

**IMAGINING AMERICA:
ARTISTS AND SCHOLARS IN PUBLIC LIFE**

BACKGROUND STUDY

**ON RESPONSIVE TENURE POLICIES FOR PUBLIC SCHOLARS
IN THE HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND DESIGN**

**DISCUSSION DRAFT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN
IMAGINING AMERICA'S TENURE TEAM INITIATIVE**

**JULIE ELLISON
DIRECTOR, IMAGINING AMERICA**

SEPTEMBER 2006

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TO THE READER	iii
FOREWORD: CANTOR AND LAVINE	1
SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS: SIX LESSONS FROM THE FIELD FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW	2
PART I: IA'S TENURE TEAM INITIATIVE: CENTERED ON PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP	5
Why Are We Doing This?	5
Goals and Process	7
Why We Focus on the Humanities, Arts, and Design	10
PART II: THE REAL WORLD OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP	12
Faculty Send a Message	12
Defining Public Scholarship	13
Adapting Policies to Projects	14
PART III: BUILDING BLOCKS OF POLICY	17
National Initiatives for the Scholarship of Engagement	20
Context: The Limits of Boyer's Multiple Scholarships	20
Scholarship of Engagement Initiatives	22
Institutionalizing the Scholarship of Engagement: Portland State University	24
Neighborhoods of Knowledge: Unit-Level Policies	27
Implementing New Tenure and Promotion Policies	36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All sources cited can be found online, in the Tenure Team Initiative Knowledge Base. This report has benefited from numerous collaborations and consultations. Dr. Timothy Eatman, Program Director for Research and Policy for Imagining America, has been a key partner in this, as in all aspects of the Tenure Team Initiative, which he oversees. The Initiative's national co-chairs, Chancellor Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University and President Steven Lavine of the California Institute for the Arts, have been extraordinary leaders and partners, shaping not only the broad goals of the Initiative, but its most particular and practical manifestations. Dr. Edgar Beckham, who died as this document was nearing completion, offered wise counsel at an early stage, at a time when such efforts required real personal cost. Other members of the informal think tank that grew up around this document have been equally generous: Harry Boyte, Margaret Dewar, Amy Driscoll, Hiram Fitzgerald, Kelly Quinn, Eugene Rice, John Saltmarsh, Lorilee Sandmann, and David Scobey.

TO THE READER

Author's Note: Who are “we”? I wrote this background paper as Director of Imagining America; it is individually authored. Its content, however, and often its wording are so grounded in dialogue and shared investigations of the topic that the word “we” prevails. This document is an attempted synthesis of the views of the faculty and administrators on Imagining America's member campuses, based on years of close listening. It is they who shape our priorities, fill our publications, and animate our conferences. “We” also refers to those who have signed on to this effort out of a commitment to the important task of developing supportive policies for public scholars, that is, the members of the Tenure Team itself, and Consulting Scholars and Artists. All of them agree with the Initiative's basic goals. This report, finally, was developed in ongoing conversation with Chancellor Nancy Cantor and President Steven Lavine, our national co-chairs, and Dr. Timothy Eatman, Imagining America's Project Director for Research and Policy. Several early readers made generous and important contributions. I extend special thanks to Hiram Fitzgerald, John Saltmarsh, and David Scobey.

Feedback request: The purpose of this study document is to focus the work of Imagining America's Tenure Team by helping that group to enter into productive reflection, debate, and revision, as well as to broadly engage with interested constituencies. We invite comments on, criticism of, and additions to these proposals. Your comments are important to us. Please send comments to Dr. Timothy Eatman (tkeatman@umich.edu).

FOREWORD
PRESIDENT NANCY CANTOR, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY AND PRESIDENT
STEVEN LAVINE, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR THE ARTS

Many faculty members experience a frustrating clash between their intellectual goals, which include pursuing community-based scholarship and art-making, and institutional tenure policies. As national co-chairs, we are pleased to provide leadership for the IA Tenure Team. There are two good reasons why a national project should address tenure as a public matter, important to our culture.

- Policies that encourage public scholarship can make alliances between universities and other knowledge-creating institutions more deliberate and useful.
- Campus-community partnerships in the arts and humanities should be excellent; therefore, they need to be examined and evaluated.

As university presidents and chancellors, we say we want creative scholars who are also committed to the public good. So how can we create environments that attract them? Their ranks frequently include faculty of color and women in underrepresented fields---just the kind we'd like to have. So how can we steer them away from the revolving door of recruitment without retention? Many faculty members experience a frustrating clash between their intellectual goals, which include pursuing community-based scholarship and art-making, and institutional tenure policies.

To draw and keep such talent, and to encourage top-notch scholarship that contributes to the public good, we need to look hard at the culture of the academic workplace, including the places and spaces in which we do our best work today. The range of scholarly products has expanded, as have the pathways for dissemination. If we care about higher education's engagement with its communities, the local impact---as well as the national and international implications of faculty work---must be recognized. And, if we truly want to encourage the integration of teaching and action research, we must reward it at tenure time.

We have worked hard, as presidents, to support public scholarship and collaborative community-based arts practice. However, even as American higher education recovers its traditions of public practice, we are not yet always comfortable extending them to our newest faculty. Even such normally sympathetic fields as policy studies and social sciences more often tend to discourage junior faculty members from collaborative work that is interdisciplinary and publicly engaged. How many times have we heard, "You'd better wait until you get tenure before you do that"? We brag about the fabulous work of our engaged faculty—but can we get them promoted?

Significant numbers of faculty believe that public scholarship and creative work are driving vital new areas in the humanities and arts. Scholars and artists have worked across campus-

community boundaries on multi-disciplinary explorations of citizenship and patriotism; ethnicity and language; space and place; and the cultural dimensions of health and religion.

As presidents, we have institutional reasons to consider this work critical. We believe that diversity, civic passion, and excellence go together and that institutional excellence inheres in the people who are exchanging ideas and doing the work. To attract and keep a diverse faculty, we need flexible but clear guidelines for recognizing and rewarding public scholarship and artistic production.

SUMMARY: PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS SIX LESSONS FROM THE FIELD FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 1: ADOPT IMAGINING AMERICA'S DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND DESIGN

- Public scholarship is scholarly or creative work integral to a faculty member's academic area. It is jointly planned, carried out, and reflected on by co-equal university and community partners. And it yields one or more public good products.
- Subject to these three conditions, public scholarship may encompass artistic, design, historical, and critical work that contributes to public discourse and the formation of robust publics. It may also include disciplinary or interdisciplinary efforts to advance public engagement in higher education itself and reflection or research on the import of such efforts.
- Public good products may take diverse and plural forms, including but not limited to: peer-reviewed individual or co-authored publications; other forms of writing and publication; presentations at academic and non-academic conferences and meetings; oral histories or ethnographies; interviews with or reflections by participants; program development; performances, exhibitions, installations, murals, or festivals; new K-16 curricula; collaboratively developed and implemented site designs or plans for 'cultural corridors,' and other place-making work; and policy recommendations.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 2: ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR THE SCOPE AND QUALITY OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN THE CULTURAL DISCIPLINES

- Local, regional projects may be valued equally with national and international ones. Also, translocal scholarship that connects regional or local projects to broader networks offers a particular kind of excellence. Existing barriers to valuing local work, therefore, should be removed from tenure and promotion policies.

- Creation of innovative public scholarship programs or centers counts as scholarly achievement. Such centers should sustain active and productive community partnerships, while contributing to the cultural disciplines and interdisciplinary fields.
- Assessment of impact includes impact on the academic discipline or interdisciplinary field, on nonacademic knowledge and cultural institutions, and on specific publics or communities beyond the university.
- Integration of scholarship, teaching, and public engagement is a distinct aspect of scholarly excellence.
- Interdisciplinarity includes work that connects academic and nonacademic knowledge.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 3: VALUE DIVERSE SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS

- Publication and dissemination of public scholarship may include peer-reviewed articles or books, as well as non peer-reviewed articles or books that speak to broader publics or nonacademic constituencies; presentations at academic and nonacademic conferences and meetings; as well as participatory workshops.
- Scholarly dissemination includes publication in journals or presentations at meetings that advance public engagement and engaged academic work; awards received for public engagement; adoption of the faculty member's models by others who seek solutions to similar problems; substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice; models that enrich the artistic and cultural life of the community.
- Qualitative or quantitative documentation of public and community-based projects extends to video documentaries, ethnographic investigations incorporating interviews and participant narratives, and evaluative methods appropriate to the methodologies of Community-based Participatory Action Research.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 4: BROADEN PEER REVIEW TO INCLUDE NON-ACADEMIC PEERS

Broaden the definition of peer to include recognized non-academic leaders in public scholarship and public art-making. Non-academic peer reviewers should have established reputations and demonstrated achievement in an appropriate area of public cultural work (for example, performance art, public art, museums, community theater, libraries, nonprofits, K-12 schools).

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 5: INCLUDE PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP PROJECT PORTFOLIO IN THE TENURE DOSSIER

The Public Scholarship Portfolio:

- is sent to external reviewers;
- includes a substantive framing statement that establishes the importance of this work for the field, narrates its progress, explains its contributions to the public good; establishes its originality; and suggests future directions;
- documents projects through relevant materials, which may include public and scholarly presentations, multimedia and curricular materials, individual and co-authored publications, site plans, policy reports, participant interviews, workshops, planning and assessment tools, etc.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 6: SUPPORT JUNIOR FACULTY WHO PURSUE PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

- When public scholarship is consistent with the mission of the institution and the unit—that is, when it is professionally safe to pursue it—junior faculty interested in public scholarship should be consistently and coherently supported.
- Effective evaluation and mentoring for junior faculty interested in public scholarship is crucial so that their work in this area can fulfill the criteria for excellence in public scholarship adopted by the department, school or college, and university (e.g. relevance to field or discipline, clarity of goals and purposes, significance of products). While mentors may advise caution with respect to a particular approach to public scholarship, they should do so with the intention of supporting, not inhibiting, an individual's aspirations as a public scholar or artist.
- Junior faculty should not be required to pursue public scholarship or art making but, should they choose to do so in ways compatible with the campus and departmental mission, they should never be penalized.

PART ONE: IA'S TENURE TEAM INITIATIVE: CENTERED ON PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS?

