

Teacher-Scholar: The Journal of the State Comprehensive University

Volume 2 | Issue 1

Article 2

January 2010

Chief Academic Officers and Institutional Change: The Example of Community Engagement

John Presley

Illinois State University, jwpresl@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/ts>

Recommended Citation

Presley, John (2010) "Chief Academic Officers and Institutional Change: The Example of Community Engagement," *Teacher-Scholar: The Journal of the State Comprehensive University*. Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 2.
DOI: 10.58809/OWDJ9022
Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/ts/vol2/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-Reviewed Journals at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teacher-Scholar: The Journal of the State Comprehensive University by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE:
THE EXAMPLE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

John Woodrow Presley
Department of English
Illinois State University

If you're being audited by the IRS, columnist Dave Barry once advised his readers, say you're a provost—not even the IRS knows what provosts do, so the auditor can't challenge any of your claimed deductions. In fact, when I served as a provost, the most common reaction when I was introduced to unsuspecting members of the public was the immediate question, some version of “What is it that provosts do?”

Well, most important among their duties, chief academic officers of colleges and universities are expected to help foster new strategic directions, such as the addition of civic and community engagement activities to the curriculum and to the expected roles of faculty. The work of department chairs and deans is crucial to successful change as well, but usually limited to their own units. Provosts or vice presidents for academic affairs—chief academic officers—are expected to make connections across academic units, to lead deans and department chairs, to manage strategically to achieve university-wide goals.

Chief academic officers are also expected, in the best of times, to know and understand not only university goals, but also to know individual faculty goals, interests, and even some of their individual enthusiasms. CAOs are expected to understand faculty culture, and the state of the campus at any given time, to know how to turn—sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly—all or as many as possible of the university's assets toward new goals for the campus curriculum, for support services, for the campus as an organic culture. CAOs have budgets, large or small, at their disposal for these and other purposes, but a CAO involved in fostering such a new direction must understand where and how to deploy that budget, how to revise rewards and acknowledgement structures, how to subtly change faculty roles in order to move toward agreed-upon goals—a task difficult enough with existing goals, and sometimes a nearly insurmountable task when it involves new goals.

One might expect campus presidents to possess these “soft skills,” and to be able to pair them with management skills such as agenda building for governance committees and the like, and indeed many presidents have been renowned for these abilities. But these days, presidents are more often selected—and rewarded—for the complex if quotidian skills of fund raising and building positive relationships between the campus and its external constituencies, especially with donors and government

offices. Presidents and chancellors seldom if ever have time to work with committees, to walk from one faculty office to another, one dean's office to another, to talk up and advocate a new direction such as community and civic engagement. Indeed, if a president tried to do so, the faculty offices that lay before that president in the "walk-through" might suddenly all be empty!

For these reasons CAOs were asked to lead campus efforts to start American Democracy Projects on participating campuses in 2003, when the American Association of State Colleges and Universities combined with the *New York Times* and the Carnegie Foundation to muster among AASCU member colleges a new commitment to civic engagement from both students and faculty. Over 250 AASCU institutions have joined in the project, which has grown in scope every year. ADP institutions demonstrate their commitment to the ADP goals of increasing student civic engagement in a number of ways. The ADP has never prescribed particular approaches to civic engagement, but annual ADP conferences feature "best practices" from around the nation. These practices, designed to teach students about democratic communication and problem-solving, range from service learning to voter registration to deliberative democracy to studying the reintroduction of wolves into national parks. Other colleges are participating in a project to support student work on the "Seven Revolutions" that will require international cooperation to solve global crises of food, water, population, and demographic changes in world economies. Other universities are participating in the Political Engagement Project, another ADP initiative, aimed at awakening student democratic "conscience" rather than simple civic "consciousness" and aimed at expressing that conscience in the current political arena. Indeed, at the national conferences, it is clear that the ADP schools have responded in an ever-increasing number of ways to student and community needs and to both national and community opportunities. In fact, the ADP has been so successful at moving civic engagement toward the center of institutions' priorities that its original three-year timetable was simply over-ruled, making ADP an ongoing AASCU initiative.

At national meetings George Mehaffy, Vice President of AASCU, has indicated in many speeches and in conversations with the CAOs participating in the American Democracy Project that AASCU calculatedly required professional commitment to the goals and practices of civic engagement on the part of CAOs, commitment to attending national conferences and learning as much as possible about practice, theory, and research involving civic and community engagement. Mehaffy knew, from his own experience as a CAO, that the public support of the American Democracy Project by CAOs was critical. Of participating campus presidents and chancellors, AASCU required only a signature on a letter.

AASCU's membership is comprised mainly of senior state comprehensive universities, which have seemed uniquely friendly to the idea that teaching and research involving students and faculty with their community is central to their mission. While large public and private research universities have been criticized for drifting away from their land grant missions of public service, the state comprehensive university has seriously taken up the mission of "stewardship of place." AASCU's mission statement contains the following commitment:

We engage faculty, staff and students with the communities and regions we serve—helping to advance public education, economic development and the quality of life for all with whom we live and who support our work. We affirm that America's promise extends not only to those who come to the campus but to all our neighbors.

