

2011

Unpacking Faculty Engagement: The Types of Activities Faculty Members Report as Publicly Engaged Scholarship During Promotion and Tenure

Chris R. Glass
Old Dominion University

Diane M. Doberneck

John H. Schweitzer

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_fac_pubs

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Glass, Chris R.; Doberneck, Diane M.; and Schweitzer, John H., "Unpacking Faculty Engagement: The Types of Activities Faculty Members Report as Publicly Engaged Scholarship During Promotion and Tenure" (2011). *Educational Foundations & Leadership Faculty Publications*. 2.

https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_fac_pubs/2

Original Publication Citation

Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(1), 7-30.

Unpacking Faculty Engagement: The Types of Activities Faculty Members Report as Publicly Engaged Scholarship During Promotion and Tenure

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

Abstract

While a growing body of scholarship has focused on the personal, professional, and organizational factors that influence faculty members' involvement in publicly engaged scholarship, the nature and scope of faculty publicly engaged scholarship itself has remained largely unexplored. What types of activities are faculty members involved in as publicly engaged scholarship? How does their involvement vary by demographic, type of faculty appointment, or college grouping? To explore these questions, researchers conducted a quantitative content analysis of 173 promotion and tenure documents from a research-intensive, land-grant, Carnegie Classified Community Engagement university and found statistically significant differences for the variables age, number of years at the institution, faculty rank, Extension appointment, joint appointment, and college grouping. Recommendations for future research are discussed as well as implications for institutional leadership, faculty development programming, and the structuring of academic appointments.

Introduction

Since the Carnegie Foundation published Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990, the question of what should be considered the scholarly activity of college and university faculty members has met with few easily agreed-upon answers in the academy (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). Boyer (1990, 1996) argued that scholarship should be conceptualized more broadly to include the scholarship of discovery, teaching, application (or engagement), and integration. Throughout the 1990s, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) convened its annual Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards to examine the expanding definitions of faculty work, and to consider how the academy might accommodate broadened definitions of scholarship in the faculty roles and rewards system. Published by AAHE, *The Disciplines Speak* and

The Disciplines Speak II (Diamond & Adam, 1995, 2000) documented similar conversations taking place in disciplinary organizations and professional societies. The authors concluded that efforts to broaden the meaning of scholarship would not succeed without clear, rigorous standards for evaluating and rewarding the different definitions of scholarly work (Diamond & Adam, 1995, 2000; Glassick et al., 1997).

Concomitant with Boyer's and the AAHE's work, the scholarly contributions that faculty members make to the greater good of society were being called into question, particularly at research-intensive, land-grant institutions, which, by mandate, are obligated to serve the public good (Checkoway, 2001; Kellogg Commission, 1999). Discussions focused on defining the characteristics of faculty engagement and clarifying the differences among service, outreach, and engagement (Sandmann, 2008). The relationship of the scholarship of engagement to research and creative activities, instruction, and service, was a major point of contention, as some argued for integration (Colbeck, 2002) and others for connectedness (Fear, Rosaen, Foster-Fishman, & Bawden, 2001). Today, as Giles (2008) notes, the central questions from two decades ago remain unanswered. Is engagement "a noun or a verb or should [it] be used in its adjectival form, engaged? Where does scholarship fit in? Is it the key activity, and *public* or *engaged* can modify this noun interchangeably? Or is engagement the overall phenomenon?" (p. 102).

At the same time as institutional leaders were working through the definitional dilemmas related to publicly engaged scholarship and clarifying distinctions associated with how faculty members

"An important question. . . remains: What types of scholarly activities are faculty members involved in as publicly engaged scholarship?"

relate to their community partners, another group of institutional leaders was addressing the need for institutional benchmarking based on detailed accounts from faculty about their publicly engaged scholarship (Church, Zimmerman, Bargerstock, & Kenney, 2002/2003; Lunsford, Church, & Zimmerman, 2006). These institutional leaders developed initial lists of the scholarly activities that faculty members and community

partners collaborate on and, through national associations, ultimately developed institutional tools for measuring outreach and engagement (Michigan State University, 2009).

An important question, however, remains: What types of scholarly activities are faculty members involved in as publicly engaged scholarship? To answer this question, this study examined faculty engagement by differentiating types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship, and by analyzing the relationships between personal characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity) and professional characteristics (e.g., rank, appointment, and college grouping).

Three questions framed this study:

1. What types of scholarly activities are faculty members involved in as publicly engaged scholarship?
2. How do the types of publicly engaged scholarship vary by demographic and appointment variables?
3. How do the types of publicly engaged scholarship vary by college grouping?