Imagining America's Tenure Team Initiative (TTI) is the consortium's most important initiative to date. It is rooted in the commitment of faculty and administrators at our member campuses to making the structural changes in higher education needed for public engagement to flourish. This study document builds on eight years of direct experience with public scholarship projects and programs. We have identified best practices, surveyed participants, published critical reflections, and fostered a national community of practicing public scholars. We have sought ways to integrate public scholarship while also developing standards for excellence. The Tenure Team Initiative moves this effort decisively forward. We are asking our campus constituencies—faculty above all—to undertake a tough balancing act between encouragement and judgment.

As we move forward with this project, we need to be clear about our motives. We support the adventurous work of publicly engaged scholars and artists. We do so because we are accountable to the larger civic purposes of education.

Engaged teaching and scholarship improve the quality of education in our universities. And they are central to the collaborations that tackle public needs and create robust public Knowledge is created across the whole society. Our campuses share in this work but it does not belong to them alone. Imaginative partners work to align the teaching and scholarly energies of the university with the energies of other knowledge-creating institutions.

The Wingspread Declaration on the Civic Responsibilities of Research Universities, issued in 1999, offers a powerful framework for this initiative, situating its call for public scholarship by faculty in the context of “a historic debate...over the future of America's great public and research universities.” The Declaration stresses the significance of public scholarship as one of the most important ways in which faculty can “[create] opportunities to work with community and civic partners in co-creating things of public value. In particular, this touchstone document emphasizes the need for “diverse cross-disciplinary...projects.” Effective campuses need faculty members in all fields who are public scholars, but such faculty members often are discouraged and put at risk by existing tenure and promotion policies. Even after many years of concerted efforts for change, public scholarship is often illegible within existing systems of evaluation. This is particularly true in humanities, arts, and design fields that combine publicly engaged intellectual work with interpretive or expressive practices. We need to change the faculty reward system that constrains the flow of discovery

across social and institutional boundaries—and we need to do it in ways that respond to the most adventurous developments in humanistic public scholarship and public creative work.

David Scobey, Chair of Imagining America’s National Advisory Board, echoes this call: “It is time for partisans of academic public engagement to spell out its intellectual claims,” to “deliver the goods.” He calls on us to demonstrate “the salience [and] intellectual richness...of the movement for academic public engagement” in the humanities, arts, and design.

If the pressure is on colleges and universities to “deliver the goods,” what does this mean, concretely? It means, for faculty, specifying the intellectual caliber of engaged scholarship. For campuses, it means connecting the institution’s civic mission to its scholarly mission in ways that are appropriate to artists and humanists. And for Imagining America, it means setting forth policies that are fully adequate to the new economy and the new politics of cultural knowledge.

Many elements of public scholarship challenge current tenure and promotion policies, especially factors related to campus-community partnerships. Collaborations yield multiple and diverse products. Projects may combine teaching, outreach, performance, and scholarship. The peers in peer review for this type of work may be drawn from several sectors.

“These are solvable problems,” says Scobey. Imagining America’s analysis of faculty evaluation is grounded in our support for the rich specificity of the knowledge work that civic professionals in and out of the academy are undertaking together. As Scobey notes, “Our conversation about ‘What is public scholarship?’ and ‘How do we figure out if it’s any good?’ resembles the same conversations in Women’s Studies thirty years ago, when people were grappling with the daring new mix of the personal and the political in that domain.”

Adapting tenure and promotion policies to public scholarship is within our grasp. Theodore Alter suggests that “we not think of faculty public scholarship and engagement initiatives as somehow so different that we don’t know how to evaluate them.” Rather, “we already have the core evaluative framework in place,” with the additional demand for “the civic professional’s public pledge to pursue public-regarding ends in public-regarding ways.” (Alter, Peters, et al., Kettering 2006).

Despite systemic and institutional obstacles, there are encouraging trends. We see small but growing numbers of faculty with track records as public scholars and a cohort of outstanding leaders based outside the academy who are equally sophisticated about collaborative projects. Public scholarship in some of the cultural disciplines (i.e. History and American Studies) is garnering modest attention at national conferences. The emergence of public scholarship as the center of some new graduate programs suggests that students who were able to combine academics and engagement as undergraduates want to continue doing so in graduate school and after.

The tenure and promotion issue is central to Imagining America’s key task: furthering the democratic and civic mission of the humanities, arts, and design by fostering public scholarship. To ground tenure and promotion policies in the concept of public scholarship

involves defining what public scholarship in the cultural disciplines is and establishing the specific character of its excellence.

Before moving on to presenting and explaining our preliminary recommendations and “lessons from the field,” we want to stress our commitment to expanding the options for faculty who identify themselves as public scholars. There are rare colleges and universities whose regional or community mission so powerfully defines their institutional identity that they may logically require all faculty members to incorporate public engagement into teaching, research, and service. But for most of the member campuses of Imagining America, it is far more desirable that they assimilate policies supportive of public scholarship as part of an ongoing—but periodically intensified—review of tenure and promotion documents.

TENURE TEAM INITIATIVE: GOALS AND PROCESS

Goals

If we take public scholarship seriously, then we need to frame broader and more flexible definitions of scholarship, research, and creative work. We need to think adventurously about what we are willing to define as knowledge, what we regard as interesting, and how complex projects require new measures of excellent complexity.

In response to urgings from our whole national network, Imagining America has formed a tenure team—a group of presidents and provosts, faculty scholars and artists, association leaders, and other experienced civic professionals. The team will sponsor debate and reflection on these issues and will produce a report with specific recommendations grounded in a broad, coherent vision of public scholarship in the humanities, arts, and design. The Tenure Team is supported by a group of Consulting Artists and Scholars, which will ground its work in specific fields and practices, and in the analysis of changes in higher education. Bringing Dr. Timothy Eatman onto the IA staff as Program Director for Research and Policy enabled us to move this agenda forward significantly.

The individuals on the Tenure Team are exceptional in their cross-sector experience. They are deeply grounded in the work of humanistic knowledge and artistic creation. Most strikingly, their careers are marked by movement between—and intellectual translations between—professions, academic fields, university administration, foundation leadership, senior roles in cultural institutions, federal government positions, experience with policy centers on and off campus. Individually and together, they bring the imagination and range that an undertaking like this needs.

The goal of the Tenure Team Initiative is to create a report for academic leaders that will help them to better understand and value public scholarship, creations, and performances by faculty in the humanities and arts. The report will be developed through a series of drafting and comment periods. This paper is the first step in that cycle.

We hope that the report will provide a stimulating intellectual framework as well as a useful policy guide for faculty, chairs, and deans. The Tenure Team initiative is both a policy project and a persuasive project, and its outcomes will reflect both priorities. This approach will allow our member campuses to match different forms of publicly engaged scholarship and art making with evaluation strategies appropriate to them.

The report will present:

- A clear definition and analysis of public scholarship and aesthetic work in the humanities, arts, and design—the conceptual foundation for the Tenure Team Initiative;
- An analysis of the characteristic qualities and forms of public art-making and public scholarship, growing out of this definition and grounded in research conducted by ourselves and others;
- Proposed tenure and promotion policies suitable to the changing realities of publicly engaged scholarly and creative enterprise; and
- A dissemination and implementation plan focusing on changing institutional cultures.

Launch

In October 2005, President and Chancellor Nancy Cantor of Syracuse University and President Steven Lavine of California Institute of the Arts, as National Co-Chairs, announced the Tenure Team Initiative. The press release coincided with Chancellor Cantor's ringing challenge to the Tenure Team and to *Imagining America*, issued at the opening of *Imagining America's* 2005 national conference at Rutgers, and endorsed thoughtfully by Rutgers President Richard McCormick.

Under Dr. Eatman's leadership, we are developing the intellectual resources that participants in the initiative need:

- We have built an online knowledge base.
- We are pursuing every opportunity to engage with informed groups concerned with aligning college and university policies with the civic goals of publicly engaged scholars and artists.
- We have posted an online survey that will help us to understand in a fine-grained way our constituencies' priorities, as well as to collect suggestions about policies that are or are not working in specific campus contexts.
- We are conducting structured in-depth interviews with all members of the Tenure Team. The final TTI report will combine material from this study document with the

findings of the survey and interviews, which are proceeding concurrently with the writing of the present document.

Key Premise: Borrow and Extend

Change works best when it grows organically from existing policies and practices, or builds on prior efforts at change. Whenever possible, our goal is to extend the reach, alter the idioms, and fill in the gaps of earlier efforts to develop tenure and promotion policies for the scholarship of engagement. At the same time, we feel that the civic dimension of such work requires more assertive policy language that honors the democratic premises, power-sharing processes, and public good products that distinguish this kind of scholarship.

There are important lessons to apply growing out of the work of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. These general policies need firmer grounding in the cultural disciplines, and we aim to provide that grounding here. In addition, key precedents for institutional tenure and promotion policies in the area of public scholarship include resources such as the relevant section of particular institutional policies.

Imagining America is not alone in pursuing a discipline-specific initiative relating to tenure. Parallel enterprises have been launched by the American Sociological Association through its Public Sociology task force and by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. We have benefited from their work and are in ongoing sympathy and dialogue with it, even as we respond to the particular needs of artists, humanists, and designers.

Our most important preparatory work in this background document, therefore, deals with creative borrowing from schools and departments in a broad range of cultural disciplines and interdisciplinary fields. Part III of this report, which identifies an important set of best practices, is a sustained exercise in *not* reinventing the wheel.

Implementation of the Tenure Team's Recommendations: Cycles of Talk and Action

The TTI report will be just the beginning. The framing arguments, policy recommendations, and guidelines for dossier preparation that will be set forth in the TTI report will be significant in themselves. But the report will matter most as an occasion for organizing both campus efforts and interventions at the level of national associations. The release of the report will be strategic and deliberate. This resource will map out pathways for using the TTI report and toolkit in diverse campus and professional settings. If resources permit, it will be accompanied by an implementation toolkit that may include realistic summaries of fictional tenure and promotion cases for humanists, artists, and designers, with discussion questions. It will also contain documentation and evaluation tools that will allow Imagining America to assess the report's impact.

