Re-Conceptualizing the Tenure and Promotion Process: A Literature Review

For: Kerry Daly & Clare MacMartin

By: Amy E. Oliphant

February 9, 2009

Table of Contents

Introduction

The following report represents a literature review of contemporary thinking and best practices on re-conceptualizing tenure and promotion processes to recognize a broader range of scholarly activities. There is a particular emphasis on ways to assess teaching and community-engaged scholarship. This document is meant to be used a source for stimulating future discussion and decision making around tenure and promotion within the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences at the University of Guelph.

The Scope of Scholarship: Boyer's Model

A primary recommendation that is made throughout the literature on tenure and promotion is the need to broaden the scope of scholarship to be more representative of the range of different types of work that faculty are engaged in. Much of this discussion revolves around the use of Boyer's (1990) distinction between 4 different types of scholarly work. They are:

1. Scholarship of Discovery: Inquiry and knowledge generation. Represents traditional notions of scholarly research, which hold prominence in most current tenure and promotion decisions.
2. Scholarship of Integration: Synthesizing research findings from across contexts and disciplines. Provides new perspectives, interpretations and ways of understanding findings.
3. Scholarship of Application: Application of knowledge generated from research to understand and solve real-world problems. Coming together of theory and practice.
4. Scholarship of Teaching: Engaging in scholarly teaching. Conducting scholarly research on pedagogy.

Boyer (1996) later added a fifth form of scholarship that integrates the four previously listed dimensions: the scholarship of engagement. According to Cox (2006), the scholarship of engagement requires active interaction with people outside of the academic institution in informing scholarly activities, from goal setting and choosing methods of inquiry to reflection and dissemination of results.

Boyer and others (eg., Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997) have argued that all of these forms of scholarship should be recognized and rewarded. There is evidence that a growing number of academic institutions have incorporated Boyer's model (or a variation of it) in their tenure and promotion documents to make explicit the range of work that the institution considers to be scholarly (eg. Jordan, 2006). In a summary of the tenure and promotion documents of 44 universities in Canada, Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf (2008) found that Nipissing University explicitly uses Boyer's (1990) model of scholarship in their tenure and promotion guidelines (*Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures at Nipissing University*, 2008, p. 14).

The Assessment of Scholarship: Four Models

In addition to broadening the way scholarship is defined, there is also a recommendation in the literature that the criteria with which the quality of scholarly work is assessed should also be broadened. Diamond (2006) went as far as to say that a re-conceptualization of tenure and promotion processes might benefit from focusing less on the type of scholarship that a candidate is engaged in (i.e., discovery, integration, application, teaching or engagement) and more on an assessment of whether the work itself is scholarly. One of the advantages of re-conceptualizing the way quality is assessed is that it allows for non-traditional forms of scholarship (eg., community-based work, use of innovative pedagogy) to not only be considered and rewarded, but also held to the same standards as more traditional forms of scholarship.

The following is a description of 4 different models that have been proposed for assessing scholarly work. The first three models are meant to be applicable across all of Boyer's (1990, 1996) types of scholarship, while the fourth model was created to specifically assess the scholarship of engagement or application. The authors of these models note that candidates for tenure or promotion are responsible for providing appropriate documentation that their work meets each of the stated criteria.

1. Glassick, Huber & Maeroff (1997)'s 6 Criteria. Glassick et al. have developed a set of guidelines that were generated from the results of a study in which hiring, tenure and promotion guidelines, teaching evaluations, and standards for scholarly publication were assessed across various American colleges and universities, 51 granting agencies, 31 scholarly journals and 58 university presses. They found that there was a set of common assessment criteria that existed, regardless of the type of scholarship being assessed. Based on these common criteria they created a rubric that they argue can be used as a guideline for assessing any type of scholarship. The 6 criteria are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Criteria for Assessing Scholarship (*Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997, p. 36*)	
Criteria	**Questions to Ask: Does the Scholar (’s)**
1. Clear Goals	A. State the basic purpose of his/her work clearly? B. Define objectives that are realistic and achievable? C. Identify important questions in the field?
2. Adequate Preparation	A. Show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? B. Bring the necessary skills to his/her work? C. Bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?
3. Appropriate Methods	A. Use methods appropriate to goals? B. Apply effectively the methods selected? C. Modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Significant Results	A. Achieve the goals? B. Work add consequentially to the field? C. Work open additional areas for further exploration?
5. Effective Presentation	A. Use a suitable style and effective organization to present his/her work? B. Use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audience? C. Present his/her message with clarity and integrity?
6. Reflective Critique	A. Critically evaluate his/her own work? B. Bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his/her critique? C. Use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

2. Diamond & Adam’s (1993) 6 Characteristics of Scholarly Work. Diamond (2006) also suggests that while it may be difficult to come to a consensus about what types of work should be considered scholarly, most people can agree that there are certain identifiable characteristics that are evident in scholarly work. The 6 characteristics he identifies are:

1. The activity requires a high level of discipline expertise.
2. The activity breaks new ground or is innovative.
3. The activity can be replicated.
4. The work and its results can be documented.
5. The work and its results can be peer reviewed.
6. The activity has significance or impact. (Diamond, 2006, pp. 2-3)

