

**University of Kentucky Promotion and Tenure: Engagement
DRAFT Version 6: Committee Recommended Document and Sources
February 16, 2009**

PREAMBLE

The University of Kentucky, a publicly funded, land-grant research institution, accepts and embraces its responsibility for research, instruction, and service that significantly benefit the people of Kentucky. The University is committed to fulfilling this signal responsibility through traditional scholarship in all of its forms as well as through engaged scholarship that directly benefits the Commonwealth. Educational units are expected to align with this University-wide mission and to develop, in consultation with the Provost, appropriate criteria for assessment of traditional and engaged scholarship within the context of their respective disciplines. Educational units are also expected to assess, evaluate, and reward the contribution of engaged as well as traditional scholarship in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations. These ongoing actions are critical to the University's ability to recruit, retain, and advance a diverse and distinguished faculty that will provide expertise, solutions, and leadership for Kentucky, the nation, and the world.

It is not the expectation of the University that every faculty member will participate in community engagement activity or engaged scholarship. Appropriate roles will vary based upon the mission and context of the educational unit, the job description, the annually negotiated distribution of effort, and the faculty member's interests and abilities. For some, traditional forms of scholarship will remain the most appropriate vehicles to advance their research agendas. For other faculty, a focused plan for engagement activity and scholarship will provide opportunities to advance a coherent plan of research and creative works, to promote student learning and preparation for leadership, and to make their service more relevant and responsive to community needs. Educational units, in consultation with the Provost, will review their missions and determine on an ongoing basis the most appropriate systems and criteria for evaluating all types of scholarship toward promotion and tenure.

DEFINITIONS

ENGAGEMENT

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines Community Engagement as: “the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities . . . for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (*Carnegie Elective Classification: Community Engagement: 2008 Documentation Framework*).

Engagement refers to the application of “academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of the university and unit missions” [This generally accepted concept is articulated in Auburn University *Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures, Section 8 C, Outreach*].

Engagement is a cross-cutting philosophy and methodology that applies equally to research, instruction, and service. [This now generally accepted concept was first enunciated in the 1993 Michigan State University document: *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society: A Report by the Provost’s Committee on University Outreach*].

Engagement recognizes that both the community and the university have their own needs and unique, valuable resources and that respectful, reciprocal partnerships with shared roles and responsibilities can be the most productive means for advancing knowledge, benefitting communities and universities, and preparing students for careers and community leadership while advancing democratic values.

COMMUNITY

References to “community” throughout this document refer to that which is beyond the University and is not associated with academia. Communities of multiple types exist, including those of location (e.g., Mayfield, the 6th Congressional District, Kentucky), of purpose (e.g., baseball players, corporations, nursing home directors, non-profit organizations, legislators), and need (e.g., individuals with a particular disease, war veterans). Engagement activity may appropriately include external

academic partners, but the intent should be to provide direct benefit to the community as defined in this paragraph.

ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990) challenged postsecondary institutions to align their intellectual resources in service to the priority needs of their communities. Boyer's concept and the many studies that have followed share a common understanding of the elements characterizing excellence in engaged scholarship: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. [These elements are discussed in greater detail at the web site of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement.]

A faculty endeavor may be regarded as engaged scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if: 1) the work seeks to advance the community and realistically addresses societal needs, issues, problems, or opportunities; 2) the faculty member is adequately prepared, with disciplinary expertise as well as the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to work successfully with the community; 3) the methodology is appropriate to the community goal as well as to the production of scholarship; 4) the results are clear and contribute to knowledge and/or community practice; 5) the faculty member critically evaluates the endeavor to determine its contribution to knowledge/creative works and/or practice for the discipline and the community; 6) the work is communicated to appropriate academic and community audiences; and 7) there is review by peers within and beyond the academic community.

Engaged Scholarship at the University of Kentucky

The University of Kentucky recognizes community engagement as a methodology that cuts across the University's three missions, research, instruction, and service, and that rises to the level of engaged scholarship when it meets the criteria for traditional scholarship as well as for community

engagement. The University's starting point for allocating faculty effort within an educational unit lies within the unit's differentiated mission, goals, objectives, and strategies, all developed with the concurrence of the Provost. These elements make clear the ways unit effort and activity will advance the University's goals and its three missions. Allocation of faculty time and effort should follow from the unit mission and goals. The specific allocation of the faculty member's time should be stated explicitly within his/her distribution of effort (DOE) and should be assessed, reviewed, and revised on a regular basis.