Imagining America will form presentation teams that will introduce the report's vision and recommendations at national meetings of professional and disciplinary associations, at the conferences of leading organizations committed to public engagement in higher education: the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), National Campus Compact, the League for Innovation in Community Colleges, the National Association of State Universities and Land

Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and the Council of Independent Colleges. HENCE—Higher Education Network for Community Engagement—is an umbrella organization that gives Imagining America (a founding member) direct access to these and other associations. Smaller, more focused networks are possibly even more crucial, as they can zero in on key constituencies in the cultural disciplines. Such networks include: the International Council of Fine Arts Deans, the Community College Humanities Association, the interdisciplinary network represented by the Tribal College Journal, state Campus Compacts, and the Pericles Project.

We envision a rolling process of analysis and action that may take a different form at each campus. Imagining America’s institutional representative (usually a professor, center director, or dean), should be the point person for a small “start the ball rolling” team. This key individual will work with chairs and deans in the humanities, arts, design, and liberal arts to set up reading-and-reporting groups in departments where there is significant interest in public scholarship, inviting input from informed colleagues on campus or in the community as they see fit. The involvement of the provost is also crucial. Indeed, “the strategic complexity of institutional change seems to indicate that multiple interventions are needed simultaneously--and they need to be coordinated” (Saltmarsh).

These communities of debate and planning will do the crucial work of institutional change. Colleges and universities that are already revising their tenure and promotion policies will have a useful new resource. In some cases, faculty and administrators may want to develop proposals for consideration by the full faculty for departmental policies that ground the institution’s already strong public mission in disciplinary cultures and practices. In other instances, a broader coalition of faculty and administrators may choose to bring a reading-and-reporting group together to make the case for systemic institutional change. Imagining America will consult with these groups, track their efforts, and connect them to one another.

WHY WE FOCUS ON THE HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND DESIGN

This section of the paper is devoted to a definition of public scholarship. Before turning to that definition, we want to remind our readers on why a particular effort is needed to develop scholarly assessment policies for the cultural disciplines specifically.

The Tenure Team Initiative is grounded in public scholarship as it has taken shape in thousands of projects and programs in the humanities, arts, and design. Public scholarship in the cultural disciplines is an increasingly common form of professional practice. The Tenure Team Initiative aims to adjust institutional policies to reality on the ground, helping evaluation to respond appropriately to public scholarship as carried out by artists, humanists, and designers. This Initiative aims to develop tenure and promotion policies that capture the particularity of expressive and reflective work in the cultural disciplines.

Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life (IA) was founded in response to a tangible circumstance. In the late 1990s, the winds of public engagement were blowing

through higher education. They were also stirring the nonprofit sector, foundations and NGOs. They were enlivening civil society work in Europe and South Africa and public cultural institutions like museums and community libraries.

But not many humanities or arts faculty were showing up at centers for community partnerships on American campuses or taking advantage of other resources for public engagement. The civic engagement movement in higher education had a strong affinity for social science and the professions. It found early adopters in professional fields such as public health, nursing, social work, and education, with their traditions of project-based, often collaborative research. Many faculty members in the humanities and arts, therefore, felt the need for space in which to foster our own language, theory, and practice of public scholarship.

As the 1999 Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University shows, the civic engagement movement in higher education has taken the public work of scholars with great seriousness, locating it in the epistemological claims that also ground new pedagogies and theories of learning.

Enormous energy has been invested in national undertakings that have articulated common aspirations (The Wingspread Declaration), challenged narrow definitions of scholarship with plural notions of knowledge (Boyer and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), and developed methods of assessment for engaged scholars through the Scholarship of Engagement National Review Board.

There are two features of these efforts that Imagining America's effort departs from, however.

First, we specialize. The emphasis of most of these national endeavors has been on generalization and standardization—an understandable systematizing feature of a new movement for systemic change in higher education. We are working to shape policies that are responsive to faculty members' core identities as scholars and artists, moved by their love for cultural work in all its particularity. Unit-level tenure guidelines, in particular, should be observant of field-specific content, methods, discourses, and habits of meaning making.

From the start, Imagining America has sought to occupy a middle ground between national efforts to support publicly engaged scholars and the needs of faculty working in the arts, humanities, and design specifically. Our understanding of Imagining America's mediating role shapes our approach to the Tenure Team Initiative. We are not proposing to rewrite the whole faculty handbook. We do aim to build into the handbook, and into school and departmental guidelines, policies that make it possible for academic colleagues and administrators to value public scholarship in the cultural disciplines through rigorous, principled evaluation of humanities scholarship and creative activity.

Second, while we are mindful of service and outreach, we are trying to create a vocabulary that emphasizes inquiry, discovery, and creation. We make a stronger claim than others have done for the intellectual "generativity" of public scholarship and artistic creation. Imagining America's approach to public scholarship is resolutely both/and: such work yields public goods, and it is intellectually and artistically bold.

In “Making use of All our Faculties,” David Scobey conceives of public scholars as occupying a “position on the borderlands,” a space “between...community partners and...scholarly colleagues.” His essay is an important one, and worth quoting at some length. Along this fluid border, he writes, “community collaboration provokes academics to see new connections,” including “new interdisciplinary formations, new research questions, new scholarly projects informed by, and in turn informing, the public work.” Scobey issues a challenge to those unhappy with the marginal status of civic engagement in disciplinary cultures and faculty careers:

Until we trust (and demonstrate) the intellectual value of civic engagement, we will unwittingly collude in that marginalization.... What's more, we will shortchange our partners, depriving them of the full measure of our attention. And by missing the opportunity to include them in our community of inquiry, we deprive ourselves of the questions and discoveries that they catalyze

Speaking right to the concerns of the Tenure Team Initiative, Scobey pushes us to look at

a host of smaller-scale practices that lie under the rock of the tenure question: new habits by which research projects are intuited, conceptualized, undertaken, and ended, new opportunities to fund community-based research and train students to take part in it. We will want to create times and spaces for reflective conversation with community interlocutors about the intellectual implications of our partnerships. We will want to experiment with new genres of writing and new practices of assessment and critique. We will want to revisit the ethics of research, amending policies — for instance, those on intellectual property and human subjects — that presume the autonomy of the research scholar and the passivity of the research subject.

And he concludes:

the full promise of public scholarship...will come when we have disseminated a commitment to the intellectual generativity of civic engagement across the whole domain of Boyer's "scholarship of inquiry," making knowledge about the world in new ways.

This ambitious approach to inquiry bears directly on the question of whether public scholarship should be optional or required for faculty. Public scholarship represents a career opportunity for some faculty scholars, artists, and designers. But it should be meaningful to and supported by all faculty members. We can point to interdisciplinarity as an analogous case. Faculty and academic leaders support interdisciplinarity as an institutional priority, regardless of whether they themselves do interdisciplinary work or direct an interdisciplinary unit. Public engagement is not something that every scholar needs to pursue but it should permeate the culture as a “legitimizing commitment” of the institution.

DEFINING PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP:
PUBLIC, CONTEXTUAL, COMPLEX, AND CULTURAL

What is public scholarship in the cultural disciplines? Here is the definition that forms our starting point for the Tenure Team Initiative and the substance of our first recommendation. We present this definition, and then discuss more qualitatively four features of most public scholarship in our fields: its public, contextual, complex, and cultural nature.

**PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 1: ADOPT IMAGINING AMERICA'S
DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HUMANITIES, ARTS,
AND DESIGN**

- **Public scholarship is scholarly or creative work integral to a faculty member's academic area. It is jointly planned, carried out, and reflected on by co-equal university and community partners. And it yields one or more public good products.**
- **Subject to these three conditions, public scholarship may encompass artistic, design, historical, and critical work that contributes to public discourse and the formation of robust publics. It may also include disciplinary or interdisciplinary efforts to advance public engagement in higher education itself and reflection or research on the import of such efforts.**
- **Public good products may take diverse and plural forms, including but not limited to: peer-reviewed individual or co-authored publications; other forms of writing and publication; presentations at academic and non-academic conferences and meetings; oral histories or ethnographies; interviews with or reflections by participants; program development; performances, exhibitions, installations, murals, or festivals; new K-16 curricula; site designs or plans for 'cultural corridors,' and other place-making work; and policy recommendations.**

What follows is Imagining America's analysis of this term, "public scholarship." Our understanding of public scholarship is organized around four key concepts: such work is public, contextual, complex, and, of course, cultural. These four concepts structure our collective analysis of the changing production of knowledge, which forms the basis for our research on and assessment of tenure policies, and our preliminary recommendations for policies that will better serve deans and department chairs in the humanities, arts, and design.

Public:

Public scholarship connects directly to the work of specific publics in specific contexts. The faculty member, drawing on his or her academic or artistic field, co-creates publicly consequential knowledge with non-academic collaborators. Public scholarship takes seriously the plural, fluid, and social life of knowledge. It is grounded in the assumption that knowledge is socially produced, an assumption manifest in the importance of intergroup and interpersonal partnerships.

Public scholarship therefore must be viewed in the context of changing constructions of knowledge. As John Saltmarsh has argued, “there is a fundamental epistemological position at issue.” Changing policies related to public scholarship, according to this logic, involves “understanding the role of the university within a larger system of knowledge production.” One important consequence of this way of framing public scholarship is that the scholar or artist, community partners, and students all become agents in “the production of new knowledge.” Inquiry and creative work emerge in concrete locations in Scobey’s campus-community “borderland,” where such agency is cultivated.

Research or creative work is jointly planned and carried out by co-equal partners, each possessing intellectual and civic agency. Public scholarship in the arts, humanities, and design often addresses the cultural dimensions of citizenship and access to public cultural goods. Cross-cultural or inter-cultural projects are common; “questions of diversity and justice...are central” (Wingspread Declaration). Public scholarship presumes an inclusive process of defining research problems and methods and often adapts the principles of participatory action research to suit cultural questions.

This understanding of the publicness of public scholarship derives in part from the notion of public work. Public work, as defined by Harry Boyte, is “sustained effort by a mix of people who solve public problems or create goods, material or cultural, of general benefit.” More importantly, Boyte and Nan Kari, in *Building America*, argue that citizenship is not a pre-existing condition or place, but rather is generated in and through public work. Public scholarship does not mean simply the delivery of knowledge to the public in accessible forms. Nor does it mean that faculty scholars become service providers. Public scholarship is not the same as public intellectual work (academic production that has a public audience) or faculty investigations of public culture or the public sphere. Rather, our approach to public scholarship grants faculty members agency and interests as civic professionals working with “peers in a community of practice and inquiry”: “As asset- or resource-based theories of social movements and community studies have taught, we are collaborating with partners who are themselves agents, creators, and interpreters, with their own expertise and their own account of both their world and ours” (Scobey).