But in a May 2002 report on a survey of AASCU institutions (which was also designed as a guide for presidents and chancellors wishing to re-emphasize civic and community engagement), it was obvious that even the AASCU institutions had drifted away from direct involvement with their surroundings communities:

At best, public engagement plays a minor role in faculty's working lives: (1) only two out of five institutions include public engagement in faculty hiring criteria; (2) when faculty are involved in public engagement, it is done over and above their regular assignment; and (3) while most institutions indicate that they evaluate faculty on public engagement, few provide professional development for faculty in engagement-related areas.

Public engagement is not an integral part of the curriculum for a majority of the AASCU institutions that responded to the survey—fewer than one-quarter require students to complete an internship, cooperative experience, community service, or service learning activity as part of their academic program. (Vortuba et al, 2002, p. 14)

But, in 2010, in the eighth year of the American Democracy Project, specific examples of this commitment can be found on virtually every AASCU member campus—certainly on every ADP campus—in broader realization of "the stewardship of place" in their own mission statements. In fact, it may well be that the senior state comprehensive universities are uniquely situated to address civic and community engagement. These institutions are committed to the undergraduate experience, and they give highest priority to excellence in teaching. The rarer graduate programs in these institutions are most often aimed at meeting regional and state needs. Comprehensive state universities in particular may be more welcoming places for community engagement, if that new initiative is presented well, planned for, and valorized. Faculty culture at these

institutions is far less bound by academic history and tradition than at other larger, more completely funded institutions like the state “flagship universities.” The explanation may be found in two other characteristics that make the comprehensive university a fertile ground for community-based teaching and research. Many are located in smaller cities or in rural communities; their serious commitment to teaching makes a research agenda that can complement, balance, or in fact just be possible alongside a heavy teaching load very compelling for faculty members in these comprehensive universities.

So, how important, really, have been the efforts of chief academic officers in changing reward structures and policies in their efforts to turn campuses toward achieving the specific goal of increased community engagement activities?

The dominant culture of academe views civic and community engagement work as weak since the new idea is interdisciplinary and viewed as “applied,” with fewer peer-reviewed publishing outlets. For these and other reasons, most faculty are likely to view civic engagement as a time-consuming, irrelevant add-on, the “initiative du jour.” The most senior faculty, those most influential in the culture, and indeed any faculty member who has served a number of years, is probably a “change survivor” (Duck, 2001). Change survivors have lived through many—sometimes unrelated—attempts by CAOs and university presidents to change institutional goals and culture. Sometimes these attempts are successful, but frequently they are not, and the institution moves on, causing faculty to view these attempts as fads (or as evidence that the CAO and president simply don’t “get it”), making faculty more and more resistant to the next proposed change.

In fact, when evaluating faculty, most universities themselves view community engaged or public work as “counting” third or fourth, behind teaching, research, and institutional service (Shaffer, 2008, p. 28). These features of the dominant culture, though, can be addressed by a thoughtful chief academic officer and by faculty “point people.” In fact, most faculty are not passive in describing or constructing faculty roles: they pressure fellow faculty and administrators at the department and college levels; they engage in discussion and revision of tenure and promotion criteria and, of course, faculty themselves make up the personnel committees judging the merit of their colleagues. Faculty constantly, if slowly, change their culture, especially the culture surrounding their own roles. But that change moves at a glacial pace—promotion guidelines are revised, but not every year—and to move an initiative like civic engagement forward, faculty involvement must be vocal, visible, focused, and led. The CAO must remember that in the final analysis, it is faculty who must change faculty culture. But it is most often the chief academic officer who will

become the “chief communicator . . . the de facto shaper of change” (Duck, p. 140-141).

First, a CAO must determine, through a campus audit or conversation, what pre-existing civic engagement activities are already in place across the campus. Inevitably there is such work going on, ranging from volunteerism to reflective service learning to community-based research and consulting. Faculty must be involved in this initial audit and discovery—this activity alone may help jump-start a campus conversation. And these existing activities must be recognized on their own terms. Even unreflective volunteer work for local charities, if successful, needs to be embraced. Early on, the excellent and the good must be equally embraced; the new ideas “tent” should be as large as possible. While this big-tent approach may run the risk of its being perceived as an attempt to be “all things to all people,” later attention to best practices and to exemplary work will establish the direction and image of the initiative, and discussions and learning communities and awards and rewards may bring some of these outlying early adaptors into line with best practices of community engagement. CAOs soliciting faculty to address campus culture must meet the campus’s early practitioners of civic and community engagement on their own ground and build on what is already in place. The CAO alone cannot be seen at the beginning as arbitrarily forcing distinctions—on who knows what grounds?—between the good and the great.

I’ve served as dean or provost at five institutions, all but one of which were senior comprehensive universities. Each is focused on undergraduate teaching, and though research is both supported and required of all faculty, none of these institutions boasts the full infrastructure to support faculty research in all areas. Being able to perform engaged work in a local community, work that involves students in class and which may also result in published or reported research, can be seen as a unifying force for a faculty member’s career.