3. Diamond's (2006) Combined Model. Diamond has also suggested that the 6 characteristics listed above could be combined with Glassick et al.'s (1997) 6 characteristics to create a more comprehensive assessment tool. Diamond (2006) noted that while the 6 characteristics listed above are more descriptive of the outcomes of scholarly work, Glassick et al.'s characteristics are more descriptive of the process of scholarly work. The advantage, therefore, in combining the two models is that both process and outcome can be accounted for. The combined system is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Criteria for Assessing Scholarship (*Diamond, 2006, p.3*)
An activity will be considered scholarly if it meets the following criteria:
1. The activity or work requires a high level of discipline-related expertise.
2. The activity or work is conducted in a scholarly manner with: A. Clear Goals. B. Adequate Preparation. C. Appropriate Methodology.
3. The activity or work and its results are appropriately documented and disseminated. This reporting should include a reflective component that addresses the significance of the work, the process that was followed, and the outcomes of research, inquiry or activity.
4. The activity or work has significance beyond the individual context. It: A. Breaks New Ground. B. Can be Replicated or Elaborated.
5. The activity or work, both process and product or results, is reviewed and judged to be meritorious and significant by a panel of the candidate's peers.

4. The National Review Board's *Evaluation Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement.* The National Review Board has also developed a list of criteria for assessing scholarship. These guidelines include those criteria developed by Glassick et al. (1997); however they have been adapted to apply more specifically to the scholarship of engagement. These criteria are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Criteria for Assessing Scholarship from the National Review Board (*Jordan, 2006, pp. 27-28*)

Criteria	**Questions**
Goals/ Questions	1. Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good? 2. Is there an "academic fit" with the scholar's role, departmental and university mission? 3. Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? 4. Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community?
Context of Theory, Literature, Best Practices	1. Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship? 2. Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to the collaboration? 3. Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work? 4. Is the work intellectually compelling?
Methods	1. Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions and context of the work? 2. Does the scholar describe the rationale for election of methods in relation to context and issue? 3. Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? 4. Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
Results	1. Does the scholar achieve the goals? 2. Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community? 3. Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration and collaboration? 4. Does the scholar's work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom? 5. Does the scholar's work make a contribution consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time?
Communication Dissemination	1. Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present the work? 3. Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution? 3. Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audience? 4. Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?
Reflective Critique	1. Does the scholar critically evaluate the work? 2. What are the sources of evidence informing the critique? 3. Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique? 4. In what way has the community perspective informed the critique? 5. Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work? 6. Is the scholar involved in a local, state and national dialogue related to the work?

Rewarding Teaching: Re-considering How Teaching and Performance are Assessed

There is an ever-growing research literature that seeks to determine the legitimacy of relying on student evaluations as a primary source for assessing teaching ability in tenure and promotion decisions (Chism, 2007). One of the criticisms of relying on this approach is that it does not provide an adequate assessment of the range of "intellectual work of teaching" (Bernstein, Nelson Burnett, Goodburn & Savory, 2006, p. 5) that faculty engage in; rather it primarily assesses teaching specifically in the context of interactions with the students. Pallett (2006) recommends that student evaluations should ideally comprise between 30%-50% of how teaching is evaluated. The following sub-sections offer descriptions of best practices and options of ways to expand on the use of student evaluations to assess faculty teaching. These practices may be useful when considering how to reward teaching that is new and innovative.

Multiple Sources, Methods & Time-Points. There is consensus in the assessment literature that best practices for assessing teaching must incorporate multiple sources of information, multiple methods of collecting data, and multiple time points of assessment (Chism, 2007; Pallet, 2006). Chism (2007) notes that the use of only a single source of information, method or time-point may be susceptible to issues of bias, inaccuracy and lack of reliability. A description of each of these best practices is provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Best Practices for Assessing Teaching (*Chism, 2007, pp. 7-8*)	
Multiple Sources of Information	A. Instructors: provide information on goals and philosophies, course materials, types of courses taught, supervision and mentorship activities. B. Colleagues: judge expertise, appropriateness of materials, methods & assessments, professional conduct. C. Administrators: describe teaching contributions, professionalism, supervision and mentorship activities. D. Students: judge quality of teaching strategy, personal impact.
Multiple Methods	Teaching portfolios, letters of recommendation, course materials, ratings or rankings, observations, counts, interviews.
Multiple Points in Time	Multiple assessments during a specified period of time.

Broadening the Assessment Criteria. Glassick et al. (1997) suggest that their broadened criteria for scholarly work may be readily applied to the area of teaching. Others have also suggested including these criteria in evaluation processes (eg., Fite, 2006). Jordan's (2006) report provides an example of how one department at the University of Minnesota has incorporated this rubric into their procedures for determining tenure and promotion. In using these criteria, candidates would be required to provide documentation that they:

- Articulate clear teaching goals.
- Demonstrate adequate preparation for teaching.
- Make use of teaching methods that are appropriate given material and context.
- Achieve significant results in student learning.
- Adopt effective methods of presentation of course material.
- Reflect on and critique their work.

The models proposed by Diamond (2006) represent other possible guidelines for how one might broaden the criteria for the evaluation of teaching (see page 4 of this report). The potential benefit of adopting these broader criteria is that it allows the candidate to document not just how students evaluated their teaching, but also the components of their teaching work that make it scholarly and worthy of recognition.

Teaching Portfolios. Teaching portfolios are now commonly used to document teaching effectiveness (Devanas, 2006). Teaching Support Services at the University of Guelph holds workshops for faculty on how to compose a teaching dossier that includes such things as: statement of teaching philosophy, teaching responsibilities, evaluations of teaching, contributions to teaching made outside the classroom, professional development activities, and documents providing supporting evidence of teaching ability (Wolstenholme, 2008). The benefit of creating a teaching portfolio is that it allows candidates to document the full range of teaching work that they have been involved in, and to describe the philosophy and methods that guide their approach to teaching. People interested in learning more about teaching dossiers are encouraged to contact Janet Wolstenholme (extension 58084).