Contextual:

Professor Victor Bloomfield, formerly Vice Provost for Research at the University of Minnesota and currently Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, distinguishes between “universal” and “local” public scholarship. Universal public scholarship “benefits humanity,” he suggests, “but without a specific local context in mind.” The roots of

universal scholarship “are geographically dispersed, depending on interlocking developments from researchers around the world.” His example is the human genome project. Cultural equivalents would include comparative scholarship on literacy, Theater for Development, or liberation theology. Local public scholarship, writes Bloomfield, includes “scholarship that is characterized by reciprocal engagement between the researcher and the community.” He points to debates about “whether the trend towards universality merely makes public value harder for the public to discern, or actually reduces public value” (Nick Jordan), acknowledging that as currently used, the term “public scholarship” typically refers to local public scholarship.

Our definition of public scholarship is weighted towards the local or regional, without being restricted to it. This reflects the fact that the idea of place has become central to the arts, humanities and design in recent years, as it has in so many other disciplines and professional fields. Public scholarship values historical specificity, place, and situated, often local knowledge. Public scholarship may exhibit a both/and structure, combining “micro scale” with “macro meaning” as small projects address big ideas: they are “about democracy” or “about citizenship” or “about place.”

Such scholarship responds to the altered relationship between the local and the global that is restructuring former hierarchies of the provincial and the cosmopolitan. The “lure of the local”—of place and everyday life—surfaces in human rights discourse and struggles around indigenous knowledge, in site-specific art and design, in cultural policy, and in fresh understandings of how nearby cities and towns are shaped continuously by global economies and migrations. Many public scholars experience place or the local as an invitation “to boundary-crossing, complexity, expansiveness of mind, and defamiliarization”—a “new cosmopolitanism,” according to David Scobey. Place-based public scholarship may be connected to older forms of cosmopolitanism, such as international networks. We see a growing interest in work that is defined by both local and translocal commitments, for example. Each participant is part of a project group deeply rooted in its region, while joining in new global coalitions of engaged educators and artists.

Complex:

Although it is not inherently more complex than other interdisciplinary and collaborative practices, public scholarship is complex in different ways, or at the very least in ways that are new to most artists and humanists. Public scholarship fosters projects involving plural sites and organizations. It is grounded in multidisciplinary teams made up of people with different skills and ways of talking. It yields multiple products that fall into academic and nonacademic genres. Participants speak the language of critique and reflection (which are academically legible) and hope (which often is not). Public scholarship projects may simultaneously pursue all of the university’s several missions: teaching, research, and service. They pose logistical problems involving transportation and scheduling. Above all, public scholarship involves relational labor, patience with process, nimble responses to unexpected opportunities, and sustained periods of uncertainty. For all of these reasons, people who do public scholarship as well as people charged with evaluating it rightly perceive it as complex. In the arts and humanities, with weak traditions of project-based teaching and scholarship, complexity of this kind can be startling.

Haridimos Tsoukas, a theorist of organizational change, helps us understand why public scholarship—in any discipline—may appear difficult and idiosyncratic. “The features of complexity are...assigned by complex observers.” They rely on narrative to interpret their experience as complex. And narrative, Tsoukas proposes, necessarily reveals contingency, context, and sensitivity to time and history. Public scholarship includes the labor of becoming a complex observer—a complex narrator—of work that particularly values context and contingency. The role of complex observer also extends to those in universities who are charged with determining the value of public scholarship that is deeply embedded in particular social and cultural contexts.

Cultural:

We are focusing on public scholarship in the cultural disciplines, so culture is an inescapable term in our definition. Culture, as Raymond Williams famously observed, “is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language.” Nonetheless, we use this term to bring the work of humanists, designers, and artists together under the common rubric of the social production, interpretation, and criticism of culture, both in the anthropological sense of “a whole way of life--the common meanings” and in the specific sense of “the arts and learning--the special processes of discovery and creative effort” (Williams).

Some concepts and theories relating to culture matter a good deal in public scholarship in the arts, humanities, and design. The idea of cultural agency is particularly important for public scholars. Agency, as George Yúdice argues, “is never wholly one’s own.” It “requires working in a range of groups and organizations.” We see this view of agency in the concept of cultural democracy (“emphasizing pluralism, participation, and equity within and between cultures”). It appears, too, in the work of Benhabib on why equality and diversity are central to “the claims of culture.” And it pervades the several strands of work on cultural citizenship by academics, governments, and NGOs.

Our analysis of public scholarship reflects important cumulative changes in how cultural organizations and institutions throughout our society understand knowledge. As we strive to advance public scholarship, we have grounded our work in the premise that knowledge and art are created in diverse, distributed, and social ways. We are building on ideas about knowledge creation that are influenced by the theory of multiple intelligences; the ‘creativity boom’ that we discuss in Part III; and by the practices and ideas associated with indigenous knowledge. Far from abstract, these discourses are affecting K-12 schooling, business and leadership education, cultural policy, urban economic development aimed at encouraging “the creative class,” and arguments over who owns information.

PART TWO: THE REAL WORLD OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

FACULTY SEND A MESSAGE

As IA has launched the Tenure Team Initiative, we have listened hard to groups of academic administrators, deans, chairs, and faculty members. These include participants in IA's 2005 national conference at Rutgers, the 2005 meeting in Phoenix of the International Council of Fine Arts Deans; and a session President Neitzler of Missouri State University, along with 100 Missouri State senior administrators (including members of the committee charged with rewriting the faculty handbook). Two concerns recur, reflecting the dilemmas of public scholars and artists who are coming up for review and the chairs and deans who must oversee the review process.

First, junior faculty are improvising. New faculty are feeling their way within existing tenure and promotion systems without clear guidelines or effective mentoring.

An engaged ethnomusicologist at a private research university notes that, without adequate policies in place, she was left to fend for herself: "You have to educate your administrators, but that's no solution." Even her sympathetic dean had little guidance for her, beyond suggesting that she "put one paragraph about this work" in what one senior administrator called her "very strange" dossier. Her case was successful, and she is now tenured, but still troubled by the process.

A member of the dance faculty at a public research university describes his predicament as he approaches tenure. "I'm coming up for review in the dance department: So what do I do? ...I'm an oral historian in the community. Does oral history methodology count as the co-generation of knowledge? I make performance works based on oral histories. Who are the peer reviewers for that? I asked four different department chairs 'what is praxis?' and got four different answers."

Second, deans and chairs are hungry for models and criteria. One dean plays devil's advocate, asking "Has the question already been asked and answered a priori about the value of public scholarship?" urging us to specify standards for excellence. An institute director observes that very effective faculty members can be inflexible about making the case for their public scholarship, saying 'It speaks for itself,' when the need to speak critically for and about such work may be paramount. A second dean seeks models: "Are there lessons to be learned from clinicians and social workers and sociologists?" Another dean, a scientist who leads a large College of Arts and Sciences, queries, "We typically look for the second book or the second grant. So how about public scholarship? Don't we ask, what is the next project?"

In order to focus our efforts to address this state of affairs—where anxiety is high, individual negotiations are improvised, and academic leaders are foraging for—we ground this discussion in one rich case study of public scholarship, leading to a more in-depth analysis of method.

THE PROJECT AS THE UNIT OF WORK

Here, we want to underscore the importance of the project in publicly engaged work in the cultural disciplines. In addition to the four attributes of public scholarship—that it is public, contextual, complex, and cultural—we know that public scholarship is structured around projects.

We know that in many fields, including interdisciplinary fields like urban studies and design fields like landscape architecture, the organization of work around projects is unremarkable. But in other cultural disciplines, and above all in the humanities, the project is not as normative (with the important exceptions of collaborative pedagogy and scholarly enterprises such as editions, dictionaries, and digital resources). Public scholarship in the humanities and other cultural disciplines is a challenge to evaluation policies in part because it organizes knowledge production around the project.

Colleges and universities need to build an understanding of projects into tenure and promotion policies for public scholarship in the cultural disciplines. Much public scholarship takes the form of projects—work carried out by a purpose-built team organized for a finite period of time in order to bring about specific results or to create particular products, events, or resources. The project is often a hybrid enterprise, integrating creative work, research, pedagogy, and outreach. It is challenging to evaluate the scholarly excellence of integrative projects that combine discovery with teaching and service. But this is precisely the balance that we are aiming for, for the following reasons:

- The project is often the basis for the core work identity of public scholars and artists.
- The project is the provocation for and subject of writing, publication, and presentation.
- The project is the focus of new programmatic and funding infrastructures in colleges and universities.

A public scholarship project requires a goal-oriented team of campus and community collaborators who work together for a specified period of time (long or short) to produce public “things of lasting value and significance” (Wingspread Declaration). Working on a community project can be a “nucleating activity” (Bloomfield) that sparks new and unexpected interdisciplinary collaborations. Project teams form relationships that may be short-term or sustained through future projects over a period of many years.

David Scobey, Director of the Harvard Center for Community Partnerships at Bates College, describes what it can feel like to participate in a public scholarship project:

[The project is] relentlessly multiple in the cultural products it aims to create, the media and disciplines upon which it calls, and the community partners it engages; and all these elements and projects are mutually permeable and reinforcing. There is an eclectic, improvised quality to the project's development, and it is constantly threatening to overrun our financial and imaginative resources, but that very disorganization points to the pent-up energy, the latent demand for new linkages and projects.

We endorse policies that credit the multiple missions served by public scholarship projects, while sustaining our emphasis on the creation of new knowledge. Two excellent examples suggest that institutional leaders are recognizing that public scholarship's power to integrate research, teaching, and engagement is itself a dimension of excellence, as IA's definition of public scholarship states. The policy of Portland State, for example, urges academic units to "recognize that research, teaching, and community outreach often overlap." And the guidelines of the University of Illinois assert that the both/and logic of publicly engaged academic pursuits can be a positive benefit:

Much as the research...of individuals may positively affect their teaching and public service, so too their involvement in public service may positively serve the purposes of their research and teaching. . This interaction among teaching, research, and public service can contribute significantly to the vitality of the institution, its colleges, units, and departments, as well as to the vitality of its individual faculty members."