Because this was an exploratory study, the researchers selected a single site for the study based on purposive criteria that corresponded to the research questions (Creswell, 2009). Michigan State University (MSU) was selected because it is a major research university with high expectations for faculty achievement in research and creative activities, instruction, and service. As a land-grant university and Carnegie Classified Community Engagement institution, MSU has both a historical mandate to serve the public good and a contemporary affirmation of excellence in curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships. In addition, researchers had access to MSU's institutional documents for the study. Researchers framed this study using the definition of publicly engaged scholarship that guided faculty work at Michigan State University during the study period, which states that outreach scholarship is "a scholarly endeavor that cuts across instruction, research and creative activities, and service, fulfills unit and university missions, and focuses on collaboration with and benefits to communities external to the university" (*Provost's Committee on University Outreach, 1993, p. 1*).

Factors That Influence Faculty Involvement in Publicly Engaged Scholarship

In their faculty engagement model, Wade and Demb (2009) proposed a systemic conceptualization of the factors that influence faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship. They examined the personal, professional, institutional, and publicly engaged

scholarship dimensions of faculty life and noted that little is known about the activities that comprise publicly engaged scholarship. Studies to better understand faculty publicly engaged scholarship have examined the institutional, professional, and personal influences on faculty publicly engaged scholarship, as well as the types of faculty engagement. For example, from the institutional perspective, scholars have studied institutional mission, leadership, policies, funding, engagement structures, and institutional types and cultures. This line of research has focused on understanding the nature of institutional support and commitment to faculty publicly engaged scholarship (Holland, 1997), the characteristics that define an engaged campus (Kellogg Commission, 1999), the level of faculty engagement across institutional types (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000), and the organizational norms that shape faculty publicly engaged scholarship (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006).

From the professional perspective, researchers have sought to understand the influence of academic discipline, tenure status, faculty rank, socialization, length of time in academe, departmental support, appointment type, and assignment (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; O'Meara, 2002; Ward, 2003) on faculty publicly engaged scholarship. This line of research has focused on understanding not only these institutional influences, but also the disciplinary influences on faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship.

From the personal perspective, research has focused on demographic and sociocultural influences on faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship, including gender, race, ethnicity, age, values/beliefs, motivation, prior experience, and epistemology (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Baez, 2000; Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Gonzalez & Padilla, 2008; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara, 2002, 2008).

From the type of faculty engagement perspective, few scholars have examined the nature, scope, and characteristics of publicly engaged scholarship. Those that have done so have focused on levels of engagement (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006), motivations for public engagement (Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; O'Meara, 2008), types of engaged activities (Schomberg & Farmer, 1994), and the integration of engagement with faculty work roles (Colbeck, 2002).

At the conclusion of their article, Wade and Demb (2009) cited the lack of research about publicly engaged scholarship and called for new research to explore this area:

Before inquiring further about the factors that affect faculty involvement in outreach and engagement, we need

to develop a set of precise terms to describe and capture the community-oriented activities of faculty that are closely associated with the core research, teaching, and service roles of the professoriate (p. 14).

The study reported in the present article was a response to Wade and Demb's call for a precise set of terms that describe and capture faculty publicly engaged scholarship. Through this study, the researchers sought to understand faculty publicly engaged scholarship broadly, rather than from a perspective limited to one type of publicly engaged scholarship (e.g., service-learning, campus-community partnerships, community-based research), or informed by one particular epistemological stance (e.g., social justice, democratic engagement; O'Meara, 2008).

Methodology

In this study, the researchers conducted a quantitative content analysis to systematically code and analyze promotion and tenure documents to identify the types of publicly engaged scholarship that faculty members reported during promotion and tenure review. Quantitative content analysis provided an empirically grounded means of examining large quantities of unstructured text to identify meanings in their context (Krippendorff, 2004). Quantitative content analysis methodology facilitated the discovery of broad, generalizable patterns in the text (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 15). With no standard language to describe publicly engaged scholarship, the researchers had to consider the context in which the types of publicly engaged scholarship were reported on the promotion and tenure documents. Consequently, the researchers coded the data by hand, making sure instances of publicly engaged scholarship met the study's selected definition of publicly engaged scholarship as well as the definitions of specific types of publicly engaged scholarship. The researchers used a publicly engaged scholarship typology they had developed earlier (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2009; see Table 1). Once the coding was completed, the researchers conducted statistical analyses (e.g., frequency distributions, means, and chi-square tests) to determine the significance in frequency of the reported types of publicly engaged scholarship (Neuendorf, 2002).

Table 1. Types and Definitions of Publicly Engaged Scholarship: A Typology Developed by Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2009)

Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Activities
<p><i>Type 1. Research—business, industry, commodity group funded.</i> Sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from businesses, industries, trade associations, or commodity groups (e.g., agricultural or natural resources groups) that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences.</p> <p><i>Type 2. Research—nonprofit, foundation, government funded.</i> Sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, foundations, or government agencies that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences.</p> <p><i>Type 3. Research—unfunded or intramurally funded applied research.</i> Community-responsive or community-based research or inquiry that is not funded by a community partner but instead is pursued by faculty through intramural support or as financially unsupported research or inquiry.</p> <p><i>Type 4. Creative activities.</i> Original creations of literary, fine, performing, or applied arts and other expressions or activities of creative disciplines or fields that are made available to or generated in collaboration with a public (nonuniversity) audience.</p>
Publicly Engaged Instruction
<p><i>Type 5. Instruction—for credit—nontraditional audiences.</i> Classes and instructional programs that offer student academic credit hours and are designed and marketed specifically to serve those who are neither traditional campus degree seekers nor campus staff.</p> <p><i>Type 6. Instruction—for credit—curricular, community-engaged learning.</i> Classes and curricular programs where students learn with, through, and from community partners, in a community context, under the guidance and supervision of faculty members.</p> <p><i>Type 7. Instruction—noncredit—classes and programs.</i> Classes and instructional programs marketed specifically to those who are neither degree seekers nor campus staff.</p> <p><i>Type 8. Instruction—noncredit—managed learning environments.</i> Scholarly resources designed for general public audiences that are often learner-initiated and learner-paced (e.g., museums, galleries, libraries, gardens, exhibits, expositions).</p> <p><i>Type 9. Instruction—noncredit—public understanding, events, and media.</i> Scholarly resources designed for the general public that are accessible through print, radio, television, or web media. General examples include self-paced educational materials and products (e.g., bulletins, pamphlets, encyclopedia entries, educational broadcasting, CD-ROMs, software, textbooks for lay audiences); dissemination of scholarship through media (e.g., speakers' bureaus, TV appearances, newspaper interviews, radio broadcasts, web pages, and podcasts, if scholarly and readily available to the public); and popular writing in newsletters, popular press, or practitioner-oriented publications.</p>
Publicly Engaged Service
<p><i>Type 10. Service—technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice.</i> Provision of university-based knowledge or other scholarly advice through direct interaction with nonuniversity clients who have requested assistance to address an issue or solve a problem.</p> <p><i>Type 11. Service—cocurricular service-learning.</i> Service-learning experiences that are not offered in conjunction with a credit-bearing course or academic program and do not include reflection on community practice or connections between content and the experience.</p> <p><i>Type 12. Service—patient, clinical, and diagnostic services.</i> Services offered to human and animal clients, with care provided by university faculty members or professional or graduate students, through hospitals, laboratories, and clinics.</p> <p><i>Type 13. Service—advisory boards and other discipline-related service.</i> Contributions of scholarly expertise made by faculty, staff, and students at the request of nonuniversity audiences on an ad hoc or ongoing basis.</p>
Publicly Engaged Commercialized Activities
<p><i>Type 14. Commercialized activities.</i> Translation of new knowledge generated by the university to the public through the commercialization of discoveries (e.g., technology transfer, licenses, copyrights, and some forms of economic development).</p>

Data Sources

The researchers selected promotion and tenure documents from a single institution as the primary data source for this study. The term *promotion and tenure documents* refers to Michigan State University's *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action* (Form D) as well as the personal narratives and curricula vitae provided by faculty members as part of their dossiers. Data from the promotion and tenure documents included faculty appointment and assignment information, and narratives about instruction, research, service to academic communities, service to broader communities, and integrated scholarship (Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2009; Michigan State University Human Resources, 2001). Additional data from a MSU administrator's database was used in the analysis of demographic information such as gender, race/ethnicity, and age at time of review.

Promotion and tenure documents were selected as credible and trustworthy sources of data for a number of reasons. First, promotion and tenure documents reflected the lived experience of faculty members at the intersection between their unique "courses of life" and the particular organizational structures and processes they must navigate in academe. The completed promotion and tenure forms offered important perspectives into how faculty members have balanced competing responsibilities, generated scholarly products, and achieved excellence and recognition for their contributions (Moore & Ward, 2008). The personal narratives and curricula vitae revealed rich insights about faculty pursuit of meaningful, scholarly work, including publicly engaged scholarship.

Second, promotion and tenure review is a time when a faculty member's scholarship, including publicly engaged scholarship, is scrutinized by peers, including department- and college-level reviewers, external reviewers, and central administrators. Documents that have undergone such review are likely to "tell the truth about the particular

"The completed promotion and tenure forms offered important perspectives into how faculty members have balanced competing responsibilities, generated scholarly products, and achieved excellence and recognition for their contributions."

events or matter” at hand (*Whitt, 2001*). Third, because promotion and tenure documents, and the corresponding decisions based on them, reflect an assessment of the quality and impact of faculty work, they are suitable data for the analysis of types of faculty scholarship (*Fairweather, 2002a*). Finally, promotion and tenure documents are safeguarded by the Office of Academic Human Resources and are, therefore, guaranteed to be original, not edited after the fact to convey facts in a particular light.

The data were from faculty members who underwent promotion and tenure review at Michigan State University between 2002 and 2006. In the 2002–2006 study period, 376 faculty members met the eligibility criteria. In this Institutional Review Board–approved study, 46% of the eligible faculty members gave informed consent to have their promotion and tenure documents included in the study. The 173 consenting faculty members were 32% female ($n = 55$), 68% male ($n = 118$), 80% White ($n = 139$), 20% non-White ($n = 34$), with the non-White comprising 5% African American ($n = 8$), 10% Asian ($n = 17$), 2% Hispanic ($n = 4$), and 3% Native American ($n = 5$). Of the 173, 58% were promoted to associate professors ($n = 101$) and 42% were promoted to full professors ($n = 72$).