Peer Review. Rigorous peer review is considered to be a gold standard in the assessment of traditional forms of research work that faculty engage in. There have been recent moves to also subject teaching to the standards of peer review (Bernstein et al., 2006; Chism, 2007; Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf, 2008; Mills, 2006). Pallet (2006, p. 2) suggests that peers are particularly qualified to make judgments about the following aspects of teaching:

- Appropriateness of objectives.
- Appropriateness of methods of evaluation & grading standards.
- Instructor knowledge.
- Whether procedures & materials are current, balanced & relevant to objectives.
- Participation in activities that foster teaching (eg., curriculum development, mentorship).
- Contribution to a climate that values teaching.

Peers may include colleagues in the department that are familiar with the course or subject area, or external reviewers who have expertise in the area or familiarity with teaching in a similar context (Bernstein et al., 2006).

One of the common formats for peer review is peer observation, in which a colleague attends one or several of the candidate’s classes. Common criticisms of this approach are that the assessment may be too context-specific and that it fails to capture the intellectual work that occurs outside of those single sessions of observation (Bernstein et al., 2006). To avoid some of these problems, Mills (2006) suggests that the peer review process should ideally contain 3 steps: a meeting with the person being reviewed prior to the visit, the visit itself, and a post-visit meeting. During the pre-visit consultation, Mills (2006, pp. 84-85) suggests that there are several questions that the reviewer could be asking. These questions are provided on the following page.

1. Determining the Context of the Class.
    - What are the course objectives of the particular session to be reviewed and how are these objectives to be achieved?
    - Where does the class fit into the curriculum & who are the students?
    - How have students been told to prepare for the class? What came before this class?
    - Will the class be a typical example of their approach to teaching or are innovative techniques being used?
    - Are there any problem areas?

2. Determining What is Expected From the Reviewer.
    - What should the reviewer read prior to the visit?
    - What should the reviewer focus on during the visit?
    - What is to be achieved from the visit?
    - What is the final product the reviewer should provide?

3. Review the Course Syllabus.
    - Look for congruence between the stated objectives and types of assignments used.

4. Determine the Logistics for the Visit

During the post-visit meeting, the reviewer should provide constructive feedback based on the visit itself. Mills (2006, p. 86) also offers suggestions for questions to be asked during the final visit. They include:

- How do you think things went?
- What was the best thing about the class?
- What would you change about the class?
- What do you think the students learned?

As a further attempt to address the concerns associated with observation-based peer review, Bernstein et al. (2006) has developed a model that they argue is more comprehensive than those that have typically been used. The model combines the peer review process with the documentation of teaching in the form of a course portfolio.

Combining Portfolio & Peer Review: Bernstein et al.'s (2006) Peer Reviewed Portfolio Model. Bernstein et al. advocate for the writing of course portfolios that are evaluated by a colleague or peer. In this case, their notion of a course portfolio is different from the teaching portfolios or dossiers that are often used in the tenure and review process; whereas the teaching dossier is an accumulation of various documents related to one's teaching (eg, course syllabi, examinations, sample work), the course portfolio is a documentation of the processes of teaching and exemplars of student learning. To this end, Bernstein et al. (2006, p. 11) suggest that the course portfolio should contain:

- Reflective discussion of course content and goals.
- Description of plan to accomplish key objectives in student learning.
- Evidence, Assessment & Evaluation of student achievement of stated goals.
- Reflective narrative on the relation among the above 3 dimensions.

In addition, they describe specific guidelines for 2 different types of portfolios that could be created: the benchmark portfolio and the inquiry portfolio. Each is created with a different goal in mind and is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Benchmark and Inquiry Portfolios (*Bernstein et al., 2005, pp. 23-121*)

Type of Portfolio	**Purpose**	**Activities**
Benchmark	1. Provides a current picture of the course. 2. Documents current practices. 3. Gives insight into questions to investigate.	Memo 1: Describe course & goals. Memo 2: Describe course activities. Memo 3: Document & analyze student learning. Collect samples of work of varying degrees of success.
Inquiry	1. Assesses progress over time. 2. Assesses long-term impact of approach to teaching. 3. Long-term assessment of student achievement.	Memo 1: State problem to investigate. Memo 2: Generate hypothesis & develop methodology to study problem. Memo 3: Analyze & assess findings.

The peer review can serve two purposes: to provide feedback and recommendations about how to improve one's teaching, and to provide an assessment of one's teaching work (eg., for such purposes as making decisions about tenure and promotion). The areas that reviewers would be asked to comment on are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Areas for Reviewer Assessment (*Bernstein et al., 2005, pp. 134-147*)	
Areas for Review	**Sample Questions**
Intellectual Content of Course	- Agreement with course goals & topics covered. - Congruence between goals & content. - Coherence between content & structure of course. - Appropriateness of level of knowledge & skills covered given context.
Quality of Teaching Practices	- Appropriateness of methods given class level. - Engagement of students. - Opportunities to practice skills learned. - Creativity & effectiveness of teaching methods. - Effective use of time outside class. - Effectiveness of course structure & procedure in encouraging learning.
Student Understanding of Course Content.	- Appropriate level of performance given course goals, context & class level. - Performance reflects appropriate level of challenging conceptual & critical thinking activities. - Appropriate methods of evaluation. - Varied ways of demonstrating achievement. - Coherence between course goals & weighing of assignments. - Appropriate number of successful students, or reflection on why success is not being achieved. - Demonstrates thinking about how to improve performance.
Consideration of Reflection & Development	- Demonstrates reflection on student achievement. - Analysis of teaching practice based on student performance. - Identifies relations between teaching & performance. - Demonstrates changing practices based on student performance.