Projects beget programs. This is part of the normal life cycle of public scholarship. Even in this period of fiscal constraint, universities are investing more and more resources in the infrastructural needs of publicly engaged faculty, students, and staff. These programmatic investments, in turn, are creating the conditions to which tenure and promotion policies will need to respond.

For example, there are new models of humanities institutes that nurture sustained collaborative projects with public and community partners, including the Simpson Center at the University of Washington, The Institute on Ethnicity, Culture and the Modern Experience at Rutgers Newark, and the Public Humanities Institute at the University of Texas-Austin. Syracuse, too, is inaugurating a humanities center focused on public scholarship. There are numerous examples of other forms of university investment in public scholarship that support—and in many cases evolved from—individual projects. At Michigan State, the Public Humanities Collaborative is linked to a new residential college and a new graduate certificate program. The Humanities Out There (H.O.T.) Program at the University of California—Irvine gives graduate students in the humanities an opportunity to integrate their research into engagement in K-12 schools.

Finally, there are new graduate degree programs at research universities in community-based cultural studies, community-based American studies, and community-based theater. As the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation's report on The Responsive Ph.D. predicted, these programs are attracting strong interest among engaged graduate students in

the humanities and arts. Project-based public scholarship will form an important part of their professional skills and aspirations.

For all of these reasons, tenure and promotion policies need to adapt to the mode of production characteristic of public scholarship—the project—and to its richly diverse intellectual and creative products.

PART THREE: BUILDING BLOCKS OF POLICY

A. LESSONS OF NATIONAL INITIATIVES FOR THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

Understanding Context: Boyer’s Multiple Scholarships Make Space for Engagement—and Keep the pressure on Research and Publication

At present, there are two major models for evaluating faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. The Tenure Team Initiative serves both models equally well, and it is our goal to propose changes that can be applied to either type. The first model is the historically established *triangle*, dominant especially in research-intensive institutions, which evaluates faculty in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Research is typically defined broadly as “research, scholarship, and creative activity,” but stands distinctly apart from teaching and service. The second, newer model is the *scholarship continuum*, based on Boyer’s multiple scholarships. In this model, the term “scholarship” extends also to teaching and service, establishing standards of intellectual achievement across all of these professional areas. Both of these systems, in different ways, demand “original, creative, non-iterative, reflective, peer-reviewed” work.

Our investigation suggests that publicly engaged faculty under both systems face challenges. Faculty whose work is evaluated under the “research, scholarship, creative activity” system struggle to make their public scholarship intelligible or legitimate within those norms. Faculty who deal with policies based on multiple scholarships may not be urged to make the kind of ambitious claims to the “intellectual generativity” of public scholarship and creative work that Scobey has called for.

This background study honors and learns from but does not require Boyer’s concept of multiple scholarships. The innovations of campuses that have adopted tenure and promotion policies based on this concept, however, should be central to any institutional discussion about these issues. They show powerfully that the assessment of scholarly excellence can be far more varied, flexible, and responsive than we had once thought. This is

a liberating realization, and institutions that have not been attentive to these bold experiments (including most research universities) stand to benefit from examining them, whether or not they decide to take the same path.

The multiple scholarship model is making a deep impact on American higher education. The need to respond to more diverse, interrelated, and experimental forms of knowledge production suffuses the most important intervention in debates about what scholarship is and how to value it: Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990). Boyer offered an analysis of scholarship that distinguishes between—while equalizing the value of—different intellectual functions and the social relations associated with them:

In addition to the four “scholarships” set forth in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer later added a fifth category, the scholarship of engagement. (Boyer, *Journal of Public Outreach*, 1996). Boyer's rubrics have been summarized as follows:

- The scholarship of discovery refers to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge.
- The scholarship of integration consists of making connections across disciplines and advancing knowledge through synthesis.
- The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be applied to the social issues of the times in a dynamic process that generates and tests new theory and knowledge.
- The scholarship of teaching includes not only transmitting knowledge, but also transforming and extending it.
- The scholarship of engagement connects any of the above dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. (Community Campus Partnerships for Health)

Boyer was least patient with the scholarship of discovery and inquiry, which he viewed as governed by the normative model of scholarship described by Rice. For Boyer, the “assumptive world” of the research university was the system that he was trying to make more flexible and democratic, without sacrificing intellectual rigor (Rice, 1986).

We sympathize with Boyer's feelings of exasperation with a system that refuses scholarly legitimacy to crucial domains of knowledge making. At the same time, we would like to see a more powerful alternative view of discovery, inquiry, and creation that claims the originality and impact of knowledge made in the ‘shuttle zone’ of public scholarship. For this reason, *Imagining America's* definition of public scholarship in the humanities and arts emphasizes discovery—the production of new knowledge and new creative work—while locating it in a nexus of public relationships and public purposes.

Efforts to implement Boyer's model have not displaced the prestige of research and publication, though expanding scholarly publication to include the scholarship of teaching

and outreach has made the content of publication more varied, as well as stimulating the formation of new journals and associations.

In 2005, Eugene Rice and KerryAnn O’Meara published a co-edited volume, *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. Rice and O’Meara present an analysis of the results of a national survey of chief academic officers (CAO’s). “Reform institutions” have changed tenure and promotion policies to weight engagement more heavily. Thirty-nine percent of reform institutions reported that “outreach and engagement” counted more than in the past. This is a good example of how policy change can validate areas of work that were previously marginal or invisible. There are complications, however.

Inside Higher Education (October 4, 2005) highlighted the “mixed news” contained in Rice and O’Meara’s study: “New book suggests that Boyer’s call for reform of tenure and promotion has had real impact — and hit roadblocks and contradictions.” While this is a reductive assessment of a volume that offers a wealth of thought-provoking material, it underscores an important lesson: validating teaching and other professional activities as forms of scholarship puts new pressure on faculty to study, write about, and publish on their work in these domains. Thus the “publish or perish” experience persists, adding publication options without transforming the genres or norms of conventional scholarly publication in the disciplines.

Teaching vs. research. That divide — real or imagined — has shaped many a faculty career and many a debate over priorities in higher education. And the dichotomy continues to be discussed today....

For many faculty members seeking tenure, of course, the question about *Scholarship Reconsidered* is: Did it have an impact? Can one earn tenure or win a promotion on multiple forms of scholarship?... The survey suggests that the dominant change in tenure in the decade following the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered* may have been more demands that faculty members be better in everything, including traditional models of research...

KerryAnn O’Meara...said she was “a little surprised” by how many colleges reported that they “simultaneously increased encouragement of multiple forms of scholarship and increased research expectations.”

Rice and O’Meara’s findings suggest that tenure and promotion policies based on multiple scholarships still lack a fully effective definition of public scholarship as the scholarship of discovery and inquiry. When major research institutions adopt the multiple scholarships model—especially ambitious universities seeking to move up in the research rankings—faculty may feel trapped rather than encouraged. They are being asked to fulfill both the demands of the older “research, scholarship, and creative activity” model, as research excellence becomes an overriding value, and also to respond to the demands of the multiple scholarship system, which calls for scholarly productivity and publication in the areas of teaching, service, and outreach, as well. A more robust commitment to public scholarship may help get faculty out of this double bind.

Apply Lessons from Scholarship of Engagement Efforts

We have reviewed national efforts to develop coherent policies for the evaluation of the “scholarship of engagement,” “professional practice,” and “outreach scholarship.” These initiatives broadly address community engagement in American higher education generally, aiming to be useful to all kinds of institutions and adaptable to all disciplines and fields. In this section, we identify some features of these policies as applicable to the particularities of public scholarship as we define it. But we also call attention to their emphasis on teaching and professional service as modes of scholarship, which are not the focus of our efforts. There is still a need for policies more deeply rooted in discovery and inquiry specific to the arts, humanities, and design. Therefore this section is followed by an extended analysis of unit-level policies from cultural fields, pointing to lessons learned from interdisciplinary humanities fields, from design disciplines, and from the arts.

A strong network of committed investigators has worked in concert on these issues for a number of years. Many of these individuals have been associated with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the National Clearinghouse and Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. Most recently these efforts have resulted in the new, elective Carnegie Engagement Classification for colleges and universities. This network includes Amy Driscoll, Mary Taylor Huber, Barbara Holland, Judith Ramaley, Lorilee Sandmann, Theodore Alter, Hiram Fitzgerald, Devorah Lieberman, the late Ernest Lynton, Eugene Rice, and a number of others. Most of them have evolved their positions through institutional change efforts, mostly on urban and land-grant campuses: Portland State University, California State-Monterey Bay, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI), Michigan State University, and Pennsylvania State University.

Huber finds broad consensus on six attributes that, taken together, define scholarly excellence (<http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph/eval.html>). Her focus is on “outreach” but this framework also is useful in assessing research, scholarship, and creativity activity (in one institutional vocabulary) and the scholarship of discovery (in another):

1. Clear goals
2. Adequate preparation
3. Appropriate methods
4. Significant results
5. Effective presentation
6. Reflective critique

Huber found that these criteria are applicable “to a broad range of intellectual projects, while allowing the markers for what is clear, adequate, appropriate, significant, effective, and reflective to vary among different kinds of scholarly projects.” We agree, and the preliminary recommendations—policy proposals for discussion and review--set forth in this document by *Imagining America* address each one of these six criteria in ways appropriate to the cultural disciplines.

These criteria—linked to a useful set of guiding questions—structure the evaluation services of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. The creation of the

National Review Board built on and modified *Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). A program of the Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement, the Board provides external peer review of a faculty member's scholarship at the request of the institution, usually tapping two reviewers. The National Review Board provides a service to academic departments, schools, or colleges that are seeking evaluation of faculty whose professional profile includes substantial community-based teaching, research, or service. The National Review Board seeks to find reviewers who are familiar with the faculty member's field, but disciplinary specificity is not the primary focus of its work.

While the National Review Board's approach to peer review has been helpful, it strikes us as a transitional effort. The Review Board's most significant contribution has been in developing criteria that from now on can be applied to the more familiar model of peer review --individual letters from external reviewers chosen by the faculty member's home institution. The present challenge is dissemination. We urge our member institutions to make sure that clear criteria for public scholarship are delivered into the hands of external reviewers who are qualified public scholars themselves, so that they can compose letters useful to departmental committees.