At Illinois State, for example, I found faculty and staff who were committed to both their national discipline and its views of faculty work and—remarkably, I thought—to the general goals of the university, which has set itself the goal of being the undergraduate “school of choice” for Illinois students. This commitment translates into a faculty culture that is focused on teaching and, secondarily, on research, the so-called “teacher/scholar model,” a balanced model common in comprehensive universities, even those deemed research-intensive. Illinois State faculty are productive in research and publication, but they primarily focus on their teaching and on the student experience, and frequently feel—and complain about—the lack of time and support for their research. As CAOs and committed faculty move to change culture, they must

understand and respect it; at Illinois State University this meant that civic engagement pedagogies might come first, and then engaged scholarship might be presented as balancing teaching with research productivity. And, certainly at first, the “found pilots,” (Kotter, 1996, p. 51-66) whose engaged pedagogy is already known to be effective in interesting ways and whose research and teaching are united by the principles of community engagement, can be celebrated and publicized; they can be discussion leaders and speakers; they can be mentors for junior faculty; they can serve on faculty evaluation committees; and most importantly they can become effective advocates for the value of community-engaged pedagogy and research.

The first of my conversations designed to prioritize civic engagement at Illinois State University was with 90 faculty and staff who were using civic engagement pedagogy and who were engaged in community-based research to some degree. They hardly required convincing. These faculty and student affairs professionals had worked with Campus Compact; they had been “early adaptors” of many forms of civic engagement, such as service learning, or had worked with registered student organizations in various “service to the community efforts” or in activities like Alternative Spring Break. They understood the benefits such work could bring to the student educational experience and to student development, and they wanted to learn about more complex ways to get students engaged in the community.

The second conversation was with a group of faculty and staff who wanted to hear about this new idea, who were open to the possibilities, but who were not currently practicing or using these approaches. I was pleased to see many smiles and much nodding during my informal talk with them. Then I asked for questions and comments.

Anyone familiar with academic culture will not be surprised that the very first question from this second group was “Will this count?” and that the room quickly became quiet. This was, and still is, the question to be answered by any CAO attempting to promulgate any idea new to faculty, who know that no matter how convinced they become that this new idea is worthwhile, they must invest time in its classroom applications and that they will invest even more time in reporting research based on student civic engagement. Even if, after a while, they understand that community-based research on questions critical to their communities is a very appropriate application of professional expertise, they still ask, “Will this investment of time and expertise count when we apply for tenure or promotion?” Will community-based teaching, research, and service be respected by our colleagues and by administrators in the inevitable reviews and decisions about rank, sabbaticals, salary increases, office space, clerical or laboratory help, and letters of recommendation?

Such questions are central to the faculty culture that permeates every campus. And every CAO knows that faculty culture, despite its

frequently cited oppositional stance, can be the most effective “lever” in trying to turn the institution—or it can be a constant, silent, sullen barrier to the best efforts for bringing new ideas to bear on faculty roles and responsibilities.

It is common even for faculty to complain about faculty culture. But every faculty culture, across divisions and disciplines, is relevant to the CAO because, for example, civic engagement as a university emphasis touches everything from individual courses to requirements for majors to student organizations to orientation day planning to computer user guidelines. The CAO and faculty committed to engagement must take into account that the majority of faculty are women and men devoted to a single discipline (to the point of sometimes ignoring college or university goals), who judge by—and are themselves judged by—standards of achievement based on these disciplines to determine their individual “merit,” whose detached scholarship is designed to qualify them as competitive experts, indeed even as “stars,” outside the campus. University faculty, especially faculty in “flagship” universities or those who aspire to be, frequently identify themselves not in relation to their colleague in the next office, but in relation to national and international figures in the discipline. Turf wars, both local and national, and constant, ruthless judging are the norms.

Inevitably, a CAO will find it necessary to provide funding for increasing engagement activities. For the American Democracy Project, campuses found internal funds and reallocated them to the ADP, or found external sources in donors and grants. Some CAOs centralized funding for all engagement work, creating a competition for resources that was judged by either the CAO or a central Task Force for Civic Engagement. This approach certainly marks civic engagement as an important activity, but I believe that diffusing the funding for engagement throughout the campus is more likely to effect change in culture, policies, and reward structures.

Diffusing funding throughout departments and offices will also indicate the importance of civic engagement as a university goal to those offices and departments. But diffused funding also distributes responsibility for creating and for judging these efforts (after all, funding should go to the most successful efforts; mere funding or mere existence does not equal quality). And competition for limited financial resources will likely result in the improvement of existing practices and in new practices that are better planned, executed, and assessed.