Bernstein et al.’s (2005) model was developed at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln as part of the American Association for Higher Educations’s Peer Review of Teaching Project. The Peer Review of Teaching Project currently has a web-site database of more than 200 course portfolios, some of which are accessible to viewers of the site (www.courseportfolio.org). Not only can those interested in instituting a similar review process view the site, but faculty can also post their course portfolios to be reviewed by colleagues on the site. It is important to note that many different models of peer review exist and are documented in a step-by-step manner (eg., Chism, 2007).

Documenting Impact. It has also been suggested that tenure and promotion processes should make a point of judging the impact of the work of faculty (Jordan, 2006; O'Meara, 2006). Documenting impact may be particularly useful in the assessment of courses that involve an experiential or service learning component. Service-based courses represent an innovative approach to teaching that has recently gained prominence. The greater level of intricacy and challenges inherent in experiential or service-based courses may increase the complexity of assessing the quality of teaching that occurs.

Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Wergin and Zlotkowski (2003) have compiled a set of matrices for assessing the impact of service-based courses on students, faculty and community partners. Although not specifically created for use in tenure and promotion decisions, the matrices may be a useful resource in the development of some more explicit guidelines for how to document and assess the impact of service-based teaching. The matrices identify:

1. Key concepts to be assessed.
2. Indicators that will be used to measure the concepts.
3. Methods used to gather data.
4. Sources of data.

Appendices B, C and D provide the full matrices for students, faculty and community partners respectively. As Appendix B indicates, to evaluate the impact of service-based teaching on students one might document such things as students':

- Community Awareness, Involvement & Commitment to Service.
- Understanding of Course Content, Ability to Communicate.
- Sensitivity to Diversity.
- Advances in Career Development.
- Sense of Ownership, Valuing of Multiple Sources of Learning.

Appendix C indicates that faculty might document the impact of their service-based teaching on:

- Teaching Strategies and Philosophy.
- Success in Course Facilitation, Ability to Overcome Barriers.
- Lessons Learned, Strategies for Future Improvement.

As the matrix in Appendix D indicates, community partners might evaluate such things as:

- Satisfaction with Partnership of the Course Instructor.
- Perception of Sustainability of Partnership.
- Benefits of Partnership for the Organization.

The matrices suggest that there are multiple ways of documenting the impact of service-based teaching, including:

- Conducting Interviews, Focus Groups or Surveys.
- Classroom or Community Observations.
- Critical Incident & Documentation Review.
- Analysis of Curriculum Vitae.

In addition, the matrices suggest multiple sources of information, including:

- Students.
- Faculty & Department Chairs.
- Community Partners & Governing and Advisory Boards.

Candidates for tenure and promotion may be encouraged to include a range of these methods and sources for documenting their achievements in service-based learning. The tenure and review process would, in turn, have to be open to receiving multiple forms of documentation of success.

The Scholarship of Teaching. Another way that candidates for tenure and promotion may be rewarded for their innovative approaches to teaching is through their formal documentation and dissemination of those approaches. Considered to be part of the scholarship of teaching, contemporary thinking on the subject suggests that reward processes should recognize these types of activities in the same way that more traditional forms of research are recognized (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Huber, 2001). Those that engage in the scholarship of teaching are concerned with the processes and outcomes related to teaching and learning, and do such things as investigate pedagogical literature and their own teaching techniques in order to improve practice (Gurung, Ansburg, Alexander, Lawrence, Johnson, 2008; Huber, Hutchings &

Shulman, 2006). According to Huber (2001), the products of the scholarship of teaching may include such things as:

- Developing & documenting innovative classroom practices and new curricula.
- Creating teaching & learning resources that colleagues and students can use.
- Publishing findings in peer reviewed journals & presenting at conferences.
- Conducting teaching workshops.
- Engaging in web-based scholarly activities.
- Collaborating with others.

The degree to which there is support for the scholarship of teaching and learning is still relatively unknown. In a recent study, Braxton and Del Favero (2001) noted that tenure and promotion processes typically base reward decisions on the number of publications, the form of publications and the prestige of the place of publication. Their analysis of journal impact scores from chemistry, physics, engineering, computer sciences and psychology indicated that there were relatively few journals that published scholarly work on teaching, and that those that did publish this work had journals had relatively low impact scores. The findings suggest that rewarding the scholarship of teaching will require institutions to recognize products other than peer-reviewed publications. They ultimately provide 3 recommendations for assessing a broader range of scholarly work (p. 28):

1. The work must be in an observable form (eg., published papers, video-taped presentations, computer software), made public, open to critical peer review, and available for use by others.
2. Criteria for assessing quality should follow those suggested by Glassick et al. (1997).
3. The scholarship must be well documented (eg., in a portfolio).