Data Coding

With a focus on types of publicly engaged scholarship, the researchers selected unique “scholarly outreach and engagement activity” as the unit of analysis. The researchers assigned a presence code (noted by a “1”) when any of the 14 types of publicly engaged scholarship were reported by faculty members in the promotion and tenure documents. For example, when a curriculum vita listed policy analysis conducted at the request of a state government agency, researchers assigned a “1” for the type “Research—nonprofit, foundation, government funded” (Type 2). When a faculty member’s personal narrative described using academic service-learning pedagogy in a class, researchers assigned a “1” for “Instruction—for credit—curricular, community-engaged learning” (Type 6). Researchers assigned an absence code (noted by a “0”) for the 14 types of publicly engaged scholarship that were *not* mentioned by faculty members anywhere in the promotion and tenure dossier, personal narrative, and curriculum vita. These presence/absence codes, along with demographic information from the MSU administrators’ database and appointment information from the promotion and tenure cover sheets, were the basis for statistical analysis.

To ensure consistency in coding, researchers followed best practices for team-based document analysis, including holding regular meetings to review codebook definitions and rules, making codes explicit, and establishing intercoder agreement early in the coding process (MacQueen, McLellan, & Milstein, 1998; Mayring, 2000). For each code, the codebook included the full definition, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and examples of the types of publicly engaged scholarship (Boyatzis, 1998). To establish intercoder agreement at the beginning of the study, the researchers independently coded text from three preselected promotion and tenure documents, then met to discuss the assigned codes and resolve coding discrepancies. The researchers continued this process until all members of the coding team thoroughly understood how to assign the presence and absence codes. Throughout the coding process, the researchers discussed coding questions at biweekly meetings of the research team. When clarifications were agreed upon by the entire research team, the codebook was updated. At the end of the coding process, the researchers entered the quantitative codes into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 17.0 for data analysis.

The Findings

The researchers used descriptive statistics to understand the types of publicly engaged scholarship that faculty members reported on their promotion and tenure forms. In addition, researchers conducted chi-square analysis to understand how types of activities varied by demographic, appointment type, and college grouping. In this section, we describe the findings from this quantitative content analysis.

What Types of Activities Are Faculty Members Involved in as Publicly Engaged Scholarship?

To answer the research question, the researchers used descriptive statistics, including frequencies, to analyze the types of publicly engaged scholarship. Overall, 94% of the faculty members reported at least one type of publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure.

Publicly engaged research and creative activities.

About three-fourths (72%) of the faculty members reported at least one type of publicly engaged research and creative activity. Analysis of engaged research and creative activities indicated the

following frequencies: nonprofit, foundation, and government funded research (50%); unfunded or intramurally funded applied research (40%); business, industry, or commodity group funded research (30%); and creative activities (6%).

Publicly engaged instruction.

Most (88%) of the faculty members reported at least one type of publicly engaged instruction. Analysis of publicly engaged instruction indicated the following frequencies: noncredit courses and programs (73%); public understanding, events, and media (62%); curricular, community-engaged learning (10%); managed learning environments (6%); and for-credit courses for nontraditional audiences (6%).

Publicly engaged service.

More than two-thirds (71%) of the faculty members reported at least one type of publicly engaged service. Analysis of publicly engaged service indicated the following frequencies: technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice (56%); advisory boards and other discipline-related service (38%); and patient, clinical, and diagnostic services (9%). No faculty members reported cocurricular service-learning on their promotion and tenure documents.

Publicly engaged commercialized activities.

A few (15%) of the faculty members reported at least one type of commercialized activity, including patents, copyrights, licenses, and/or technology transfer.

How Do the Types of Publicly Engaged Scholarship Vary by Demographic and Appointment Variables?

To address this research question, researchers conducted chi-square analysis comparing faculty members by demographic (age, years at institution, gender, ethnicity) and appointment (rank, Extension appointment, joint appointment) variables. Statistically significant findings (at $p \leq .05$) are summarized in columns two and three of Table 2.

