Completed January 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals and Objective guidelines

Things to keep in mind as you develop your action plan:

Goals are long-range, broad, general statements describing a desired condition or future toward which you are working.

Objectives are short range and describe the results to be achieved in a measurable way. Objectives should:

- be directly related to the goal
- begin with an action verb, for example, to provide, to increase, to establish, to conduct
- be the desired outcome, not the means to the outcome
- include a date by which it will be accomplished
- specify "what" and "when" and not discuss "why" and "how"
- be measurable or verifiable, and provide a measure by which you will know if the objective has been achieved
Introduction

The Critical Friends process focuses on developing collegial relationships, encouraging reflective practice, and rethinking leadership. This process is based in cooperative adult learning, which is often contrary to patterns established in work environments. It also addresses a situation in which many leaders find themselves – trained to work as independent units; certified as knowing all that is needed to know; feeling like the continuation of professional learning is not essential to the creation of an exciting, rich, learning environment; and that they are simply supervisors in the leadership role.

Critical in the context of the group is intended to mean “important” or “key” or “necessary.” Those who have used this process have found that many leaders are clumsy at being “critical.” They have further discovered that many leaders are trained to talk around and avoid difficult issues, not carefully confront them. The Critical Friends process provides an opportunity both to solicit and provide feedback in a manner that promotes reflective learning.

Background:

The Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University first developed the Critical Friends model for collegial dialogue. It is currently in use by an estimated 35,000 teachers, principals, and college professors in over 1,500 schools. In July 2000, the National School Reform Faculty program, which currently houses Critical Friends Groups and coordinates the training for Critical Friends Coaches, relocated to the Harmony School Education Center (HSEC) in Bloomington, Indiana.

As originally developed, the three “occasions” for reflection using the Critical Friends protocol are: (1) peer observations; (2) tuning a teaching artifact using the Tuning Process; or (3) consulting about an issue using the Consultancy Process. Each activity in the Critical Friends group contains elements of careful description, enforced thoughtful listening, and then questioning feedback – which may well be the basic elements of reflection. The feedback arrived at through the discussions also has been grouped
in these ways: “Warm” feedback consists of supportive, appreciative statements about the work presented; “Cool” or more distanced feedback offers different ways to think about the work presented and/or raises questions; and “Hard” feedback challenges and extends the presenter’s thinking and/or raises concerns. In general, this process utilizes time limits and agreed-upon purpose and norms help reduce interruptions in discussion and the rush-to-comment approach that our busy lives seem to promote.

The basic format for collegial dialogue is the same for each protocol: facilitator overview; presentation of observations, work or issue; clarification questions; feedback/discussion by participants (discussants); presenter reflection; debriefing of process. The questions and issues that presenters offer typically spring from feelings of concern, from moments in work without closure, and from issues they have not been able to find a solution through solitary thinking. The focus in our workshop will be on the Consultancy Process.

**Group Member Roles**

There are three roles in the Critical Friends process: facilitator, presenter, and discussants. The group can vary in size from four to seven people.

**Facilitator:**

Reviews the process at the outset, even if everyone is familiar with it. Sets time limits and keeps time carefully. Participates in discussions but is on the lookout for others who want to get in conversations. Adjusts time slightly depending on participation. May end one part early or extend another, but is aware of the need to keep time. Reminds discussants of roles, warm and cool feedback, and keeping on topic that the presenter designated. Leads debriefing process and is careful about not “shorting” this part. Is careful during the debriefing not to slip back into discussion.

**Presenter:**

Prepares an issue for consultancy. Is clear about the specific questions that should be addressed. Unlike most discussions of this nature, the presenter does not participate in the group discussion. Sits outside the group and does not maintain eye contact during the discussion but rather takes notes and gauges what is helpful and what is not. Later, is specific about the feedback that was helpful.
Discussants:

Address the issue brought by the presenter and give feedback that is both warm (positive) and cool (critical). The feedback should be given in a supportive tone and discussants should provide practical suggestions.

The “Consultancy” Process

The consultancy process allows colleagues to share issues confidentially and seek suggestions for positively overcoming or managing them. Consultancy creates opportunities for colleagues to find ways collaboratively around the obstacles and barriers that often limit or stifle effective action.

The process works best in smaller groups (4-7 people) where colleagues can feel comfortable sharing complex issues. Presenters share an issue, and members of the Critical Friends group offer “warm” and “cool” feedback, talking to each other not to the person who presented the issue. The presenter sits out of the group, listening, taking notes, and deciding what has been useful. The actual process (with maximum time allotted) follows.