Once it is determined that engaged research, instruction, and/or service are appropriate for a specific faculty member within an educational unit, the guidance in this document should be followed to ensure that the work will rise to the level of engaged scholarship that will advance the University, educational unit, discipline, and faculty member. Department chairs/directors and faculty members should work together to develop and monitor a long-term, targeted plan for engaged scholarship that contributes to the faculty member's success.

PURSUIING ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

The engaged scholarship undertaken, whether disciplinary or interdisciplinary, should address a community need, and "must be creative and intellectual in nature" and based in the faculty member's area of academic expertise (University of Wisconsin *Articles of Faculty Governance, Appendix I.B, Criteria for Faculty Appointment and Promotion in UW-Extension, VI. Assessment of Scholarship*). The work undertaken should develop "new knowledge, and/or incorporate creative methods of applying, sharing or presenting new or existing knowledge. The faculty member must demonstrate awareness of best practices . . . [and of] existing knowledge . . . in the field. The scholar . . . [must clearly identify] the need for new knowledge or an improved practice, and . . . [develop] that knowledge, method, or approach to appropriately fill the need." These activities should include methodological designs, findings, and/or outcomes that advance the discipline and the community.

Review and evaluation by peers of the scholarship undertaken should affirm the work as it is shared in the form of “academic presentations, exhibitions of work, creative performances, or publication of articles,” policy briefs, and reports (Wisconsin *Articles*). These venues for dissemination are “not meant to be exclusive of other means by which the product of a scholar's work [undergoes] . . . independent evaluation by those persons having comparable understanding of the discipline or activity and who can provide judgment as to the work's value or merit to the academic discipline.” To provide documentation of the faculty member’s cohesive body of engaged efforts, the promotion/tenure dossier should contain supporting evidence (i.e., reports, policy briefs, letters of support, etc.). “Since evaluation is most valid when that judgment is independent, the scholar's peers, as opposed to collaborators, should . . . [evaluate the work]. Collaborators can and do provide useful review, but such review is not peer review in the sense intended here. Peers are persons working in the same academic discipline or who are familiar with the body of knowledge in that discipline, and may include person(s) whose professional work has been done outside of the university.”

The work undertaken should “add to the existing body of knowledge and creative achievement. To that end, it is essential that engaged scholars disseminate their work and add to the existing body of [knowledge] Faculty members may choose multiple ways to share . . . [and] make their work accessible to others. This may be accomplished through a variety of means including, but not limited to, presentations, publications (e.g., journal articles, hard copy and electronic papers), and other ways of sharing work with colleagues” and stakeholders (Wisconsin *Articles*).

The engaged scholarship should address issues of significance to the community and should, if fully successful, positively impact citizens and society. If the scholarship undertaken appropriately addresses all issues, practical and theoretical, at all stages, achieves reasoned conclusions, and generates new knowledge, applications, and/or best practices, that, in itself, will make the scholarship valuable. In research, for example, negative outcomes of experiments can provide the basis on which

later scholars achieve success. Still, the engaged scholar should pursue projects and goals that show promise of successful outcomes.

The scholarship undertaken and, hopefully, the outcomes and impacts achieved should be recognized and valued by those for whom it was intended. To this end, the scholar must identify the intended audience/recipients. Recognition and valuing can be reflected in: “persistence of use, impact, and duration of public use, scope, persistence of influence, and/or public appreciation. The ‘intended’ portion of the statement is framed within the context of a primary audience. These audiences may be peers, educators, students, various publics, patrons, and/or” stakeholders (*Wisconsin Articles*).

The National Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement provides the following questions that will prove helpful to faculty in planning, implementing, and evaluating their engaged scholarship.

“Goals/Questions

- Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good?
- Is there an ‘academic fit’ with the scholar’s role, departmental and university mission?
- Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
- Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the context of a scholarly agenda in the discipline and in the community?

Context of theory, literature, ‘best practices’

- Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship?
- Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to the collaboration?
- Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work?
- Is the work intellectually compelling?

Methods

- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions and context of the work?
- Does the scholar describe rationale for election of methods in relation to context and issue?
- Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?
- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Results

- Does the scholar achieve the goals?
- Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community?
- Does the scholar’s work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom?
- Does the scholar’s work make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time?

Communication/Dissemination

- Does the scholar use a [sic] suitable styles and effective organization to present the work?
- Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution?
- Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audience?
- Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

- Does the scholar critically evaluate the work?
- What are the sources of evidence informing the critique?
- Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique?
- In what way has the community perspective informed the critique?
- In what way has the community perspective informed the critique?
- Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work?
- Is the scholar involved in a local, state, and national dialogue related to the work?"