Moreover, diffusing funding throughout a number of campus offices respects the existing campus culture. For example, the CAO should find ways to make resources available to the found pilots and make the usual motivational structures and processes available to them, as well as to faculty and staff just now exploring community engagement. These

“motivators” might be simple cash support, but equally motivating are the more standard “perks” of the successful faculty member: time for course revision and experimentation, or travel opportunities that allow learning from other faculty from other campuses. Lunches for faculty discussion groups (it is absolutely astonishing what the promise of a good pizza can accomplish), speakers, books for beginning learning communities and the later, more important communities of practice for engaged teachers and researchers—all have cumulative effect. These standard signs of support and appreciation set the stage for more grand acknowledgements such as annual awards or certificates or, the grandest of all, new honorary titles. Nothing was as effective for increasing Illinois State University’s participation in the American Democracy Project and in its Political Engagement Project as was the opportunity to award new honorary titles to faculty members leading this work. And rightly so: recognition of outstanding faculty work was followed by exemplary treatment of award winners and title holders with teaching loads that gave them more time to plan and accomplish their teaching and research agendas, and more faculty development funds to support their work—all motivated more participation and more innovation.

Centers for faculty development can coordinate activities to recognize and foreground research and teaching centered on community engagement. A chief academic officer who makes dedicated funding available for the faculty development center to create a campus focus for community-engaged work has made a wise choice: learning communities, communities of practice, speaker series, organized mentoring programs for junior faculty (more dependably goal oriented than when administered by departments), workshops, and faculty development websites will recognize outstanding work by faculty and make it easier and simpler to interest more faculty in community engagement. At Illinois State, we made summer support available for outstanding faculty who then created generic web-based modules that made the real challenge of adding community engagement work into existing courses seem easier and less daunting. Other faculty and staff created a website to link interested faculty with experienced mentors to discuss changes in courses, and to quickly link interested faculty with community and campus resources. Coordinating such activities through the campus faculty development center can make that center a primary force in fostering community engagement. All this rewards faculty exemplars, and such recognition “counts.”

A powerful way to ensure that community-based research and teaching is valued is to interlink the goals of this teaching and research with the campus culture’s existing governance structures and protocols. With more faculty involved, it can be simple, when the moment arrives for mission statement revision and strategic planning, to make civic engagement of faculty, staff, and students a stated goal or strategy

of the university. Scores of AASCU provosts have taken this step with strategic plans, academic plans, mission statements, lists of goals, vision statements, hallmarks of graduates, and the like. When the time came to revise “Educating Illinois,” the strategic plan at ISU, the work was guided by the Director of Planning and Institutional Research and by an Associate Provost closely involved with the ADP. A third of the Planning Committee had experience and commitment to community-engaged work. There were few challenges to the proposal that civic engagement become one of the plan’s Five Core Values—weaving civic engagement more deeply into campus culture. With Trustee approval, the centrality of civic engagement in the University’s goals became reality.

With community and civic engagement approved as a campus value and goal (with broad strategies to achieve that goal), the effect was immediate. The way was clear, for example, to add questions about community engagement strategies in curricula and research to the existing program review protocols. As the program review processes were changed in this way, almost all departments in Arts and Sciences moved to require civic engagement or reflective service learning in their capstone courses. This single change did more to make community-based faculty work more valuable and important, valorizing such research and teaching, than did any other action we undertook.

Another example of the power of including new expectations of such work in campus goals and plans is the effect on budget processes and “budget cultures” once this step has been taken. At institutions in which the budget requests of academic units are presented and discussed in any sort of open and transparent process—presentations to a CAO with the Academic Senate present or “hearings” open to all campus constituencies—it is common for the CAO to ask that such requests address the ways in which funding of new projects or initiatives will help achieve strategic goals. Some chief academic officers even require that a new budget request first detail how last year’s new funds were used to achieve campus goals. When fostering community involvement is a specified campus goal, suddenly the professional vocabularies of community-based teaching and research become part of the campus’s “shared vocabulary,” and even budget hearings foster further campus-wide discussion of engagement. One of the most common discourses on any campus will now involve, at least in part, arguing for more community engagement. Funding for the College of Nursing to provide free physical examinations to students in a low-income neighborhood school is now more likely to include teaching civic skills and reflective service, not just mere volunteerism from nursing students. And the Department of Public Health Services, the College of Education, and even the College of Business are more likely to be interested in joining these efforts. Suddenly

community-based teaching and research is more widespread and more valuable than ever.

This simple step, with its cascading possibilities for altering campus discourse and culture, is an invaluable action for any CAO who wants to make community-based faculty work “count.” All these steps may constitute an agenda for change for any chief academic officer, not unique to the goal of infusing community engagement throughout a university, but in fact are steps to be undertaken on behalf of many other culture- and focus-changing goals such as the creation or revision of First Year Experiences or the inclusion of civic engagement in these FYEs (Barefoot, 2008; Gardner, 2008). Gardner includes the suggestion that a CAO consider making civic engagement or First Year Experience a focus of the campus’s next reaffirmation of regional accreditation—a powerful machine for change on any campus. Gardner’s and Barefoot’s prioritized lists of action-steps should be consulted by any CAO planning to make campus culture more accommodating to community-based work or indeed planning change of any kind.