An Example of Institutionalizing the Scholarship of Engagement: Portland State University

Portland State University has successfully brought about cultural change at the institutional level by implementing tenure and promotion policies that adapt Boyer's analysis of the multiple dimensions of scholarship. Indeed Portland State served as a sort of national laboratory for the public engagement movement in American colleges and universities, since many key members of the "scholarship of engagement" network worked there before moving on to lead national initiatives. Therefore we have selected the sections on Scholarship in the Portland State University Promotion Policies as a best practice for institutional tenure and promotion policies.

PSU's strong commitment to its urban mission informs its approach to faculty evaluation. Its policies are distinguished by many features that we commend to other colleges and universities:

- A flexible approach to scholarship, responsive to differences among fields and disciplines, including sustained and nuanced consideration of creative work in the arts (Section C);
- Clear criteria for scholarly excellence, compatible with the standards of the National Clearinghouse and Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement (Section D);
- An integrated approach to scholarship that acknowledges the way faculty projects may combine research, creative practice, teaching, and public engagement (Section E);
- Acknowledgement throughout of practices specific to the arts, humanities, and design (Section E); and

- Respect for public and community-based scholarship and creative activity, for example, in policies that include community peers among external reviewers (Section E.4).

Public scholarship's power to integrate research, teaching, and engagement constitutes an important dimension of excellence. We would like to underscore the importance of this point, which we incorporate into Preliminary Recommendation 2, below. Portland State's policy document urges promotion committees to accept blurred boundaries and cautioning against confining faculty engagement within narrow categories:

one should recognize that research, teaching, and community outreach often overlap. For example, a service-learning project may reflect both teaching and community outreach. Some research projects may involve both research and community outreach. Pedagogical research may involve both research and teaching.... it is more important to focus on the general criteria of the quality and significance of the work than to categorize the work.

This recommendation parallels the guidelines of the University of Illinois, which also declare that the both/and logic of publicly engaged academic pursuits can be a positive benefit:

Much as the research...of individuals may positively affect their teaching and public service, so too their involvement in public service may positively serve the purposes of their research and teaching. ... This interaction among teaching, research, and public service can contribute significantly to the vitality of the institution, its colleges, units, and departments, as well as to the vitality of its individual faculty members.

While the work of the National Clearinghouse and the National Review Board and the institutional policies shaped by their leadership form a good starting point, there are important dimensions of public scholarship that they fail to make explicit. We recommend adopting five additional criteria relating to the scope and quality of public scholarship in the cultural disciplines. The criteria presented above, developed by national efforts to standardize the evaluation of the scholarship of engagement, are enormously helpful. But they are not complete.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 2: ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR SCOPE AND QUALITY OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN THE CULTURAL DISCIPLINES

1. **Local, regional projects may be valued equally with national and international ones. Also, translocal scholarship that connects regional or local projects to broader networks offers a particular kind of excellence. Existing barriers to**

valuing local work, therefore, should be removed from tenure and promotion policies.

- 2. Creation of innovative public scholarship programs or centers that support and contribute to the cultural disciplines and interdisciplinary fields counts as scholarly achievement.**
- 3. Assessment of impact includes impact on the academic discipline or interdisciplinary field, on nonacademic knowledge and cultural institutions, and on specific publics or communities beyond the university.**
- 4. Integration of scholarship, teaching, and public engagement is a distinct aspect of scholarly excellence.**
- 5. Interdisciplinarity includes work that connects academic and nonacademic knowledges.**

Nonacademic Peer Reviewers

We urge attentiveness to “the context and conditions in which the work was produced” by sanctioning the practice of soliciting letters from peer reviewers who are based outside the academy, when their perspective is relevant to a faculty member’s promotion or tenure dossier. We invite our colleagues at Imagining America’s colleges and universities to examine policies like those of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and Portland State, which include nonacademic professionals among appropriate external reviewers: “Active professionals in various fields...are in an appropriate position to assess the impact of such activities...[and] may also be able to provide evidence of the contribution of scholarly endeavors” by illuminating “the practical implications of theory” or improving professional practice. But while we commend such openness, we believe that restricting external reviewers who are not themselves academics to the domain of “practical implications” reduces their standing as co-creators of knowledge for whom theory-building and the integration of action and theory are paramount.

Peer reviewers tasked with evaluating public scholarship will be presented with many collaborative productions. Therefore, they will need guidelines for assessing collaborative work. The policies of the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Michigan recommend that peer reviewers “be asked to identify clearly the nature of the individual’s contribution, rather than permit important joint work to be neglected in evaluation...the nature of the contribution must be clearly specified and *critically evaluated*, relying on clients and users as well as professional peers.”

The same principle of expanded participation in reviews by experienced public scholars applies to the mix of people on tenure and promotion committees on campus. Already, it is not unusual to have faculty from different academic units represented on tenure subcommittees for highly interdisciplinary faculty members with joint appointments in more than one department or program. Such committees offer a model for the evaluation of faculty whose community-based work connects them to one or more campus units and also

to non-academic organizations. Department chairs should have the option of including on the committee the faculty director of a center for community partnerships or a professor who has standing as a public scholar in, for example, public history or community theater.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 3: BROADEN PEER REVIEW

Recognized nonacademic leaders in public scholarship and public art-making are qualified peer reviewers, as are public scholars and artists on the faculty member's home campus:

- **Capable reviewers of faculty engaged in public scholarship and creative work are based in both academic and non-academic settings (i.e. museums, theaters, libraries, nonprofits/NGOs, K-12 education). Growing numbers of such individuals have national reputations for campus-community partnerships and public culture making. Many are highly regarded as both practitioners and theorists.**
- **Scholars and artists who are experienced public scholars at the faculty member's home institution may be represented on tenure and promotion subcommittees, when their participation provides a valuable interdisciplinary perspective on a colleague's public scholarship.**

B. NEIGHBORHOODS OF KNOWLEDGE: LESSONS FROM UNIT-LEVEL POLICIES IN THE CULTURAL DISCIPLINES

At this point we turn from transformative but somewhat generic policies developed by national efforts to support the scholarship of engagement to strategies that speak directly to artists, humanists, and designers, as well as to scholars in interdisciplinary fields such as Women's Studies.

Lessons from Interdisciplinary Fields: Make Assumptions about Knowledge Explicit

Colleges and universities may usefully adopt certain features of tenure and promotion policies for engaged interdisciplinary fields, which offer helpful strategies for understanding public scholarship in the arts, humanities, and design. Public scholarship is sufficiently like other interdisciplinary areas to benefit from responsive policies developed in Ethnic Studies and American Studies, as well as in Women's Studies.

With these factors in mind, we propose that colleges and universities consider the insights embedded in policies such as those governing tenure and promotion review for the Women's Studies Institute at the University of Georgia. These policies show how important it is for academic units to be explicit about the nature of knowledge in a particular field—especially when that field emerged from challenges to conventional assumptions about objectivity and impersonality, as is the case with Women's Studies.

It is a good idea to include a statement like the one below in tenure policies. The chances are better that the review committee will focus with an open mind on the unique particularity of the case at hand. We believe that this would be a stronger statement if it included, as we do in recommendation #2, a clear statement that “interdisciplinarity includes work that connects academic and nonacademic knowledges.” But we like the way in which the Institute posits the field of Women's Studies as a pluralist site for debate about different forms of knowledge, rather than as a domain that is organized by pre-fabricated binaries. This paragraph clearly grows out of hard-won insights rooted in years of faculty and institutional negotiation:

The Women's Studies Institute recognizes that women's studies scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, scholarship of discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false choices. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore, that success in professional development can be achieved in many ways, that contributions may affect study, practice, or policy, and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another. (Women's Studies Institute Promotion and Tenure Manual, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia State University, 2004).

The resulting sophistication about the generation of knowledge pervades the rest of the Institute's policies, which resist categorical inclusions and exclusions, urging scrupulous care in judging the appropriateness of diverse scholarly products. These clarifications are especially germane to public scholarship and provide a model for addressing the challenges of evaluating public work that does not fit neatly within the publishing apparatus of established disciplines:

While loose hierarchies of scholarly journals, publishers, granting agencies, and venues for performance and showing creative work may exist in each discipline, there is generally disagreement about such rankings. Moreover, valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence and perspectives that challenge existing knowledge may not be found in or supported by the allegedly best of these. In fact, as the history of women's studies shows, sometimes cutting-edge work can only be made available outside and independently of the most prestigious. In addition, given the interdisciplinary nature of women's studies, some of a candidate's work may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines. That work should not be disadvantaged.

The Institute's policies provide helpful models of how to approach interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary work. Nonetheless, they subscribe to a status hierarchy that values the national and international above all. This set of geopolitical assumptions is a real problem for public scholars whose work has transvalued the meaning and prestige of the local: "Dissemination venues may be to an on-campus, local, regional, national and/or international audience, generally in a hierarchy of rising valuation." This is language that policies supportive of public scholarship should challenge through a thoughtful statement on local knowledge, such as the one included in our "Criteria for Scope and Quality," preliminary recommendation #2, above.

In order to further address assumptions about the relative value of local and national scope, as well as the merit of different publication venues and genres, our fourth recommendation validates the diversity of scholarly and creative products in publicly engaged cultural work.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 4: VALUE DIVERSE SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS

Publication and dissemination of public scholarship may include peer-reviewed articles or books, as well as non peer-reviewed articles or books that speak to broader publics or nonacademic constituencies; presentations at academic and nonacademic conferences and meetings; as well as participatory workshops. Specifically, scholarly dissemination includes publication in journals or presentations at meetings that advance public engagement and engaged academic work; awards received for public engagement; adoption of the faculty member's models by others who seek solutions to similar problems; substantial contributions to public policy or influence upon professional practice; models that enrich the artistic and cultural life of the community. Qualitative or quantitative documentation of public and community-based projects extends to video documentaries, ethnographic investigations incorporating interviews and participant narratives, and evaluative methods appropriate to the methodologies of Community-based Participatory Action Research.

Lessons from Design: Connecting Professions and Disciplines, Integrating Practice and Reflection

In design fields such as Architecture and Landscape Architecture, off-campus, site-specific projects involving government agencies, public spaces, and public stakeholders are common. So are products other than peer-reviewed articles, such as policy recommendations, site plans, and public consultations. What may be unfamiliar, or even radical, in a Department of English could be business as usual in a Department of Architecture. Throughout the history of Imagining America's work in the area of public scholarship, faculty in design fields have brought to our work crucial insights from their professional practice. At the same time, we hear from designers that they, too, need policies that distinguish civically engaged

scholarship from work centered on other kinds of relationships with clients and collaborators outside the academy. They, too, seek standards of excellence that are adequate to the reflective, democratic, co-equal production of public goods that the highest standards of engagement require.