In an informal survey of people working in educational centres across Canada, Peter Wolf (Associate Director, Teaching Support Services, University of Guelph) indicated that in addition to the use of student evaluations, there are some institutions that are extending their evaluation procedures to include: peer or external review of teaching performance and design, publication and dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching and learning, and engagement in formal or informal teaching development procedures (eg., certifications, degrees) (P. Wolf, personal communication, February 4, 2009). Peter also indicated that he would be willing to facilitate discussion groups around the issues of re-conceptualizing tenure and promotion processes.

Similarly, in their review of tenure and promotion documents across Canadian Universities, Gravestock and Gregor Greenleaf (2008, p. 3) indicated that there were multiple ways that institutions are documenting teaching competency and effectiveness. These include:

- Student evaluations.
- Peer review.
- Publications on the scholarship of teaching & learning.
- Awards.
- Participation in program and curriculum development.
- Sample teaching material.
- Teaching dossiers.

It should also be noted that Teaching Support Services at the University of Guelph conducts a discussion group called *Teaching On The Edge* (TOTE), where faculty discuss new and innovative approaches to teaching that are occurring on campus. This is also a forum for discussing a range of challenges and brainstorming solutions. Faculty engaged in innovative approaches to teaching may find this discussion group to be a useful resource.

Recognizing the Scholarship of Application & Engagement

The literature suggests that attaining tenure and promotion can be particularly difficult for those who are involved in the scholarship of application or engagement (*Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions*, 2005; Jackson, Schwartz & Andree, 2008). The report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions (2005, pp. 19-30) listed a series of recommendations for how to encourage health-related institutions to provide greater support to faculty who conduct community-engaged scholarship. Several of those recommendations are pertinent to the discussion on how to re-conceptualize the tenure and promotion processes in CSAHS to recognize a broader range of scholarship. Some of the recommendations from the report are listed below. Additional information and description is included where appropriate.

1. *Define scholarship in such a way that it explicitly includes community-engaged scholarship.* This recommendation recognizes the work of Boyer (1990) in broadening the scope of what is considered to be scholarly activity.
2. *Recognize a portfolio that includes both peer-reviewed work and applied products. Take into consideration the time required for community-based work by allowing for flexibility and extended deadlines.*
3. *Recognize the range of outputs that come from community-based work & broaden the acceptable journals in which to publish.* These recommendations are made in acknowledgement of the fact that the results of community-based work are often not published in peer-reviewed journals. Jackson et al. (2008, p.137) provide several different options for places to disseminate community-engaged research:

    - The Community University Exposition (CUExpo).
    - The Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning.
    - The pan Canadian Community-Based Research Network.
    - The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.
    - Action, Research and Manifestation.

    Other non-traditional forms of output that have been recognized in tenure and promotion documents include:

    - Technical reports on community issues.
    - Evidence that work has improved community services.
    - Contributions to changes in public policy.
    - Multi-media products & media appearances that contribute to the community.

- Evidence of using expertise to solve community problems.
- Letters of support from community stakeholders.
- Evidence of connections between one's research, community-engaged work and teaching. (Jordan, 2006)

4. *Recognize the collaborative nature of community-engaged work by not over-emphasizing first authorship on disseminated products.*
5. *Use criteria to measure the impact of work on the community.* In the study of 7 institutions that recognize community-based work presented by Jordan (2006), the most important product to come from community-based work was evidence of the impact that work had on the greater community. One might consider using matrices similar to those proposed by Battison et al. (2003) to measure the impact of the candidate's community-based work.
6. *Recognize the varied funding sources for community-engaged work.*
7. *Involve community partners in the review process.*
8. *Educate those involved in the review process about community-engaged work.*

Re-conceptualizing the Tenure and Promotion Process: Broad Recommendations

It seems important to include several of the recommendations, advice and suggestions that have been made about the broader process of re-conceptualizing tenure and promotion.

O'Meara's (2005) 10 Principles of Good Practice. O'Meara has suggested ten principles of best practices for encouraging faculty to engage in multiple forms of scholarship. These recommendations were generated from a range of sources, including: literature reviews, case-study research, the national survey of chief academic officers conducted by the American Association for Higher Education, focus groups with chief academic officers, 9 campus studies from the "Reflecting on Best Practices Project", as well as more than a decade of consulting with higher learning institutions. The 10 principles are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. 10 Principles of Good Practice (O'Meara, 2005, pp. 293-300)		
Emphasis	**Principle**	**Example Suggestions**
Faculty Socialization	1. Prepare faculty in graduate school for the variety of roles and types of scholarship in which they will engage 2. Socialize new faculty to the broader institutional definition of scholarship	-Provide clear definition of scholarship & criteria for T&P. -Exposure to multiple forms of scholarship. -Mentorship with senior faculty. -Sharing scholarly work.
Faculty Expectations	3. Present clear expectations for scholarship in promotion and tenure guidelines 4. Do not expect to reward the "overloaded plate"	-Describe how to document multiple forms of scholarship. -Create set of evaluation standards. -Flexible workload programs. -Recognizing time spent. -Strategies to avoid burnout.
Assessment & Evaluation	5. Assess the impact of scholarship on multiple beneficiaries and partners. 6. Provide useful feedback to faculty during evaluation.	-Document a range of impacts. -Peer review. -Create classroom assessment tools. -Discuss strengths & weaknesses. -Encourage collaboration.
Resources	7. Support pioneers with resources – structural and financial, training and development, political and symbolic	-Provide resources for multiple forms of scholarship. -Promote partnerships. -Highlight new forms of work.
Collaboration & Community	8. Encourage scholarly contributions that build on strengths.	-Emphasize individual & departmental strengths. -Recognize the changing nature of interests & strengths. - Senior faculty with particular strengths collaborate with new faculty.
Institutional Identity & Direction	9. Define and emphasize scholarship in the context of institutional mission 10. Resist increasing research expectations to enhance institutional prestige.	-Open discussion of scholarship & mission. -Link faculty work with mission. -Reward multiple forms of scholarship. -Reward work that fits with institutional mission.