Other culture-shifting actions and activities undertaken by individual AASCU chief academic officers at comprehensive universities have included curricular changes (focused especially on interdisciplinary majors and minors that require community-engagement of their students), new general education goals, new and relocated centers for engaged learning, and awards for community-engaged teaching. Among the most impressive efforts are campus centers that serve communities by directly collecting oral history or studying local culture.

Modification or creation of interdisciplinary curricula and programs requires academic leadership, academic advisory committees, and teaching faculty. Not only do such programs allow CAOs the opportunity to tailor the hiring of new faculty to emphasize the capacities for engaged teaching and research—such new curricula can also create new and profoundly important agendas for a Committee on Community Engagement, investing a community of practice with new oversight responsibilities, important and visible responsibilities. I would urge a chief academic officer to consider giving a Committee on Community Engagement full responsibility for these interdisciplinary community-engaged curricula: for hiring, for admission and graduation requirements, and administering budgets, that is, all the responsibilities one associates with academic departments. A Committee for Community Engagement would then parallel the governance structures of some of the most prestigious centers and institutes at universities in the United States (which of course might also make such assignment of responsibility simpler for the CAO to achieve). And such an investment of authority addresses many of the difficult issues of administering interdisciplinary programs and the reward issues facing engaged faculty.

But, with or without such solutions, engaged faculty may continue to feel that the central problem of their academic situation is whether or not their activities count. They may feel that it is a simple enough matter to document community-based teaching, and to demonstrate that such efforts help achieve institutional goals or improve their teaching or allow for more complex and interesting student outcomes. Similarly, it is simple enough to list community service activities as just that—as “service to the community,”—and some engagement work may be appropriately characterized as “service to the institution.” (We can set aside the category of “service to the profession,” which lies outside this discussion). It is the issue of the perceived value of community-based research that more commonly troubles many engaged faculty, and it is this issue that many leading scholars of community engagement consider to be the single greatest barrier responsible for what they perceive as a “stalling” of the national movement toward more community engagement in higher education.

There are no simple or easy solutions to what are essentially very local (and in many ways closed) processes of faculty evaluation. But there are many actions a chief academic officer can suggest or take, especially once learning communities and communities of practice related to community engagement are in place on the campus, to resolve these issues.

When promotion and tenure policies are designed to operate at the university level, with departments and colleges simply advising a university level committee, the revision of these policies can be a simpler task. A CAO can lend authority to a task force charged with updating university-wide promotion and tenure policies, with community-based faculty work discussed in the context of other new pedagogies and research directions. Promotion and tenure policies are, after all, periodically revised, and there is always an expectation that new directions be considered—almost every set of existing promotion and tenure policies in the country has either just been revised or soon will be revised to deal, for instance, with electronically distributed scholarship.

When promotion and tenure policies are developed, authorized, and very specific at the department or discipline level, this personal approach, with the CAO talking and visiting with committees and chairs, is likely too feeble to create the desired outcomes. Using this approach, I was frankly never able to change a narrow and outmoded description of peer review in one department. Nor was I able to convince another department that its constant advice to junior faculty to forego work on articles and instead focus on publishing books was dangerous to junior faculty careers.

A more successful and quicker approach at personally turning promotion and tenure policies in new directions is available, however. For the State University of New York campus where I served as provost, faculty evaluation guidelines were set at the System Offices in Albany in negotiations with the faculty union. These guidelines were viewed as

near holy writ, or certainly as having the effect of law. Nevertheless, the CAO's interpretation of the Albany guidelines and definitions was an area of extreme interest, as I learned from talking with faculty. Thus, I was able to write and distribute a complex, 10-page, single-spaced memo (in a small font) that explained how I, as CAO, personally viewed dossiers, reports, and applications in various merit processes. I carefully explained that I was aware my memo had no statutory standing and was simply an explanation of my own views. The Faculty Senate and the union almost immediately accepted the proposal. In this memo, which is still in effect in a slightly revised version at that campus, I dealt with new pedagogies and new directions of research. I even added, in my personal explanation, a criterion new to the campus, collegiality—which was also widely accepted because I balanced it with a section on academic freedom and its relation to collegiality. This powerful method of change is widely available to CAOs who wish to make subtle changes in faculty evaluative criteria.

But the more frequently available and more obvious strategy is still the CAO's assigning to a faculty group the task and authority to revise policy or offer specific advice aimed at departmental, college, or university-wide personnel committees deciding merit issues. It might, in fact, be an even better idea to aim this advice at administrators—chairs, deans, provosts and presidents—who are involved in merit decisions, and to distribute and promulgate the advice as widely as possible. Many colleges have a process in place to allow the faculty as a whole to "Give Advice to an Administrator." The omnipresent capital letters in the titles of such policies emphasize the seriousness with which this advice process is invested. And, for obvious reasons, pursuing this route might be a more palatable way of attempting to change promotion and tenure policies. The CAO simply receives the advice and (sometimes happily) acts upon the advice.