Step One: Facilitator Overview (3 minutes)
- Review process
- Set time limits

Step Two: Presenter Overview (5 minutes)
- Share issue
- Provide context
- Frame key question for specific consideration

Step Three: Probing or Clarifying Questions (5 minutes)
- Group members ask more questions to learn about the issue
- Reminder, this is not a time to give advice or get into the discussion

Step Four: Discussant’s Group Discussion (12 minutes)
- Group discusses issue (both warm and cool)
- Presenter is silent, taking notes
- Group addresses possible suggestions related to the issue

Step Five: Presenter Response (5 minutes)
- Presenter responds to group feedback

Step Six: Debriefing (5 minutes)
- Facilitator leads discussion, critiquing the process
Preparing an Issue for Consultancy: A Guide for Presenters

Not sure if you have any issues to present...

   Ever wonder if you took the appropriate action?
   Challenged by a particular employee and not sure how to proceed?
   Looking for fresh ideas or a different approach to a challenging dilemma?
   Not sure how to follow-up with an issue that needs to be addressed?
   Have you recently been “stumped” by a situation?

These are precisely the issues that you could bring to the “Presenters” table through the Critical Friends Consultancy process.

Framing the Issue:

It is important to provide the discussants with enough information to discuss effectively and create solutions for the issue you are presenting. As you prepare your issue, consider including the following:

   • Context in which the issue presents itself – does this situation come up in department meetings, or is this related to a philosophical disagreement in a particular discipline
   • Important components surrounding the case – past history between the actors, or personnel structures that affect your ability to act
   • If there is a meta issue looming behind the issue you present, it would be useful to share that with the discussants
   • Your actions and/or reactions about the issue
   • What you would like the group to discuss or the outcome you seek from the discussants – alternate suggestions, reinforcement for your actions, identify potential obstacles for you, etc.

Preparing to Present:

Consider bringing notes to the meeting at which you present. Remember that you only have five minutes to present your issue. Discussants do have five minutes to clarify but that is really time for them to get a better idea of the scenario. It is very important to let the group know what you want to get as a result from their discussion.
**Following Your Presentation:**
Listen carefully; take notes. Often the discussants will try to bring you back into the group, but it is more useful if you are able to distance yourself from the discussants so that you can capture all the information discussed. Hold yourself back from making judgments during the discussion as this might affect your ability to hear all the ideas and feedback.

**For the Presenter Response:**
This time portion is your opportunity to respond to the group discussion. This is not the time to continue the discussion with you involved. This is an opportunity for you to summarize your impressions of the discussion. Consider all the information gathered and identify which ideas might be useful and which ones you are unlikely to pursue.

**Critical Friends References:**


Note: Other articles and materials were used to create this document; unfortunately, many of the materials used in this compilation did not have identifying information and therefore it was impossible to cite the original source.

**Critical Friends Resources:**

Critical Friends Groups at the National School Reform Faculty, which is a professional development initiative of the Harmony School Education Center in Bloomington, Indiana [http://www.harmony.pvt.k12.in.us/www/cfg1.html](http://www.harmony.pvt.k12.in.us/www/cfg1.html)
Workshop Follow-Up: Campus Grants

As noted earlier, participating institutions were invited to apply for a small grant to support activities outlined in their action plan. The Compacts’ goals were to sustain the momentum of the workshop into the coming academic year, to provide institutions with incentive and support for the implementation of their plans, and to continue building the capacity of the participating institutions to act as resources for other colleges and universities in the region.

Please click here for a full copy of the Request for Proposals for campus grants

Things to consider in the Grant Process:

1. Timing: The grant application was due mid-August, approximately 2½ months after the workshop. This date can present challenges with regard to faculty and staff vacation schedule, however it allows for the review of applications and the distribution of funds by October.

2. Grant amount: Available per campus grant funds were $2000. While this is a relatively modest amount, as can be seen in the examples below, campuses can effectively leverage it to create change and other opportunities for support. A one-to-one match was required and could include “in-kind” contributions.

3. Grant application: While the grant application itself was long (approximately 8 pages), it requested information that campuses had already begun to document during the workshop. Campuses were asked to submit:
   a. The names and contact information of their initiative’s leadership team;
   b. A proposed project abstract (limited to one page);
   c. Assessment of current faculty rewards process (use of the rubric, already started prior to and during the workshop)
   d. Action plan (started, and possibly completed during the workshop)
   e. A budget, including the match.

4. Reporting: The funding was for the academic year (October to May). Before the grant period campuses were required to conduct a self-assessment of current faculty rewards programs at their institutions and to submit action plans and a budget for their work.