Table 2. Attending teachers' performance on pre- and post-content assessment

Type	Demographic and Appointment Characteristics		College Groupings	
	Less Likely	More Likely	Less Likely	More Likely
Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Activities				
Business, industry, or commodity group sponsored research	None	Extension	Social & behavioral sciences; Arts & humanities; Education	Agriculture & natural resources
Nonprofit, government, or foundation sponsored research	30s 0-5 years	50s and 60s 6-10 years Extension appointments; Joint appointments	Arts & humanities; Physical & biological sciences	Agricultural & natural resources
Unfunded or intramurally funded applied research	None	60s	Physical & biological sciences	Social & behavioral sciences; Agriculture & natural resources
Creative activities; including performances of original	None	None	None	None
Publicly Engaged Instruction				
For credit—nontraditional audiences	None	None	None	None
For credit—curricular service learning and community engagement	None	None	None	Social & behavioral sciences
Noncredit—classes and programs	None	Extension appointments	Social & behavioral sciences	Agriculture & natural resources
Noncredit—managed learning environments	None	None	None	None
Publicly Engaged Service				
Patient and clinical care services	None	None	Agricultural & natural resources	Health & medical professions
Technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice	None	Extension appointments	Arts & humanities; Physical & biological sciences	Agricultural & natural resources; Health & medical professions
Community service, including civic engagement activities not associated with academic credit	None	None	None	None
Advisory boards and other discipline-related service	30s 6-10 years Associate professor	40s, 50s, and 60s 11-15 years; 16+ years Full professor	None	Health & medical professions
Publicly Engaged Commercial Activities				
Patents, copyrights, technology transfer, economic development	Associate professor	Full professor	Agriculture & natural resources	

All results reported in this table are at a $p \leq .05$ level of significance.

Age.

Faculty members were grouped into four categories according to age (30s, 40s, 50s, and 60s) for statistical analysis. Faculty members in their 30s were less likely than faculty members in the other age groups to report advisory boards and other discipline-related service ($p = .005$). Faculty members in their 30s were less likely to report nonprofit, government, or foundation sponsored research, while faculty members in their 50s or 60s were more likely to report it ($p = .017$). Faculty members in their 60s were more likely to report unfunded or intramurally funded applied research than faculty members in their 30s, 40s, or 50s ($p = .027$).

Years at institution.

Faculty members were grouped into four categories according to the number of years they had served at the institution (5 years or less, 6–10 years, 11–15 years, and 16 or more years). Faculty members who had been employed at the institution for 5 years or less were less likely than faculty members in the other year categories to report nonprofit, government, and foundation sponsored research ($p = .016$). Faculty members who had been employed at the institution for 6–10 years were less likely to report advisory boards and other discipline-related service ($p = .025$); however, they were more likely to report nonprofit, government, or foundation sponsored research ($p = .016$). Faculty members in the categories employed at the institution for 11–15 years and for 16 and more years were more likely to report advisory boards and other discipline-related service ($p = .025$).

Rank.

Faculty members were promoted either to associate professor or to full professor. Associate professors were less likely than full professors to report advisory boards and other discipline-related service ($p = .015$) and commercialized activities ($p = .000$). Full professors were more likely than associate professors to report advisory boards and other discipline-related service ($p = .015$) and commercialized activities ($p = .000$).

Extension appointment.

Faculty members either had Extension appointments or they did not have them. Faculty members with Extension appointments were more likely than their non-Extension colleagues to report business, industry, or community group sponsored research

($p = .000$); nonprofit, government, or foundation sponsored research ($p = .000$); teaching noncredit courses and programs ($p = .000$); public understanding, events, and media ($p = .033$); and technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice ($p = .010$).

Joint appointments.

Faculty members either had a joint departmental appointment or a single departmental appointment. Faculty members with joint appointments were more likely than their single-department colleagues to report nonprofit, government, or foundation sponsored research ($p = .027$).

Gender.

Comparisons of male and female faculty members with type of publicly engaged scholarship were not found to be statistically significant.

Ethnicity.

To ensure a large enough number of faculty members to run tests of statistical significance, faculty of color were grouped into one category (non-White) and Caucasian faculty into another category (White). Although this comparison of White and non-White is consistent with other analyses of ethnicity and engagement (*Abes et al., 2002; Antonio, 2002; Antonio et al., 2000*), the researchers do not believe that all non-White faculty (or all White faculty) members approach their involvement in publicly engaged scholarship in the same ways. Comparisons of ethnicity with the types of publicly engaged scholarship revealed differences, but none were found to be statistically significant.

How Do the Types of Publicly Engaged Scholarship Vary by College Grouping?

To address this research question, a chi-square analysis was conducted comparing faculty members within the college group to all faculty members not in the college group being analyzed. The researchers decided to use college groupings (instead of the institution's actual colleges) so that the analysis and findings would be more relevant and comparable to those from other institutions (and less reflective of MSU's particular institutional history and culture). The use of college groupings is a common practice in this kind of analysis (*Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Fairweather, 2002b*). Statistically significant findings (at $p \leq .05$) by college grouping

are reported below and summarized in columns four and five of Table 2.

Agriculture and natural resources.

Agriculture and natural resources faculty members were more likely than their colleagues to report business, industry, or commodity funded research ($p = .000$); nonprofit, government, or foundation funded research ($p = .000$); unfunded or intramurally funded applied research ($p = .043$); teaching noncredit courses or programs ($p = .020$); public understanding, events, and media ($p = .033$); and technical assistance and expert testimony ($p = .008$). However, agriculture and natural resources faculty members were less likely than faculty members in other colleges to report patient and clinical services ($p = .009$) or commercialized activities ($p = .026$).