EVALUATIVE MATRIX

Table one, below, adapts the taxonomy developed by Boyer, Glassick et al., and Penn State University's UniSCOPE in applying Boyer's forms, discovery, application, integration, and learning, to the scholarly work conducted by UK faculty.

The main contribution of the model presented in Table 1 (matrix) emerges when one considers how Boyer's four forms of scholarship create a logical framework for classifying the traditional and familiar types of scholarship activities. Table 1 is a four by four matrix with the four forms of engaged scholarship on the left axis and the four areas of function at the top. The cells of the table illustrate how the interaction of the form and function creates a framework in which we can locate the full range of traditional and engaged scholarship activities. These examples are illustrative and not intended to exhaust the range of engaged activities that would qualify as scholarship. These examples provide samples of the types of work that a faculty member may include as components of their dossier as prepared for promotion and tenure to reflect engaged scholarship.

DRAFT

Works Consulted

The UCAPP Engagement Committee reviewed tenure and promotion documents from UK benchmarks and leading engagement institutions around the nation. The committee also reviewed central engagement documents. Although the proposed text of the Administrative Regulation does not reference every one of these documents, all were critical in the formation of the committee's sense of national standards and appropriate recognition, reward, and encouragement of engaged scholarship consonant with maintenance of high academic standards.

The following were reviewed:

Auburn University

Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (undated)
University Outreach: University Connections to Society (August 2000)
Guide for Faculty Outreach: Outreach Resources for Faculty (undated)
All Auburn documents are available in .pdf format through Phil Greasley.

Boyer and His Successors

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, 1990.
Glassick, Charles E., Huber, Mary T., and Maeroff, Gene I. *Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation*, 1997.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Elective Classification: Community Engagement Documentation Framework (Revised 10/23/2007).
Available online at: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/dynamic/downloads/file_1_614.pdf.

Imagining America

Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design (2008)
This document is available electronically at: http://www.imaginingamerica.org/TTI/TTI_FINAL.pdf.

Indiana University

Academic Handbook (2008)
This document is available electronically at:
http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/acad_handbk_2008.pdf.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Dean of the Faculties' Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers. (2007-2008)
The 2008-2009 revision of this work is available electronically at: <http://faa.iupui.edu/newFaa/pandt.asp>

Michigan State University

The committee received numerous MSU documents including those for many colleges because MSU promotion and tenure requirements are college-based. More important, however, we received the two following documents:

University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society: A Report by the Provost's Committee on University Outreach (October 1993)
Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach (1996, revised 2000).

Both documents are available online at: <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp>.

National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement

Web Site

This document is available electronically at:

http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/evaluation/evaluation_criteria.html).

North Carolina State University

Academic Tenure Policy (Revised September 17, 2008)

This document is available electronically at:

<http://www.ncsu.edu/policies/employment/faculty/POL05.20.1.php>.

Values North Carolina State University Holds Dear and Six Associated Realms of Faculty Responsibility (Adopted 2006)

This document is available electronically by typing in the name on your browser.

The Ohio State University

2009/2010 Promotion and Tenure Dossier Outline (Updated December 2008)

This document is available electronically at: <http://extadmin-cms.ag.ohio-state.edu/policy-handbook/iii-appointments-promotions-tenure/faculty-promotion-tenure/>.

Penn State University

Uniscope 2000: A Multidimensional Model to Scholarship for the 21st Century (2000)

This document is available online at:

<http://cas.psu.edu/docs/CASPROF/keystone21/uniscope/default.htm>.

Portland State University

Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (Adopted June 13, 1996)

Hard copy of this document is available through Phil Greasley.

Purdue University

Form 36-Instr-08-09 (September 2008)

Purdue Promotion Document (August 2008)

Summary of Relevant Sections from Purdue University¹ Criteria for Promotion That will be useful for UK: Extraction from Many Regulations by Vic Lechtenberg (October 2008)

These documents are available in electronic form through Phil Greasley.

University of Georgia

Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. (April 2004, revised Fall 2007)

Public Service and Outreach, Academic Rank: Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion (Revised March 2007)

Hard copies of both documents are available through Phil Greasley.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Faculty Policies and Procedures, Chapter Seven: Faculty Appointments (Amended 5 May 2008)

This document is available electronically at:

http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_7.htm

UW-Extension Articles of Faculty Governance, Appendix 1.B. (September 25, 1997; revised September 2001)

This document is available electronically at:

<http://www.uwex.edu/secretary/policies/section8/fapp1b.pdf>.

Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship (February 1997)

DRAFT