Zahorksi's (2005) 9 Lessons Learned. Similarly, Zahorski (2005) has put together a list of 9 lessons learned through the process of re-conceptualizing tenure and promotion processes to recognize multiple forms of scholarship at a small American liberal arts college (pp. 63-64). The list is provided below.

1. Put faculty in charge of the process to ensure greater buy-in.
2. Foster a spirit of shared ownership by seeking input from faculty and academic community.
3. Establish common ground for discussion: ensure understanding of the meaning of scholarship and other relevant vocabulary being used.
4. Make the process and product of redefinition congruent with your mission statement.
5. Take a two-tiered approach: first discuss how the definition of scholarship is to be broadened, then make practical applications to the current tenure & promotion system.
6. Prepare for heated debate and a broad spectrum of views.
7. Work toward compromise: compromise that is inclusive of varied perspectives is a more realistic goal than complete consensus.
8. Follow up redefinition with modification of the reward system.
9. Prepare for an ongoing conversation, lingering questions, and tensions: expect questions about how the new system will be applied.

Summary of Important Themes and Considerations

There were several suggestions and recommendations that came up repeatedly in the literature on tenure and promotion. These themes are summarized below.

1. Begin with the Institutional Mission. A common recommendation in the literature on tenure and promotion is that any re-conceptualization of the process must first begin by reviewing the mission of the institution (Curry, 2006; Fite, 2006; O'Meara, 2005; Diamond, 2009; Zahorski, 2006). This recommendation recognizes that different institutions and departments will have different sets of purposes and goals. The ways in which scholarship is defined and evaluated in tenure and promotion processes should therefore be consistent with the purported goals of the institution or department. It would therefore be important to review the mission statement for the University of Guelph before making significant amendments to tenure and promotion processes (see http://www.uoguelph.ca/secretariat/senate/handbook/Mission Statement.pdf).

2. Include Faculty in the Re-conceptualizing of Evaluation Processes. A second recommendation is that any re-conceptualization of criteria or processes related to tenure and promotion should be conducted in consultation with the faculty that will ultimately be impacted by it (Fite, 2006; Zahorski, 2005). Open dialogue with faculty about changes to evaluation systems will help to address any concerns they might have, create a sense of ownership, and ensure clarity of the new expectations being developed.

3. Be Explicit in Defining Scholarship and Provide Clear Guidelines for How It Will Be Assessed. Overall, there appears to be a consensus that scholarship must be defined broadly enough to account for the range of scholarly activity that faculty engages in (Glassick et al., 1997; O'Meara, 2005; Zahorski, 2005). Minimally, it is important to be explicit in defining the types of work that will be considered scholarly and worthy of reward through tenure and promotion (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Glassick et al. (1997) and Diamond (2006) suggest re-conceptualizing the assessment of scholarship to include broad characteristics that may be applied to scholarship in any form.

4. Re-examine Workload Expectations. There is suggestion in the literature that it is important to recognize that different forms of scholarship require differing amounts of time and energy (Curry, 2006; O'Meara, 2005). For example, community-engaged research is generally recognized to take longer than other types of research because of the inherent complexities of working with community partners. One recommendation is that there be some flexibility in timelines for those doing this type of work (*Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions*, 2005). Other suggestions that have been made include: altering weightings of workload depending on the nature of the work that faculty are engaged in (Curry, 2006; Jackson, Schwartz & Andree, 2008), and allowing faculty to focus on only one or two forms of scholarship at particular points in their careers (O'Meara, 2005).

*5. Assess the Impact of Work & Involve Community Partners in Peer Review. A*ssessing the impact of work has been suggested to be a particularly important method of evaluating candidates that conduct community-based research (Jordan, 2006). It may be similarly important for those who are use innovative approaches to teaching. It has also been recommended that community partners be formally involved in the peer review process of such scholarship because they are equipped with the expertise and experience to comment on the complexity of this type of work and the degree to which it has impacted the community (Jackson, Schwartz & Andree, 2008; *Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions*, 2005). O'Meara (2005) has extended the notion of evaluating impact to include students, other faculty members, the discipline, the profession and the academic institution.

6. Recognize Multiple Forms of Outputs. While publication in peer reviewed journals remains the gold standard for evaluating the products of faculty work, there is consensus that other forms of scholarly work should also be recognized in the tenure and review process (Jordan, 2006; *Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions*, 2005). O'Meara (2005) suggests that guidelines for what constitutes scholarly output across the different domains of scholarship should be explicitly expressed in tenure and promotion documents. Braxton and Del Favero (2001) suggest that these different forms of output must be observable, public, open to critical peer review and available for use by others.

7. Adopt Multiple Forms of Teaching Assessment. There is suggestion in the literature that student evaluations of teaching do little on their own to provide an accurate representation of teaching ability (Bernstein et al., 2006; Chism, 2007). One recommendation that has been made is to use multiple methods of collecting assessment data from multiple sources, at multiple time points (Chism, 2007). Teaching assessment procedures may be expanded to include not only student evaluations, but also such things such as peer review, the impact of teaching work on faculty, students and community partners (particularly in the case of service-based courses), and acknowledging a wide variety of products that come from the scholarship of teaching and learning.