Arts and humanities (including music).

Arts and humanities faculty members were less likely than the faculty members in other colleges to report business, industry, or commodity funded research ($p = .000$); nonprofit, government, or foundation funded research ($p = .000$); or technical assistance, expert testimony, or legal advice ($p = .013$).

Business.

Business faculty members were neither more nor less likely than faculty members in other colleges to report different types of publicly engaged scholarship.

Education.

Education faculty members were no more likely to report different types of publicly engaged scholarship than faculty members in other colleges. However, education faculty members were less likely than their colleagues to report business, industry, or commodity funded research ($p = .036$).

Engineering.

Engineering faculty members were neither more nor less likely than faculty members in other colleges to report different types of publicly engaged scholarship.

Health and medical professions (including veterinary medicine).

Faculty members in the health and medical professions were more likely than faculty members in other colleges to report patient and clinical services ($p = .000$); technical assistance or expert testimony ($p = .041$); and advisory boards or other forms of discipline-related service ($p = .018$).

Physical and biological sciences. Physical and biological sciences faculty members were more likely than faculty members from other colleges to report commercialized activities ($p = .000$). However, physical and biological sciences faculty were less likely than their colleagues to report nonprofit or government funded research ($p = .001$); unfunded or intramurally funded applied research ($p = .000$); and technical assistance or expert testimony ($p = .000$).

Social and behavioral sciences.

Faculty members in the social and behavioral sciences were more likely than faculty members in other colleges to report unfunded or intramurally funded applied research ($p = .014$) and for-credit community engaged learning ($p = .025$). However, social science faculty members were less likely than their colleagues to report business, industry, or commodity group funded research ($p = .017$) and teaching noncredit courses and programs ($p = .004$).

Overall, the findings suggest that faculty report some types of public engaged scholarship (e.g., public understanding, events, and media) more frequently than others (e.g., curricular, community-engaged learning). Results also suggest that, according to the analytical framework used in this study, the types of publicly engaged scholarship that faculty members were involved in varied in statistically significant ways by age, number of years at the institution, faculty rank, Extension appointment, joint appointment, and college grouping. The following section explores the implications of these findings for policy and practice.

Implications for Policy and Practice

This study's findings suggest policy and practice improvements for institutional leaders who wish to support faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship more effectively. The researchers conclude that their findings may inform faculty development, including support for early-career faculty, the structuring of faculty

appointments, and the allocation of resources to support publicly engaged scholarship.

Faculty Development

The findings may be used by faculty development staff as the basis for more effective professional development for community engagement. The different types of publicly engaged scholarship suggest the need for a multitrack approach to building faculty

“[I]nstitutional leaders committed to strengthening faculty engagement would do well to recognize the unique rigors of different types of publicly engaged scholarship and what kinds of professional development would support early-career faculty engaged in them.”

capacity for engagement. Instead of the typical “one size fits all” approach, faculty development staff may tailor their activities to reach faculty members who are involved in different types of publicly engaged scholarship. For example, faculty members interested in publicly engaged instruction would benefit from different professional development activities than faculty members interested in commercialized activities. At larger institutions, these faculty development activities may, in fact, be led by different units such as centers for teaching and learning, service-learning and civic engagement centers, offices of faculty development, and offices focused on intellectual property

or technology transfer. The tenure system is central to how early-career faculty organize their work. Studies of early-career faculty have highlighted the importance of formal support from structured programs at both the campus and national levels in preparing faculty for the rigors of the tenure process (Austin & Rice, 1998; Sorcinelli, 2000). Therefore, institutional leaders committed to strengthening faculty engagement would do well to recognize the unique rigors of different types of publicly engaged scholarship and what kinds of professional development would support early-career faculty engaged in them.

The findings about age and years at the institution suggested effective ways of supporting early-career faculty. Faculty members who are in their 30s and who have been at the institution less than

5 years are less likely to be engaged in nonprofit, government, or foundation supported engaged research. These early-career faculty members, who are often new to the area and/or the state, would benefit from introductions, networking, and mentoring about funding opportunities for this type of publicly engaged scholarship. Early-career faculty members are also less likely to be involved in commercialized activities (possibly related to maturity of their research). As junior faculty members begin their careers, understanding the opportunities and procedures involved in patents, copyrights, licenses, and other commercialized activities may allow them to craft their programs of research to accommodate this specific type of publicly engaged scholarship from the start.

Faculty Appointment Structure

The findings revealed important differences in how faculty members' appointments are structured. Faculty members who have Extension appointments and joint departmental appointments are more likely to report publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. As department chairs, faculty search committees, and deans structure appointments for faculty members, they would do well to remember that those with joint or Extension appointments are more likely to report publicly engaged scholarship.