If a Committee on Community Engagement or a Center for Community Engagement has become a force on campus, perhaps creating a catalog of best practices, or a typology of such work, or creating a description of a developmental sweep of community engagement to reach from first-year seminars to general education to capstone majors courses—even graduate education—will help such a committee be better placed to address directly the value and merit of community-based scholarship. At least one comprehensive campus has pursued this approach by sending groups of faculty, at the CAO office's expense, to regional charrettes discussing engaged scholarship, with the expectation that these faculty produce similar charrette discussions on the home campus.

CAOs should seek analogous national action models for valorizing the work of these task forces, and one very successful external model that might be the best analogy is the continuing movement to valorize the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL). While the Carnegie Foundation has lent its resources and prestige to this effort, campus

faculty groups have been responsible for thousands of discussion group meetings and forums to increase the amount of SOTL work done and to increase its prestige, to cause SOTL to be viewed more favorably by faculty and administrators. The International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning posts on its website a list of resources and a list of outlets for publishing SOTL work, and a large literature now not simply advocates for it but describes—in a mentor-like fashion—the characteristics of the best SOTL work. Kathleen McKinney (2007) provides very practical advice on the characteristics of the best SOTL research, advice on presenting SOTL work in merit processes, even suggesting a method for obtaining peer review after publication.

CAOs should know about the specific work of national disciplinary organizations changing the ways community-based scholarship is valued. Perhaps the most relevant of these is the Public Sociology group, with its arguments for the primacy of engaged research in the discipline. But perhaps the most promising national effort is the work of the group *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life*. This consortium, with 80 institutional members, released a report in June 2008 on "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University," aimed at department chairs, deans and directors, and including very focused interviews with deans, provosts, and national association leaders. The report recommends that "colleges define public work and scholarly work, expand and document what counts toward tenure and promotion, support publicly engaged graduate students and junior faculty members, and broaden the scope of people who can serve as peer reviewers" (Ellison, 2008).

Junior faculty and faculty new to community-based work need both advice and guidance. And CAOs should know sources where they can find answers. Campus Compact has information about "Publishing Outlets for Service-Learning and Community-Based Research" and "Service Learning in Promotion and Tenure Resources" available on its website, along with more than 50 syllabi that illustrate the use of service learning in all sorts of disciplines, and lists of funding sources. These faculty should know that federal agencies like FIPSE consider civic engagement work in higher education a high priority, and that major organizations such as AASCU and the Association of American Colleges and Universities consider civic engagement of university students a major priority in reclaiming the distinctiveness of American higher education (Meisel, 2007; National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007). Faculty considering engaged work should know the history of the civic mission of American higher education (Snyder, 2008; Peters, 2008). In fact the perception of a "falling away" of land grant institutions from their original purpose of preparing students

to be citizens was one of the sparks behind the American Democracy Project (just as it was the community-engaged vision of one AASCU school, Portland State University, that helped frame the ADP and its approach). They should know about the Kellogg Commission and its efforts to return land grant institutions to their original purposes. They should know about the Engagement Academy at Virginia Tech; about Jim Vortuba, president of Northern Kentucky University, and his engagement work with the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities; about Lorilee Sandman and the Higher Education Network for Community Engagement; and about the newest Carnegie Classification System.

Learning about, discussing, using these national models and efforts, and aligning themselves with these organizations' work, can certainly inform engaged faculty and staff about best practices, but it seems to me that the most positive effect of knowing about national work is that it convinces engaged faculty that they are not alone, that they are part of a movement, that there is "standing" and status attached to this work on other campuses.

These faculty also need to know that many descriptions of the characteristics of effective community-based research are available, sometimes even usefully contrasted with the characteristics of ineffective community-based work (Creighton, 2008). These faculty need to know, as do CAOs, at least some of the criticism surrounding community-based research, even voiced by some of the most highly regarded practitioners who speak of some community-based research as actually ignoring real community needs and wasting resources (Brown, 2008; Creighton, 2008; Shaffer, 2008; Stanley, 2008; Boyte, 2008). Perhaps the most concise description of the tension between academic self-interest and effective community-based work is that of Ira Harkavy when he says, "As an aphorism neatly put it, 'Communities have problems, universities have departments'" (Harkavy, 2008, p. 52). Marguerite Shaffer spells out the causes of this tension in her discipline:

I do think that the way in which the university has institutionalized professional standards most definitely works against a broader notion of shared democratic knowledge production and dissemination, and the way it might be defined in American studies. The bureaucratic process of tenure and promotion, and the narrow compartmentalization of teaching, scholarship, and service, works against the very interdisciplinary and engaged work that can be done in American studies. (Shaffer, 2008, p. 28)

To truly engage a community, a scholar or student must first listen and consult with the community to determine its priorities for problem solving. Is the first priority of the community the health of children in its local school, or is its first priority a walk-in clinic for everyone?