5. Technical Assistance and Networking: Initially campuses were asked to send their teams to attend a follow-up meeting in early December in order to share their progress to date, collaborate around challenges, focus on assessment, and to learn more about current national
initiatives. This date turned out to be problematic for several reasons (including New England weather), two of which were the difficulty in campuses having teams attend an off-campus day long meeting at that point in the semester, and that not enough time had passed at that point with regard to the implementation of campus work plans. Thus, a conference call/web meeting was held in April. Campuses were able to share progress to date. The call was facilitated by one of the workshop presenters. In this session, virtual technical assistance was provided in a just-in-time format, with the facilitator accessing material during the call.

**Participation in Grants**

Out of the eight campuses that participated in the May workshop, five elected to participate in the grant program. The five campuses were required to submit Action plans aimed at revision of tenure and promotion guidelines, completed campus self-assessment rubrics at the beginning and the end of the grant year, and submitted materials for dissemination demonstrating the outcomes of their work to promote and recognize engaged scholarship. The following are a sampling of how some of the participating campuses leveraged the workshop and subsequent grant to advance their campus’ support of community engaged faculty:

**Something Else College** brought an outside scholar, David Scobey of Bates College and Chair of Imagining America, to campus to work with the faculty council and administrators on issues related to faculty rewards. He led a two-hour joint discussion with these groups on the clarification of terms such as “engaged scholarship” and the consideration of how service-learning informs, enhances or inspires faculty research in the community. He gave several presentations and led discussions with the following stakeholder groups: The Undergraduate Research Committee, the Service-Learning Advisory board, the Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee, and the Teaching Resource Committee. The campus is now prepared to reconsider their tenure and promotion policies and guidelines.

**Small College** worked to support its small but rapidly expanding faculty in the process of professional development on all levels - including all aspects of a “rewards” system by establishing its first-ever faculty-led Committee on Rank and Promotion. They began this process with a series of speakers - Dwight Giles, John Saltmarsh, Edward Zlotkowski, Jill Mattuck Tarule (all experts in engaged scholarship)- intended to help faculty reflect on various aspects of professional development and advancement. This soon led to a proposal to create a faculty-led committee to develop and recommend appropriate policies, guidelines, protocols, and support to faculty wishing to advance in rank. Four
drafts of a “Policies and Procedures” document were circulated to all full-time faculty, with discussions following each draft in Faculty Association meetings. The expectation is that this document will be voted on by a quorum of the full-time faculty and forwarded to the Provost and President by mid-June, 2011.

Marvelous College’s Rank and Tenure Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met independently to propose changes to the rewards process to be published in the Faculty Handbook. When they met jointly in the winter to reach an agreement on the revised language that would then be presented to the Faculty Senate, they realized that they had been working with very different interpretations of the same language. In deciding to work through the interpretation issues, the two committees opened up a faculty-wide discussion that was very well attended. In early spring, a faculty member with a portfolio of engaged scholarship was denied tenure, provoking strong feelings and reactions on campus. A decision was made to postpone final discussions on the revision of guidelines until the fall, and focus spring work on developing a common language and definition and a professional development system for junior faculty. Both endeavors are moving forward.
Lessons Learned & Challenges

Lessons Learned for Campuses

1. For engaged department work, start by assessing where you are in terms of number of service-learning courses, different types and sophistication of service-learning in existence, kinds of community partnerships in existence, and numbers of faculty involved and interested.

2. For faculty professional development it is useful to have an Engaged Scholar in Residence to deliver workshops and consult one on one with faculty and administrators. Using a combination of outside faculty for professional development and featuring internal faculty as exemplars of practice is very effective in helping faculty new to service-learning adopt the practice.

3. Having a “hands-on” experientially-based faculty training on any topic related to faculty rewards is an extremely beneficial process, leading to a much-improved product, for both faculty and facilitator alike.

4. It was critical to have a campus staff member who could devote time to scheduling meetings, setting agendas, typing up and distributing notes, etc. This helped the committee to stay focused and meet deadlines.

5. Don’t talk of engaged scholarship as an “alternative or exception” but rather as a form of scholarship with similar expectations of rigor.

6. Work on changing tenure and promotion involves:
   - Professional development for junior faculty
   - Professional development for senior faculty charged with reviewing junior faculty
   - Developing new definitions of scholarship, peer review, and dissemination in a widespread, inclusive way

Challenges

1. Revamping faculty rewards takes more time than anticipated. Scheduling meetings can be difficult as is finding time for relationship building with initially uninterested colleagues.