References

Battistoni, R., Gelmon, S., Saltmarsh, J., Wergin, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2003). The engaged department toolkit. Campus Compact.

Bernstein, D., Nelson Burnett, A., Goodburn, A., & Savory, P. (2006). *Making teaching and learning visible: Course portfolios and the peer review of teaching.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Braxton, J. M., & Del Favero, M. (2002). Evaluating scholarship performance: traditional and emergent assessment templates. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 114,* 19-31.

Chism, N. V. N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005) *Linking Scholarship and Communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions.* Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved January 28, 2009, from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/kellogg3.html

Cox, D. N. (2006). The scholarship of engagement: what is it? In S. L. Percy, N. L. Zimpher & M. J. Brukardt (Eds.) *Creating a new kind of university; institutionalizing community-university engagement.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company. Retrieved January

28, 2009, from Tomorrow's Professor Msg. #726, http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/cgi-bin/tomprof/posting.php

Curry, T. H. (2006). Faculty performance reviews. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from Tomorrow's Professor Msg.#740, from, http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/cgi-bin/tomprof/posting.php

Devanas, M. A. (2006). Teaching portfolios. In P. Seldin (Ed.) *Evaluating faculty performance, a practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service.* (pp. 111-130). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Diamond, R. M. (2006). *Tenure and promotion: The next iteration.* Retrieved January 28, 2009, from The National Academy for Academic Leadership, http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/tenpromo.html

Diamond, R. M. (2009). Priorities and the promotion and tenure process: The faculty reward system. Retrieved January 28, 2009, from The National Academy for Academic Leadership, http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/priorities.html

Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (1993). Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000. In M. Kramer (Ed.) *New directions for higher education, 81*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fite, D. (2006). Using evaluation data for personnel decisions. In P. Seldin (Ed.) *Evaluating faculty performance, a practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service.* (pp. 181-200). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gravestock, P., & Gregor Greenleaf, E. (2008). Overview of tenure and promotion policies across Canada. Retrieved January 28, 2009, from http://www.mtroyal.ca/wcm/groups/ public/documents/pdf/aptc_Canada_tenurepolicies.pdf

Gurung, R. A. R., Ansburg, P. I., Alexander, P. A., Lawrence, N. K., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). Scholarship of teaching and learning strategies and tactics. *Teaching of Psychology, 35,* 249-261.

Huber, M. T. (2001). Balancing acts: Designing careers around the scholarship of teaching. *Change Magazine.* Retrieved January 29, 2008, from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/publications/sub.asp ?key=452&subkey=2012

Huber, M. T., Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (2006). The scholarship of teaching and learning today. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship,* 290-302. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jackson, E. T., Schwartz, K. & Andree, P. (2008). Aligning tenure and promotion: Procedures for community-university engagement: Dialogue for action. Retrieved January 28, 2009, from CUExp08, http://www.cuexpo08.ca/program/abstracts/ aligningtenureand promotion.pdf.

Jordan, C. (2006). *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholarship for promotion or tenure*. Retrieved January 26, 2009, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Developing%20Criteria %20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf

Mills, B. J. (2006). Peer observations as a catalyst for faculty development. In P. Seldin (Ed.) *Evaluating faculty performance, a practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service.* (pp. 82-95). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

O'Meara, K. (2005). Principles of good practice: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in policy and practice. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship,* 290-302. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pallett, W. (2006). Uses and abuses of student ratings. In P. Seldin (Ed.) *Evaluating faculty performance, a practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service.* (pp. 50-65). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures at Nipissing University (2008). Retrieved January 28, 2009 from http://www.nipissingu.ca/academic/downloads/SJCPTStandards Final18sept08.pdf

Wolstenholme, J. (2008). Teaching dossier workshop. University of Guelph: Teaching Support Services.

Zahorksi, K. J. (2005). Redefining scholarship: A small liberal arts college's journey. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*, 290-302. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Informative Web-Based Resources

Campus Compact: Lists a range of resources on community service learning.

- http://www.compact.org/

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: An American foundation dedicated to the continual improvement of teaching and learning. Contains links to various publications (including Change Magazine) on topics relevant to higher education.

- http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: Provides a range of useful resources for how community-engaged scholarship might be recognized in tenure and promotion processes. The second link is to a toolkit that community-engaged scholars can use to document their work. The third link is to the Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, which provides several recommendations for how to reward community-engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion processes. The fourth link is to the report on Developing Criteria for Review of Community-Engaged Scholars for Promotion or Tenure, in which the tenure and promotion documents of 7 Institutions that support community engaged scholarship are examined. Provides exemplars of how scholarship has been defined and criteria developed in tenure and promotion documents.

- http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/index.html
- http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html
- http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/kellogg3.html
- http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Developing%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf

Peer Review of Teaching Project: Provides examples of course portfolios and allows users to solicit peer review of their work.

- www.courseportfolio.org

The National Academy for Academic Leadership: Contains some contemporary writing on topics related to tenure and promotion.

- http://www.thenationalacademy.org/

Tomorrow’s Professor Mailing List: A list-serv that is free to join. Articles on a range of topics in higher education are disseminated.