The design fields have much to contribute to a discussion of tenure and promotion policies in the humanities and arts. These fields—especially Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Urban Planning—possess robust traditions of complex, project-based work leading to concrete results in particular locations. Cultural Geography, Urban Studies, and certain fields within Natural Resources and Environmental Studies also organize much of their work around projects. Project teams connect academic and non-academic participants; the latter may include representatives of municipalities, neighborhood organizations, business empowerment zones, and other interest groups. The process of proposal development and review may be highly public and dialogic. Rich contextual knowledge is crucial and may be captured through powerful mapping tools that are now widely available to students, artists, and community groups. Some faculty in these fields work within well-developed democratic engagement frameworks that stress co-equal participation and democratic purposes, although public scholarship is still a minor strand in these disciplines.

Design departments and schools have significant contributions to make to the development of tenure and promotion policies for publicly engaged scholars in all of the cultural disciplines. They constitute interdisciplinary areas that are pervaded by an intense awareness of the fact that institutional policies need to honor the realities of rapid change, experiment, and innovation in the field. Some of these policies exhibit an unusual degree of epistemological self-consciousness, which we hold up as a model.

The “Criteria and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review” of the University of Michigan’s Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning (TCAUP) take an unusually conceptual approach. They emphasize the *variety, complexity, and fluidity* of work in the design and planning fields, acknowledging that a good deal of faculty work “combines characteristics from traditional academic disciplines with characteristics from the professions,” which has clear implications for the evaluation of public scholarship in the arts and humanities, as well.

The policy document of Taubman College responds to the variable conditions of knowledge production by valuing *integration, synthesis, and creativity*.

Professional work evolves rapidly as social and technological changes demand new answers, new skills, and new roles for architects and planners. In such a fluid context, a central concern is the linking of theory, practice, and values.

Having established the fluid nature of the field, this document proceeds to the necessarily diverse qualities of the faculty, collectively and individually. The same equation between faculty diversity and publicly committed, collaborative work carried out in real-world settings holds for public scholarship in the cultural disciplines. All unit-level tenure and promotion policies could benefit from a statement like this, setting forth a “big tent” ethic:

The composition of our faculty is of critical importance. We need diversity in breadth of knowledge, in range of professional experience, in representation of disciplines, in professional productivity and attainment. Some faculty are scholars in the humanistic tradition; some are artists; others pursue empirical research or develop methodologies in the traditions of the natural or social sciences. Finally a substantial group is oriented primarily to the world of practice, and makes its contribution in solving current problems. Few faculty fit these pure types; rather they represent a mix of two or more of the types. The special value of many faculty to the College often lies in their ability to link diverse pursuits.

Tenure and promotion policies are particularly attentive to the forms of knowledge that emerge in project-based endeavors. Seeking to generalize from the diversity of faculty productivity, the TCAUP statement on Research and Creative Work invites different kinds of “evidence that the candidate is effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance.” These categories apply also to the forms of public scholarship in the design fields:

- advances in the understanding of basic phenomena of human well-being or of the environment;
- new formulations of questions or tasks of the field which are more useful than older ones;
- advances in methods which are more likely to provide more power, insight, or better designs than their predecessors;
- distinguished products such as designed, enhanced, or restored environments, works of art, buildings and groups of buildings;
- plans, programs or evaluations that deal creatively with elusive or complex tasks;
- innovative systems or ways for addressing difficult problems of practice.

One consequence of such a broad range of scholarly production, also relevant to some aspects of public scholarship in other cultural disciplines, are new challenges of dissemination:

Frequently [faculty members] need to be inventive in finding ways to disseminate the results of their work widely.... While many faculty are expected to publish journal articles, for those whose activities fall more at the practice end of the spectrum, journal articles will not necessarily be the appropriate medium for their creative output.

While honoring the specific value of intellectual products generated through practice, the Taubman document also demands critical reflection, and here, too, there is a lesson for all public scholars: practice alone is not enough:

The normal range of practice activities, no matter how valuable in themselves or as a source of ideas for the practitioner, is insufficient. . . . the practitioner/professor must extract insights from their experience, they must generalize and synthesize, and present those broader ideas for consideration, debate, and development by others.

Professional Practice Portfolios

Finally, design offers an important model for creating a public scholarship portfolio, which may include “news clips, published critiques, and descriptions written by others.” We recommend adapting the professional practice portfolio common in architecture and design to the presentational needs of public scholarship projects in the humanities and arts.

We are in the midst of a portfolio boom. Portfolio-based assessments are migrating throughout higher education. The use of self-assessment and reflective portfolios by students (increasingly, in the form of e-portfolios) is becoming a common feature of programs that advance engaged learning. For graduate students and undergraduates entering the academic and K-12 job markets, teaching portfolios are now the norm.

In this environment, we want to stress the wisdom that generated the professional practice portfolio in the design disciplines and its usefulness in the tenure and promotion process. The professional work portfolio is well suited to public scholarship and public creative work, as it allows for both reflective, critical analysis and for a broad diversity of sometimes unconventional products.

Making Outreach Visible: Guide to Documenting Professional Service also offers valuable examples of project portfolios that can be adapted to the documentation of public scholarship. Two of these examples are especially useful for faculty in the humanities: the Memphis anthropology project portfolio and the Portland YWCA history project portfolio. Interestingly, the faculty teams that generated the model portfolios for this book debated where, in the portfolio, to locate reflective writing (13); how to manage issues of voice and narrative within the portfolio (29); and the inclusion of alternative channels of dissemination, which they deemed very important (24).

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 5: INCLUDE A PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP PORTFOLIO IN THE TENURE OR PROMOTION DOSSIER

The public scholarship portfolio:

- is sent to external reviewers;
- includes a substantive framing essay—probably longer than the standard research statement—that narrates progress, establishes the importance of this work for the

field, explains its contributions to the public good; establishes its originality; and suggests future directions;

- documents projects through relevant materials, which may include public and scholarly presentations, multimedia and curricular materials, individual and co-authored publications, site plans, policy reports, participant interviews, workshops, planning and assessment tools, etc.

Note: Portfolio materials relating to teaching are included here because the integration of teaching, research, and engagement is an independent criterion for intellectual excellence. They will also count in the evaluation of teaching.

Learning from the Arts

Context

In order to analyze the gap between existing tenure and promotion policies and real-world practice, we need to understand not only the context of arts disciplines as they are organized and pursued on campus, but also powerful movements for change in the larger artistic domain outside of higher education. Cultural and knowledge institutions--museums, symphonies, historic sites, festivals, and theaters--are investing heavily in more engaged relationships to their local publics, especially through more sustained artists' residencies and more thoughtful partnerships with K-12 schools. Community cultural development is now a field, and seasoned professionals in this area are seeking new forms of infrastructure for learning, exchange, and reflection. Nonprofit cultural organizations are engaged in rethinking evaluation and assessment, often as a result of the requirements of foundation funding.

Arts faculty who are involved in public art making are important bridges to these domains, developing the intellectual and creative environment on campus that support engagement with cultural institutions off campus. They provide a model for parallel, but often less visible, trends in the humanities.

As one result of the growing interaction between community arts organizations and higher ed arts departments, new academic programs are emerging: the Art and Public Policy Department at the Tisch School for the Performing Arts at NYU; Community Arts Partnerships at CalArts; the Columbia College Center for Arts Policy in Chicago; ArtsBridge, launched at the University of California Irvine and now a network of 22 campuses; Theater with a Concentration on Youth at Arizona State University; a new arts journalism program at Michigan State; the Visual and Public Art Major at California State-Monterey Bay, and a number of others.

These new academic initiatives make it more important than ever to develop appropriate tenure and promotion policies that address the specific forms of public and community-based artistic work. The emergence of new programs and majors, with a new set of faculty leaders at the helm, makes policy changes all but inevitable. It is not surprising that at the 2006 meeting of the International Council of Fine Arts Deans, a presentation on Imagining

America's Tenure Team Initiative to all conference participants sparked lively interest and substantive feedback.

Tenure and promotion policies for fine and performing artists are a hard-won accomplishment. Even where robust policies for peer review of creative work are in place for musicians, visual artists, dancers, poets, and actors, the annual labor of institutional translation is considerable. This also holds true for freestanding arts institutions, such as the California Institute for the Arts, which eschew the tenure system in favor of other approaches to faculty evaluation. These evaluation methods, like most tenure policies, heavily weight artistic productivity off campus, especially in national and international arenas. As a result, these campuses, too, face the hard work of rethinking assessment standards to respond to locally engaged creative projects.

As the making of expressive culture involves more mixed forms, the arts and humanities need each other more than ever in order to develop evaluation policies adequate to work that combines elements of each: choreography built on oral histories; performance art that redefines public spaces; installations that advance the analysis of the concept of "the border" so central to Ethnic Studies, historical photographs discovered through intensive archival work projected onto the buildings they depict. In sum, as departments grapple with faculty work that incorporates artistic practices—often collaboratively made with community members and resulting in new kinds of scholarly products—swapping pieces of tenure and promotion policies will be mutually beneficial to both arts and humanities departments.

The Strengths and Limitations of Current Policies

Many colleges and universities currently possess effective strategies for describing and valuing the work of faculty artists, and we urge institutions to build this specificity into policies relating to public scholarship in all the cultural disciplines. Tenure and promotion policies credit a broad array of creative practices and products. As in the case of design, this openness to the rich diversity of artifacts, exhibits, performances, compositions, choreography, designs, festivals, and installations is an important resource for fields, such as the humanities, faced with evaluating new cultural production generated by public scholarship—new, at least, to the non-arts discipline.

Even as we acknowledge the evaluative power of existing tenure policies in the arts, however, we need to look at where these policies are inadequate to public art making, especially to the most common forms of collaborative creative work informed by civic purposes.