2. Gaining consensus on new definitions of scholarship for the tenure project is very difficult work.
3. During the period of this grant, most of our participating campuses were facing serious budget shortfalls. Some campuses eliminated positions of service-learning support staff. For some of these campuses, the demonstrated positive effects of service-learning on retention and the strong communication and camaraderie among faculty participating in the project either persuaded the administration to reinstate the staff positions, or allowed the continuance of the program despite the cutbacks.
Participating Campuses:

Daniel Webster College
Dartmouth College
Plymouth State University - grantee
Saint Joseph’s College - grantee
Saint Michael’s College - grantee
Southern Vermont College - grantee
The University of New Hampshire
The University of Vermont

Participating Campus Compact Offices:

Maine Campus Compact
220 College St.
Lewiston, ME 04240
Contact: Liz McCabe Park, Executive Director
E-mail: epark@bates.edu

Campus Compact for New Hampshire
3 Barrell Court, Suite 200
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Contact: Ann Tierno, Program Director
E-mail: tierno@compactnh.org

Vermont Campus Compact
SMC-Box 289
One Winooski Park
Colchester, VT 05439
Contact: Cheryl Whitney Lower, Interim Executive Director
E-mail: clower@smcvt.org
Resources for Faculty Rewards and Engaged Scholarship

Research University Engaged Scholarship Toolkit:
http://www.compact.org/resources/research-university-engaged-scholarship-toolkit/6823/
This toolkit offers a guide to the best resources on engaged scholarship, along with models, exemplars, and original essays. Developed by The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), for which Campus Compact serves as coordinator, the toolkit offers information and resources for all institutions seeking to implement or expand engaged scholarship on campus.

The following annotated list of resources comes from the Toolkit, above:

1. Original Essays on Engaged Scholarship Written for the Toolkit

  This essay, written by a University of Cape Town professor of sociology, summarizes his community-engaged research concerns and activities, and proposes an investigation and theorization of how universities might become more deeply engaged with civil society, particularly with respect to research relations with local and regional government bodies, community and civic organizations, labor and other non-governmental organizations etc.

  A brief practical essay addressing six critical areas for faculty consideration in undertaking community engaged research: institutional context, establishing legitimacy, community credibility, funding, methodological difficulties, and collaboration.

  The community-engaged scholar often experiences challenges to career advancement (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005). Fortunately, a variety of resources and tools are emerging to assist in overcoming these hurdles. This article reviews the challenges in terms of developing skills, securing recognition for community-engaged scholarly work, and particularly in successfully navigating the promotion and tenure (P and T) system. This review is followed by presentation of several resources for addressing these challenges.

  Michelle McClellan, historian at the University of Michigan, received an Arts of Citizenship engaged scholarship grant for developing and teaching a public history course and for scholarship deriving from her work on a public history project. In this two-part article, McClellan describes the proposed project that was awarded Arts of Citizenship funding, then reflects on the experience — how it will affect her future teaching and future historical scholarship.
This essay profiles Loyola University’s Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL), which organizes and sponsors collaborative university-community research in the Chicago area, which emphasizes the bringing of a ‘communities eyes, ears, and voice to the research table.

This essay advocates articulation of a broader role for academic faculty in American democracy beyond their technical expertise as critical for making the case for community engaged research.

This essay focuses on the need to frame engagement as scholarship and to gain support for faculty members who do this type of work from institutional leaders.

2. Journals That Focus on Engaged Scholarship

• See Campus Compact, Publishing outlets for service-learning and community-based research

3. National Resources for Promoting and/or Carrying Out Community Engaged Research in a Research University Context

The Task Force was appointed by ASA Council and commenced its work in August 2004. In addition to being responsible for designing a Public Sociology web site, the Task Force collects and analyzes information from the field on public sociology projects and public sociology promotion and tenure. The Task Force has developed and is asking the ASA Council to approve model guidelines that could potentially be adopted by interested departments as they work to promote and reward public sociology activities among their faculty. See Guidelines for Use by Academic Departments in Personnel Reviews Submitted by the Task Force on the Institutionalization of Public Sociology, for possible adoption by the ASA Council (available at:http://pubsoc.wisc.edu/e107_files/public/pandt.html).

ASPH has compiled information from 17 schools of public health that recognize and reward academic public health practice.