If faculty members are working with their students on discovering the most efficient bus routes for expanding a small city's transit service, do they consult only with the Transit Director, or with customers, or with citizens who wish desperately that they could ride the bus to work more conveniently from their part of town? And, in either of these cases, what is the outcome or product for the faculty member: a report to the city Transit Department or an article in a journal of transit studies? I would argue, as would Shaffer and other critics of work that is only community sited work rather than truly community engaged, that these academic articles are properly a secondary or tertiary product, even if a necessary marker for any faculty career. The primary product is the process of problem-solving shared with the community, the shared delivery of a solution, and shared communication and testing of that solution—not necessarily an article in a peer-reviewed journal.

No chief academic officer can afford to be seen as naïve in any public remarks about these issues that may detract from the perceived value of community engagement, nor can the members of a committee on Community-Engaged Faculty Work, in whose forums discussions of these controversies must occur, seem the least bit uninformed about criticism from the practitioner-scholars of community-engaged faculty work.

Nor can the CAO or committee expect to be successful in advocacy unless they know about universities that have found ways to work through or to compromise between these opposing views. When asked if outreach operations like his "have to provide 'professional reasons' for faculty to be attentive to civic culture," the Director of the Netter Center in Philadelphia, Ira Harkavy, is clear about that compromise:

I certainly believe that faculty members in general will do this work if it is a means to do good and do well. Among other things, the Center has to help illustrate that engaged, democratic, locally focused teaching and research can produce first-rate academic work. We do this by being attentive to the need for faculty to present and publish their work and encouraging colleagues. We also assist faculty in acquiring grants that both support their research and teaching and help to advance their careers. (Harkavy, 2008, p. 57)

It is, by the way, quite relevant to the success of the Center and to consideration of the chief academic officer's role in advocacy for community-engaged scholarship that it was the Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education at the University of Pennsylvania who "designated academically based community service as a core component of Penn undergraduate education during the next century" and thus encouraged participation in the work of the Netter Center (Benson et al, 2007, p. 95).

Importantly, both the CAO and any task force revising faculty personnel policy should think about countering the “horror stories” that underlie most informal talk about—and can undermine—merit policies on campus. “Professor W was not promoted,” everyone will hear, “because her committee did not understand her research topic, despite her record of good teaching,” or “Dr. Z was not awarded tenure simply because his department chair didn’t like his teaching approach, even though the rest of his colleagues thought he was on the cutting edge of both teaching and scholarship.” In whatever guise, with whatever content, these frequently ill-informed, second- or third-hand horror stories are a subject of fascination on campus, but these tales most of the time amount to little more than unfounded gossip and disguised complaint, and of course the folks who originate these horror stories almost always have an agenda. But the horror stories are so compelling that they frequently are the only source of information about merit processes except for long, legalistic, difficult-to-read policy manuals that have grown by accretion, sometimes contradicting themselves from page to page. In fact, sometimes promotion and tenure horror stories are even the underlying reason for what might seem a scheduled periodic revision of merit policies. And of course it may be that Professor W’s research topics involved work with and in the community, and it may be that Dr. Z’s teaching required students to perform research in the community. A task force on the value of community-engaged faculty work should attempt to counter these negative tales about the merit process.

How to do so? Create ways to publicize positive stories. Last year’s successful applicants for promotion and tenure, especially those who have records of engaged scholarship, can be featured in this year’s faculty orientation session on a panel designed to advise new faculty in setting priorities and agendas for their work; the question-and-answer sessions after such panels are always instructive for new faculty and effective in countering horror stories. Or such panels can be part of a later mentoring program, matching successful faculty engaged in community-based scholarship with newly hired faculty with similar scholarly agendas. These mentors need not be from the same discipline; in fact, doubled mentoring from inside and outside the discipline is frequently more effective.

Another approach has its definite legal boundaries, but is very effective. One comprehensive college, a part of a university system with careful legal counsel, for a while made available to the entire campus all final letters of decision regarding promotion and tenure. This was, for obvious reasons, quickly changed to include only letters about positive decisions. Another campus, in its publicity surrounding promotion and tenure awards, always included a few sentences explaining the reasons for the decisions—obviously always praise for the successful candidates’

achievements. These few sentences were almost never included in external community newspaper announcements, but their use in campus publicity helped limit the number of horror stories told on the campus, I’m sure, and when these decisions were based on engaged scholarship and teaching, the positive results were quite specific. The most powerful use of success stories available to CAOs and their task forces and advisory committees is the use, with consent, of dossiers and résumés and statements of teaching and research philosophies of successful candidates as illustrative examples in policy statements or in memos of advice about dossier preparation for would-be candidates. Today, when many faculty include their résumés on their websites, there is much less concern about disguising their identities as there once might have been. These measures can help counter the horror stories surrounding merit processes and over time can even help change perceptions of the worth of new directions of research.