The standard rationale for tenure policies for artists, framed in terms of the conventional three-part mission of higher education, is summarized in the report on the 2004 American Assembly, *The Creative Campus: The Training, Sustaining, and Presenting of the Performing Arts in American Higher Education*. "The arts on campus have sustained...the academy's deep-seated, tripartite mission—to provide research, education, and service to society." Under the rubric of research, concepts of "knowledge" and "discovery" bestow legitimacy on artistic work in college and university settings:

In the arts, the creative processes of developing and presenting works are parallel to the creation/production of scholarly work. Artistic work constitutes one form of knowledge, of research, which is valuable in its own right, and which also resonates with discoveries in other disciplines. The performing arts, using appropriate laboratories and archives, exercising their own skills and talents, make discoveries, which—like those in other disciplines—enrich understanding and make progress possible.

The Creative Campus report issues a call for “more deliberate approaches” to the task of trying to “assimilate...artistic disciplines into the fabric of academic life.” From the point of view of Imagining America’s Tenure Team Initiative, this process of assimilation should include the coherent recognition of public creative work.

The Creative Campus national meeting, under the auspices of the American Assembly, included powerful calls for integrating public engagement into the vision of the creative campus, issued by Nancy Cantor (then Chancellor of the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign) and Sekou Sundiata, a poet and theater artist on the faculty of the New School. But these themes are muted and thus remain unresolved in the final report, which avoids grappling with the systemic challenges of the growing trend toward public scholarship and artistic creation by arts faculty in higher education.

The new global cultural networks of richly contextualized, locally grounded, and socially purposeful artistic production are rarely acknowledged in existing policies. Imagining America’s definition of public scholarship goes a long way in correcting these insufficiencies.

Existing policies are slanted toward highly prestigious international or national arts institutions, presenters, and events. As can happen in design, as well, such language reinforces a fiercely hegemonic, and sometimes narrow, definition of peers. Scholarly products for performers include the following: commissions for musical compositions; publication of compositions or arrangements; appearances off-campus as a speaker, conductor, soloist, actor, director, designer, ensemble member, panelist, or clinician, or as a director of a workshop or institute...[or] with paid professional groups or in professional (paid) settings; performances [including commercial recordings] of compositions by the faculty member; and “service as an adjudicator in major competitions when it is clearly an honor to have been selected” (University of Michigan School of Music, Dance, and Theater).

Arts faculty are so focused on exhibiting, performing, and presenting in off-campus settings, that they may need support in two directions: first, in expanding their valid options off campus by recognizing a broader range of peers in peer review. They also need support in dealing with the question of what is valued on campus, since inreach may be as important to the success of the project as outreach, and since the campus side of the campus-community relationship is fundamental to the artistic project.

A Note on Equivalencies

We have received many questions about how to “count” the public scholarship produced by a community-based cultural project, using the master currency of books and articles. People are asking, “Assuming we know what an academic book or article is ‘worth’ in the tenure

process, what are the equivalents in the creative arena?” This question is understandable, but flawed. It reflects the quantitative logic that equates the value of knowledge with a narrow range of publication, a logic that John Guillory resists in an important issue of the Modern Language Association’s *Profession* on “Valuing the Humanities, Evaluation Scholarship.” Nonetheless, the question makes explicit calculations that tacitly structure scholarly assessment, and there is value in this explicitness. We want to share one model for establishing such equivalences between non-arts and arts productivity, because it is suggestive of the challenges faced by anyone writing new tenure and promotion policies for public scholars and artists. The policies of the University of Georgia Women’s Studies Institute face head-on the tricky issue of equivalencies between scholarly publishing and artistic production, with rare explicitness:

Criteria for evaluati[ng] creative projects will include consideration of the length and complexity of the project, the means of disseminating the work to an audience, and the valuation of the completed work by outside peer review. For creative projects, a loose analogy might be drawn between a produced short play, short film, or short performance and a journal article or book chapter. Similarly, a loose analogy might be drawn between the production of a full-length film or full-length play and a book.

Can this logic be extended to the different products of public scholarship? We will be listening closely during the comment cycles of the Tenure Team Initiative for suggestions relating to this issue.

C. IMPLEMENTING NEW TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES: INTERACTIVE DIALOGUE, SUPPORTIVE CLIMATE

We know from early responses to our online survey that faculty who care about the Tenure Team Initiative rank “changing institutional culture” as a higher priority than “changing tenure and promotion policies.” We take this to mean that our constituency understands that changing the rules is ineffective unless the institutional climate also changes. The following are crucial elements of an institutional climate that supports public engagement across the board and especially public scholarship in the cultural disciplines:

- Commitment to socially, experientially, and intellectually diverse faculty. Overall hiring/tenure flexibility on all life/work issues and mentoring of faculty throughout professional life cycle.
- Pervasive articulation of the public mission, with institutional leaders who talk about the university as a knowledge-making institution working for the public good.
- Leadership on the part of the Provost as new policies are implemented and sustained over time.

- Emphasis on richly different approaches to engagement within changing disciplines.
- Focus on the campus's alliances with other knowledge-making institutions and groups (schools, media, museums, nonprofits/NGOs, foundations).
- Validation through internal grants, awards, centers, fundraising.
- Building public scholarship into undergraduate research programs and into graduate education, including integrating discussions of public engagement into Preparing Future Faculty programs.
- Training and professional development for department chairs, deans, and other administrators.
- Participation in national engagement efforts.

The most important vehicles for changing institutional culture are campus groups dedicated to study, reflection, and dialogue at the departmental and college level. Such groups can work on policy change through interactive, sometimes unconventional activities. As noted by the authors of *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*, some campuses “have each held mock deliberations of promotion and tenure committees”(23). In those workshops, faculty and administrators used cases from the *Guide* “to explore areas of uncertainty, identify gaps, and affirm the strengths of those examples for the review process.” At IUPUI, the focus is on departments. Tenure committees participate in a required workshop on the multiple forms of scholarship, including engaged scholarship.

For faculty in the cultural disciplines, even more inventive strategies may work best. At the University of Michigan, the CRLT Players of the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching use the techniques of interactive, forum, and traditional theater to address many issues relating to teaching, campus climate, women in science and engineering, and tenure reviews. In the interactive sketches,

following each sketch, the audience dialogues with the actors, who stay in character. A trained facilitator guides the discussion and provides professional expertise and research-based information about the topic at hand.... After the dialogue, the characters often repeat the sketch, incorporating audience members' suggested changes.

The troupe's traditional theater presentations, based on interviews and focus groups, are designed to “bring to life the unspoken assumptions, motivations, and feelings of students and faculty around issues of teaching, learning and diversity.”

Dialogues like these at the departmental, college, and institution-wide level are critically important, and they lead to a cycle of reflection and policy clarification that supports public scholarship in a continuously attentive fashion. The ambitious scope of Michigan State University's Office of Outreach and Engagement supports institutional climate change in

many ways, including through *Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning and Evaluating Quality Outreach*.

Although it relies on the vocabulary of “service” rather than scholarship, the *Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process* from the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign (UIUC) provides an example of how tenure and promotion policies can (and should) be supplemented with additional guidelines for faculty and department chairs, arising from and directly addressing the concerns of faculty.

This UIUC guide supplements the University’s policies in order to support both engaged faculty and those charged with evaluating their work. Documents like the UIUC *Faculty Guide* make an important contribution to specifying how people can work together to create an institutional climate that supports public scholarship and art making:

The guide provides important information regarding how to make a case that an individual’s performance is of high quality, that it is integrated with teaching and research (scholarship), and that it makes an impact on the quality of life. Use of this guide by faculty members, department heads, and committees should lead to better-supported promotion and tenure documents, more successful cases, and more fulfilled and appropriately rewarded faculty members.

In the UIUC *Faculty Guide*, perhaps the most useful contribution of this document comes in Part II. This section responds to many of the anxieties felt by faculty members regarding the preparation of the tenure dossier and to the worries of department chairs and deans charged with mentoring faculty through this process. The recommendations for all faculty members emphasize the fundamental importance of early and sustained mentoring. The guide stresses, first of all, understanding the institutional mission (in the case of UIUC, the mission of a land-grant and research intensive university), as well as unit or departmental expectations. Particular questions help ground this advice (for example, “In what areas has the department established a history of quality in public service?”). Sound guidance also includes building evaluation into project development, involving department chairs in the planning process, and aiming to make public service “visible, evaluatable, and improvable.”

The kind of dialogues we are proposing here are fundamental to creating a robust public sphere *on campus*, with all of the mood swings that such dialogue can provoke, ranging from excited advocacy, to sympathetic skepticism, to blunt opposition. Ted Alters writes at length about “enabling settings” for public scholarship, and this term—“enabling settings”—is precisely what we have in mind for the Tenure Team Initiative, too: broad-based collegial discussion of the recommendations and arguments set forth in the TTT’s final report, followed by the framing and implementation of new policies.

It is of the utmost importance to *implement new policies in a supportive, flexible way through:*

- interactive campus dialogues,
- explanatory guidelines with examples, and

- a responsive climate.

Transformations in campus climate are fundamental to the democratic vision that underlies the entire Tenure Team Initiative and Imagining America itself. We return to the Foreword of this report by the TTI's national co-chairs, President Lavine and Chancellor Cantor, in order to remind ourselves of this fact:

[E]ven as American higher education recovers its traditions of public practice, we are not yet always comfortable extending them to our newest faculty. . . . How many times have we heard, “You’d better wait until you get tenure before you do that”? We brag about the fabulous work of our engaged faculty—but can we get them promoted?

Our final preliminary recommendation for discussion and review speaks directly to Lavine’s and Cantor’s urgings that American colleges and universities actively welcome new public scholars and artists onto their faculties.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION 6: SUPPORT JUNIOR FACULTY WHO PURSUE PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

- When public scholarship is consistent with the mission of the institution and the unit—that is, when it is professionally safe to pursue it—junior faculty interested in public scholarship should be consistently and coherently supported.
- Effective evaluation and mentoring for junior faculty interested in public scholarship is crucial so that their work in this area can fulfill the criteria for excellence in public scholarship adopted by the department, school or college, and university (e.g. relevance to field or discipline, clarity of goals and purposes, significance of products). While mentors may advise caution with respect to a particular approach to public scholarship, they should do so with the intention of supporting, not inhibiting, an individual’s aspirations as a public scholar or artist.
- Junior faculty should not be required to pursue public scholarship or art-making but, should they choose to do so in ways compatible with the campus and departmental mission, they should never be penalized.