Resource Allocation

Similar to published research about service-learning (*Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Hammond, 1994*), this study shows significant differences in faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship by college grouping. Faculty members in some college groupings (e.g., agriculture and natural resources, the health and medical professions) are more likely to report various types of publicly engaged scholarship. At the same time, faculty members in other college groupings (e.g., arts and humanities, business) are less likely to report publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. Institutional leaders should consider these differences as they allocate increasingly scarce institutional resources to encouraging and supporting different types of publicly engaged scholarship. Institutional leaders should consider the degree to which they invest resources into colleges that already demonstrate high levels of publicly engaged scholarship relative to their investments in colleges that are less likely to report publicly engaged scholarship.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

This study's results are limited by the lack of detailed description of the qualities and characteristics of publicly engaged activities in promotion and tenure documents, the selection of a single site for this study, a focus on tenure-line faculty, and insufficient data to determine the extent to which committee members valued the reported publicly engaged scholarship. Consequently, future researchers may wish to expand this line of research in four ways: (a) to gain greater insight into distinctions associated with publicly engaged scholarship, (b) to explore types of publicly engaged scholarship at other (similar or dissimilar) institutions, (c) to understand types of publicly engaged scholarship from the perspective of other kinds of faculty members, and (d) to explore the relationship between faculty members' reports of publicly engaged scholarship and their success in achieving promotion or tenure.

First, although quantitative content analysis of institutional documents allowed the researchers to discover broad patterns of the *types* of scholarly activities submitted by faculty members in promotion and tenure, the source of data limited other kinds of questions that could legitimately be answered. For example, it was not possible for the researchers to make significant determinations about the qualities and characteristics of the faculty members' publicly engaged scholarship. Most faculty members did not describe the processes they used in their publicly engaged scholarship in enough detail on their promotion and tenure forms for the research team to distinguish between publicly engaged outreach and partnerships (*Carnegie Foundation, 2009*), between publicly engaged scholarship conducted *in* the community and publicly engaged scholarship conducted *with* the community, or between scholarship that is located in the community and scholarship that *builds community capacity* (*Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009*). To address these limitations, future research based on different source data is needed to provide more detailed accounts of the process and products of publicly engaged scholarship.

A second line of future research pertains to understanding types of publicly engaged scholarship at dissimilar and similar institutions. This study was conducted at a research-intensive, land-grant, Carnegie Classified Community Engagement university. Consequently, the findings may have been influenced by characteristics particular to this kind of institution. Future researchers may wish to examine the types of publicly engaged scholarship reported by faculty members at other kinds of institutions of

higher education. Similarly, future researchers may also use these findings as a starting point for a broader examination of types of publicly engaged scholarship at other research-intensive, land-grant, Carnegie Classified Community Engagement universities. Organizations such as the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, or the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching may view this research as an empirically grounded way to revise existing or construct new cross-institutional benchmarking activities.

A third line of future research pertains to understanding types of publicly engaged scholarship from different faculty members' perspectives. With the distinct shift from a tenure system to an alternative appointment system, the majority of faculty members are no longer employed in full-time, tenured positions (*Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007*). Very little is known about the types of publicly engaged scholarship that individuals who hold alternative appointments are involved in. Future studies that focus on non-tenure-line faculty would likely enhance understanding of different types of publicly engaged scholarship and highlight different patterns between tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty. Future studies may seek to understand similarities, differences, and patterns in reporting types of publicly engaged scholarship by faculty of color. Future research using research designs sensitive enough to study differences between racial and ethnic groups is vital, because the pool of future faculty is expected to become increasingly diverse (*Gappa et al., 2007*), and limited research on the subject reveals differences in motivation and involvement (*Antonio, 2002*).

A final line of future research pertains to the relationship between types of publicly engaged scholarship reported by faculty members and their success in promotion and tenure review. Because faculty promotion and tenure documents at Michigan State University do not include notes about the deliberations made by promotion and tenure committee members, it was not possible for the researchers to determine the extent to which committee members valued the reported publicly engaged scholarship in making their promotion and tenure determinations. Nor was it possible to draw conclusions about the proportions of reported publicly engaged scholarship in relation to other reported scholarship and success during promotion and tenure review. Future research based on different sources of data, such as surveys or interviews of promotion and tenure faculty members or an experimental design using sample promotion and tenure forms, would reveal the relationships between faculty members' reports of publicly engaged

scholarship and promotion and tenure decisions in ways that were not possible given this study's design and data sources.