Finally, chief academic officers should serve as models of engaged faculty work themselves. If a CAO has found the time to teach a class, it would have enormous impact if his or her colleagues knew that the CAO required service-learning activities. Or if the CAO has found time to continue research, think of the campus model that would result if that research were the result of collaboration with community representatives or community public policy officers. Several AASCU chief academic officers are well known—and highly regarded—for their own community-engaged research and for their local political service work, for serving on local boards and task forces, even standing for elections. At least one CAO has based his advocacy of the campus American Democracy Project on that service and on the connections he has created in the surrounding community. And chief academic officers must be known for rewarding in appropriate ways those faculty members engaged in community-based research and teaching.

As urged by Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont and Stephens (2003, p. 48), if we are to rid our campuses of “the inhospitable structures and practices . . . still visible at most institutions,” chief academic officers must join with the very large numbers of people in the academy and in the community who care about the goals and values of liberal education, and equally importantly with “those who are paying special attention to the moral and civic components of those goals.” As these authors observe, “the new developments are gathering strength, but so are the opposing trends of commodification, specialization, and institutional competition, so it is not a time to be complacent.”

I have focused almost exclusively on the ways chief academic officers must protect faculty members with a professional interest in community engagement from internal pressures, but there are external pressures as

well. These engaged faculty are frequently perceived as having only a left-wing agenda, even when the track record of the entire ADP argues against this view. Careful work with local newspapers and local media can help dispel this notion, as can work with legislative committees and individual legislators—indeed, one must be sure that an equal number of Democrats and Republicans are invited to campus! In fact, even national work with the Political Engagement Project recognizes this dilemma. The original framing of the PEP included assessment to discover whether, after a politically engaged course, student political positions changed radically. Both nationally and locally, we were pleased that the students' political leanings do not change, and we cite this fact constantly on and off campus. We help students learn to participate in the political arena and to give voice to all political positions. One cannot deny that this fact has given a measure of comfort and harbor to faculty involved in the Political Engagement Project.

But the chief threats and barriers are internal. John Tagg noted in a speech to the provosts of AASCU institutions that there are at least five very strong types of barriers to change in any academic institution—structural barriers; information barriers; incentive barriers; financial barriers; and of course, cultural barriers (2008). Chief academic officers at state comprehensive universities participating in AASCU's American Democracy Project have successfully addressed each of these barriers on campuses all over America. While many of the nation's engagement scholars see the movement in the academy as having slowed to a standstill, national surveys of campus policies and attitudes show substantial changes between 2002 and 2010 in the perceived importance of civic engagement and in policies that valorize it and give it priority on campus (Rush, 2010). And here I might note that most of the national scholars who believe they see civic engagement as stalled or diminishing are at flagship or private universities, not at state comprehensive universities or at AASCU institutions.

Chief academic officers at comprehensive universities have constituted a very strong voice nationally, and a strong and uniquely-placed individual voice on each of their campuses, to argue against complacency in the face of barriers and opposing forces, and to argue successfully for the proper valuing of community-based faculty work.

References

Barefoot, B. (2008). Institutional structures and strategies for embedding civic engagement in the first college year. In M. J. LaBare (Ed.), *First-year civic engagement: sound foundations for college, citizenship and democracy*, (pp. 23-25). New York: New York Times Knowledge Network.

- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: universities and democracies in an age of education reform*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Boyte, H. C. (2008). Public work: civic populism versus technocracy in higher education. In D. Brown and D. Witte (Eds.), *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey*, (pp. 79-102). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Brown, D. W. (2008). The journey of a recovering professional. *Higher education exchange*, 5-11.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Creighton, S. (2008). The scholarship of teaching and learning. *Higher education exchange*, 12-22.
- Duck, J. D. (2001). *The change monster: The human forces that fuel or foil corporate transformation and change*. New York: Crown Business.
- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.
- Gardner, J. N. (2008). Action steps to move the first-year civic engagement movement forward. In M. J. LaBare (Ed.), *First-year civic engagement: sound foundations for college, citizenship and democracy*, (pp. 26-28). New York: New York Times Knowledge Network.
- Harkavy, I. (2008). Democratic partnerships. *Higher education exchange*, 47-58.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning*. San Francisco: Anker.
- Meisel, W. (2007, Spring). Connecting cocurricular service with academic inquiry: A movement toward civic engagement. *Liberal education*, 52-57.
- National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise. (2007). *College learning for the new global century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Peters, S. J. (2008). Reconstructing a democratic tradition of public scholarship in the land-grant system. In D. Brown and D. Witte (Eds.), *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey*, (pp. 121-148). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Rush, R. (2010, March/April). Are our faculty ready for community engagement? Are we? *Public purpose*, 28.
- Shaffer, M., & Leon, L. (2008). Changing public culture. *Higher education exchange*, 23-38.
- Snyder, R. C. (2008). Should higher education have a civic mission?

Historical reflections. In D. Brown and D. Witte (Eds.), *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey*, (pp. 53-75). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Stanley, M. (2008). The limits of public work. In D. Brown and D. Witte (Eds.), *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey*, (pp. 29-49). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Tagg, J. (2008, July 24). Changing minds in higher education: Students change, so why can't colleges?" Speech delivered at American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Winter Academic Affairs Meeting, Boston, MA.

Vortuba, J., et al. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.