- http://ctl.stanford.edu/Tomprof/index.shtml

Appendix B

Assessment Matrix for Students

What do we want to know? (concepts)	How will we know it? (indicators)	How will we measure it? (methods)	Who/what will provide the data? (sources)
Awareness of community	Knowledge of community issues Ability to identify community assets and needs Understanding of community strengths, problems, resources	Interviews Focus groups Classroom observations	Students Faculty Community partners
Involvement with community	Quantity/quality of interactions Attitude toward involvement Interdependence among community partners and students Feedback from community	Interviews Focus groups Classroom observations Community observations	Students Faculty Community partners
Commitment to service	Attitude toward current service experience(s) Plans for, and barriers to, future service Reaction to demands/challenges of the service	Interviews Focus groups Surveys	Students Faculty Community partners
Career development	Career decisions/opportunities Development of professional skills related to career Opportunities for career preparation related to service experience	Surveys Interviews Focus groups	Students Faculty Community partners
Understanding of course content	Role of community experience in understanding and applying content Perceived relevance of community experience to course content	Interviews Surveys Classroom observations	Students Faculty Community partners
Sensitivity to diversity	Attitudes about and understanding of diversity Knowledge of new communities Self-confidence and comfort in community settings Changes in preconceived understandings/ability to articulate beliefs	Interviews Surveys Community observations	Students Faculty Community partners
Sense of ownership	Autonomy and independence from faculty Sense of role as learner and provider in partnership Responsibility for community project	Focus groups Classroom observations Interviews	Students Faculty Community partners
Communication	Perceived skill development Recognition of importance of communication Demonstrated abilities (verbal and written)	Interviews Classroom observations Community observations	Students Faculty Community partners
Valuing of pedagogy of multiple teachers	Role of student peers in learning Perception and role of community partners in learning Role of faculty in learning	Focus groups Classroom observations Community observations	Students Faculty Community partners

Appendix C

Assessment Matrix for Faculty

What do we want to know? (concepts)	How will we know it? (indicators)	How will we measure it? (methods)	Who/what will provide the data? (sources)
Motivation and attraction of faculty to service-learning	Level and nature of community participation Nature of discipline Activity related to level of learner in courses Linkage to other scholarly activities Identification of motivating factors (value, rewards, etc.) Awareness of socioeconomic, environmental, cultural factors	Interviews Focus groups Critical incident review Curriculum vitae analysis	Faculty Students Community partner Department chair Faculty peers
Professional development (support needed/sought)	Attendance at related conferences/seminars (local/regional/national) Participation in campus-based activities Leadership/mentoring role with others in promoting service-learning Role in advocating service-learning in academic societies	Interviews Focus groups Curriculum vitae analysis	Faculty Community partner Students
Impact or influence on teaching	Knowledge of community assets and needs Nature of class format, organization, activities Evolution of teaching and learning methods Articulation of philosophy of teaching Nature of faculty/student/community partner interactions	Interviews Focus groups Critical incident review Curriculum vitae analysis	Faculty Community partner Students Institutional resources
Impact or influence on scholarship	Changes in research emphasis Changes in publication/presentation content and venues Changes in focus of research proposals, grants, and projects Scholarly collaborations around community-based learning	Interviews Focus groups Critical incident review Curriculum vitae analysis	Faculty Community partner Institutional resources
Other personal or professional impact	Creation of partnerships with community organizations Level of volunteerism Mentoring of students Campus-based leadership role around community-based learning Commitment to community-based teaching and learning Role in department/program advocating service-learning	Interviews Focus groups Critical incident review	Faculty Community partner Students Department chair
Identification of barriers and facilitators	Strategies to capitalize on facilitators Methods and activities to overcome barriers Illustrations of creative problem-solving Ability to build upon barriers and create facilitators	Interviews Focus group Critical incident review	Faculty Community partner Students
Satisfaction with experience	Strengths and lessons learned Opportunities for future improvement	Interviews Focus groups	Faculty Students

Appendix D

Assessment Matrix for the Community

What do we want to know? (concepts)	How will we know it? (indicators)	How will we measure it? (methods)	Who/what will provide the data? (sources)
Variables about community partner organization			
Capacity to fulfill organizational mission	Types of services provided Number of clients served Number of students involved Variety of activities offered Insights into assets and needs	Survey Interview Focus groups Documentation review Critical incident review	Community partner Students Faculty Advisory committees Governing board
Economic benefits	Identification of new staff Impact on resource utilization through services provided by faculty/students Identification of funding opportunities	Interview Focus groups Documentation review	Community partner Students Faculty Governing board
Social benefits	New connections or networks Number of volunteers Impact on community issues	Interview Focus groups Documentation review	Community partner Students Faculty Governing board
Variables about community-university partnership			
Nature of community-university relationship (partnership)	Creation of partnerships Kinds of activities conducted Barriers/facilitators	Survey Interview Critical incident review Documentation review	Community partner Faculty Governing board
Nature of community-university interaction	Involvement of partners in campus activities Involvement of campus representatives in community activities Communication patterns Community awareness of university programs and activities University awareness of community programs and activities	Interview Focus groups Documentation review	Community partner Faculty Students Governing board Advisory committees
Satisfaction with partnership	Perception of mutuality and reciprocity Responsiveness to concerns Willingness to provide feedback	Interview Survey Focus group	Community partner Faculty Governing board Advisory committees
Sustainability of partnership	Duration Evolution	Interview Survey Critical incident review	Community partner Faculty Governing board