Conclusion

This study found that at one large, public, land-grant university, the types of activities faculty members reported as publicly engaged scholarship include a wide range of community-oriented, scholarly activities. At Michigan State University from 2002 to 2006, over 70% of the faculty members reported scholarly activities on their promotion and tenure forms in each of three areas: publicly engaged research and creative activities, publicly engaged instruction, and publicly engaged service. Exactly which types of publicly engaged scholarship faculty members were involved in varied in statistically significant ways by personal characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity) and professional characteristics (e.g., rank, appointment, and college grouping). This study contributes to theory development by examining publicly engaged scholarship by type of activity reported in promotion and tenure documents. Specifically, this study's results confirm that the types of publicly engaged scholarship vary significantly by personal and professional characteristics. This study also contributes to practice by suggesting that institutions striving to support community engagement should not simply take a "one size fits all" approach to faculty development and should consider appropriate resource allocations to support different types of publicly engaged scholarship.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank MSU's faculty members, department chairs, school directors, and deans who granted consent for the inclusion of the promotion and tenure documents in this study. In addition to our colleagues at the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement, we would like to acknowledge Diane L. Zimmerman and Robert L. Church (University Outreach and Engagement emeritus staff), who worked to revise the form in 2001 and initiated this study 5 years later, in 2006; Angela Hunt and Shelly Wells (Academic Human Resources), who granted us access to the promotion and tenure documents; and Kirk Riley, Lynne Devereaux, Adina Huda, Dori Pynnonen, and Linda Chapel Jackson (University Outreach and Engagement staff), who assisted with consent, additional data, professional presentations, and editing.

References

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5–17.
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(5), 582–602.
- Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 23*(4), 373–398.
- Austin, A. E., & Rice, R. E. (1998). Making tenure viable: Listening to early career faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(5), 736–754.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*(3), 363–391.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 1*(1), 11–20.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009). *Community engagement definitions*. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education 72*(2), 125–147.
- Church, R. L., Zimmerman, D. L., Bargerstock, B. A., & Kenney, P. A. (2002/2003). Measuring scholarly outreach at Michigan State University: Definition, challenges, tools. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 8*(1), 141–152.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. In C. L. Colbeck (Ed.), *New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 114* (pp. 43–52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Weaver, L. D. (2008). Faculty engagement in public scholarship: A motivation systems theory perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 12*(2), 7–32.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. A. Eberly & J. Cohen (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 105* (pp. 17–26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (2000). *The disciplines speak II: More statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2009, September). *Scholarly outreach and engagement reported by successfully tenured*

- faculty at Michigan State University, 2002–2006: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. Retrieved from <http://ncsue.msu.edu/publications/reappointment.aspx>
- Fairweather, J. S. (2002a). The ultimate faculty evaluation: Promotion and tenure decisions. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2002 (114), 97–108.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2002b). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 26–48.
- Fear, F. A., Rosaen, C. L., Foster-Fishman, P., & Bawden, R. J. (2001). Outreach as scholarly expression: A faculty perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 6(2), 21–34.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Giles, D. E., Jr. (2008). Understanding an emerging field of scholarship: Toward a research agenda for engaged, public scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(2), 97–106.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. (2009, November). Summary of the 2001 revisions to the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure form at Michigan State University: Expanding the definition of scholarship to include engagement. *The Engagement Exchange*, No. 1. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. Retrieved from http://ncsue.msu.edu/files/EngagementExchange_No.1_Jan2010.pdf
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonzalez, K. P., & Padilla, R. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Doing the public good: Latino/a scholars engage civic participation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 21–28.
- Holland, B. A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4(1), 30–41.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy*, 20(2), 345.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lunsford, C. G., Church, R. L., & Zimmerman, D. L. (2006, Fall). Assessing Michigan State University's efforts to embed engagement across the institution: Findings and challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11(1), 89–104.
- MacQueen, K. M., McLellan, E., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods*, 10(2), 31–36.

- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1(2). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2386>
- Michigan State University. (2009). *Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI): Engagement activities from January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008* [Survey form]. Retrieved from <https://oemi.msu.edu/>
- Michigan State University Human Resources. (2001, March). *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action* [Form D]. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Retrieved from http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRRPTPages.htm
- Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2008). Documenting engagement: Faculty perspectives on self-representation in promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(4), 5–27.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7–29.
- Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Retrieved from <http://outreach.msu.edu/documents.asp>
- Rice, R. E., Pathways, A. N., et al. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996–2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 91–104.
- Schomberg, S. F., & Farmer, J. A., Jr. (1994). The evolving concept of public service and implications for rewarding faculty. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 58(3), 122–140.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. (2000). *Principles of good practice: Supporting early-career faculty—guidance for deans, department chairs, and other academic leaders*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education & Accreditation.
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5–16.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitt, E. J. (2001). Document analysis. In C. F. Conrad, J. G. Haworth, & L. R. Lattuca (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: Expanding perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 447–454). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

About the Authors

Chris R. Glass is a Ph.D. student in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education Department and graduate research assistant in the Institute for Research on Teaching and Learning at Michigan State University. His research focuses on civic engagement and publicly engaged scholarship.

Diane M. Doberneck is a researcher at Michigan State University's National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement, and an adjunct assistant professor in the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program. Her research focuses on faculty integration of publicly engaged scholarship, effective teaching and learning practices for engaged scholarship, and international community engagement.

John H. Schweitzer is a professor in Michigan State University's Center for Community and Economic Development, and an adjunct professor with the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. He uses his knowledge of social science research processes to study the impact and effectiveness of educational and social programs and policies.