• California State University, Engaged scholarship and retention, tenure and promotion website http://www.calstate.edu/csl/resource_center/tools/scholarship_tenure_promotion.shtml
Provides links to three websites that provide tools for individual faculty, review committees, and institutions to reexamine the policies and procedures for recognizing service learning and other forms of community scholarship.
• Campus Compact, Service-learning in promotion and tenure resources.
  http://www.compact.org/resources/service-learning_resources/promotion_and_tenure/
  General list of resources related to supporting service-learning teaching and community-engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion processes.

  http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html
  CCPH has developed an online toolkit to provide health professions faculty with a set of tools to carefully plan and document their community-engaged scholarship and produce strong portfolios for promotion and tenure. The toolkit includes sections advising faculty in preparing for promotion and/or tenure review, specific details for creating a strong portfolio, examples of successful portfolio components from community-engaged faculty and references and resources.

• Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), Initiative on faculty for an engaged campus
  http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/faculty-engaged.html
  Supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), this CCPH initiative in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill aims to legitimize and support community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of community-engaged scholarship, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process. The initiative builds on the work of the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, a FIPSE-funded group of health professional schools that has been working to build capacity for community-engaged scholarship on their campuses and among peers nationally.

• Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (HENCE), http://www.henceonline.org/
  HENCE is a national network of organizations organized in response to the growing need to deepen, consolidate, and advance the literature, research, practice, policy, and advocacy for community engagement as a core element of higher education’s role in society.

• Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life, Tenure team initiative on public scholarship: Valuing public scholarship in the cultural disciplines.
  http://www.imaginingamerica.org/TTI/TTI.html
  Imagining America (IA) is a national consortium of colleges and universities committed to strengthening the public role and democratic purposes of the arts, humanities, and design. IA’s Tenure Team Initiative (TTI) seeks to develop a broad understanding of the university’s public mission and its impact on changing scholarly and creative practices in the cultural disciplines. The Tenure Team seeks to create a usable resource for deans and chairs that will help them to assess and reward public scholarship and creative work by faculty in the arts and humanities. The TTI effort arises from recent developments within the cultural disciplines themselves. These changes, it argues, are led by significant numbers of faculty who believe that public scholarship and creative work tap the most inventive potential of the arts and humanities. The TTI online Knowledge Base includes materials on core reading, civic engagement in higher education, faculty; models and case studies, research, teaching and service, tenure policies.
• International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) [http://www.researchslce.org]
  IARSLCE is an international nonprofit membership organization devoted to promoting research and discussion about service-learning and community engagement. It organizes and sponsors the annual International Research Conference on Service-Learning and Community Engagement.

• Michigan State University, The National Center for the Study of University Engagement [http://ncsue.msu.edu/about.aspx]
The National Center for the Study of University Engagement (NCSUE) seeks a greater understanding of how university engagement enhances faculty scholarship and community progress. How do scholars engage most effectively with their communities, and how, in turn, does such engagement enhance their scholarship? The Center convenes scholars and community fellows to explore ways of creating institutional support for building truly collaborative arrangements. NCSUE supports research studies and dissemination through publications, a speaker series, conferences, presentations, and workshops.

• National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. As of the toolkit’s release, this website is under construction and will be transitioning to the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement website at [http://www.researchslce.org], summer 2009.
The National Review Board provides external peer review and evaluation of faculty members’ scholarship of engagement. It provides consultation, training, and technical assistance to campuses that are seeking to develop or strengthen systems in support of the scholarship of engagement. It also conducts forums, programs, and regional conferences on topics related to the scholarship of engagement and provides a faculty mentoring program with opportunities for less experienced faculty to learn from the outreach experiences of more seasoned outreach scholars. The board of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) voted recently to assume responsibility for the Review Board, with the caveat that it might consider modifying the activities to put more emphasis on developmental reviews for faculty rather than just official reviews at the time of tenure and/or promotion. The Board agreed to expand the panel of reviewers, and to coordinate their work with that of others (such as CCPH, Imagining America and the public sociology initiative) to avoid duplication. A small working group has been appointed to develop ideas and recommendations.

• National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, [http://www.servicelearning.org/]
The Clearinghouse offers an online library of numerous and diverse, relevant citations and resources. Suggested research terms are “tenure” and “faculty recognition.”

• Outreach Scholars Academy (2007), Welcome to the outreach scholars academy, University of New Hampshire, [http://www.unh.edu/outreach-scholars/]
  This website provides information and tools useful for establishing an engaged scholarship academy for faculty including curriculum, workshop design, principles of practice, etc.

4. Annotated Bibliographies

- National Academy for Academic Leadership, Faculty rewards and scholarship readings and websites http://www.thenationalacademy.org/rewards/biblio.html

- University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Center for Teaching Excellence, Annotated links for career development and community-based scholarship, http://cte.umdnj.edu/career_development/career_community.cfm