EVALUATING ENGAGED RESEARCH IN PROMOTION AND TENURE:

NOT EVERYTHING THAT COUNTS CAN BE COUNTED

Lauren Wendling

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
In the Department of Education Leadership and Policy Studies,
Indiana University
January 2022
Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee

________________________________________________________________________
Tomas Nelson-Laird, Ph.D.
Dissertation Chair

[September 23, 2021]

________________________________________________________________________
Megan M. Palmer, Ph.D.

[September 23, 2021]

________________________________________________________________________
Lucy A. LePeau, Ph.D.

[September 23, 2021]

________________________________________________________________________
Kristin E. Norris, Ph.D.

[September 23, 2021]
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have helped me through the many years of my graduate education and ultimately the completion of this dissertation. Dr. Tom Nelson-Laird, my chair and academic cheerleader, who is insightful, honest, and a truly fantastic mentor. In combination with the guidance from Dr. Nelson-Laird, I was fortunate to learn from many amazing Indiana University faculty and staff, including those on my dissertation committee – Dr. Kristin Norris, Dr. Megan Palmer, and Dr. Lucy LePeau.

I am beyond grateful for my colleagues at Collaboratory and across the field of higher education community engagement who encourage and inspire me daily. Your insights, new ways of thinking, and passion that you bring to this work is unparalleled. I am especially indebted to my academic mentor and friend, Dr. Kristin Norris, who continuously supports and encourages me to think deeply about the role of higher education within society. Thank you for setting me on this path. Your advice and mentorship are invaluable.

Last, but certainly not least, I must thank my family and friends who have been nothing but supportive as I’ve pursued a doctoral degree. Mom, Dad, and Kacy, your unwavering support and love throughout my lifelong pursuit of education is something for which I am eternally grateful. Sean, as the one who has sacrificed the most as I’ve focused on my education for much of our relationship, I am most appreciative of your love, support, and understanding these past ten years. Thank you all!
ABSTRACT

Lauren Wendling

EVALUATING ENGAGED RESEARCH IN PROMOTION AND TENURE: NOT EVERYTHING THAT COUNTS CAN BE COUNTED

As institutions of higher education evolve and adapt to meet the increasing needs of their communities, faculty are faced with the choice of where and how to employ their time and expertise. To advance and encourage partnerships between institutions and their greater communities, academic reward structures must be designed in ways that support those who choose to leverage their expertise, resources, and time to engage with community in meaningful and mutually beneficial ways. This study contributes to the growing body of higher education community engagement literature by investigating how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees not only define and understand faculty’s engaged research, but how they evaluate it. Specifically, this study explored what goes into making evaluative decisions, if and how committees utilize tools for evaluation, and how evaluative decisions are made. In this single case multi-site qualitative study 12 participants across five R1 institutions classified as engaged by the Carnegie Foundation, participated in semi-structured interviews. All participants were tenured, engaged scholars with experience serving on a school- and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committee.

Participants shared that in their experience, school and department review committees and their institutions more broadly struggle to define, categories, and evaluate community engaged research in promotion and tenure. Though their universities were making strides to institutionalize engagement within other areas of campus (e.g., faculty development, creation of engaged centers or offices), appropriate recognition of engaged research within promotion and tenure is not yet a reality. Conclusions drawn from this study include: (1) Definitions of
Community engaged research do not matter to review committees, as most reviewers have “no idea what it even means”. (2) Promotion and tenure guidelines are too rigid to appropriately categorize or value engaged research. (3) Metrics used to evaluate traditional research do not work for community engaged research. (4) Institution-wide supports to assist with the evaluation of community engaged research do not exist. (5) When it comes to community engagement, institutions and their leaders are “talking out of two sides of their mouth[s]”. (6) The events of 2020 have both positively and negatively affected community engaged research.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Since its foundations, American higher education has been inextricably linked to the public good. Higher education has long held a special place in American society, expanding public knowledge, creating tomorrow’s leaders, and advancing social consciousness (Chambers, 2005; Newman & Couturier, 2002). During the past 150 years, higher education has brought scientific advances to agriculture and national defense, expanded the national economy, boosted industrialization, and created channels for individuals to climb the social and economic ladders of success. The partnership between institutions of higher education and American society, however, is not one-sided. The public has long provided huge financial support for higher education, understanding it to be a primary vehicle for social and economic improvement (Votruba, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

Though the roots of higher education’s involvement in society have long run deep, many fear that in the last few decades, higher education has been slowly shifting from a public to a private good. Though 95% of urban research institutions have made a commitment to community engagement in their most recent strategic plan, only 55% of Americans today believe higher education has a positive impact on society (Accardi, 2018). This growing concern is influenced by multiple forces including, but not limited to, increasing tuition costs and student loan debt, creep of neoliberal politics, growth of a largely contingent academic workforce, and a general feeling of incongruency between social expectations and institutional goals (Chambers, 2005; Cohen, 1998; Giroux, 2003; Lynton, 1995; Rice, Saltmarsh, & Plater, 2015; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003). Many believe that higher education’s greatest challenge in rectifying its sullied public image requires institutions to better articulate societal benefit beyond individual economic security. It is thus essential that higher education not only continue to engage in
community, but do so deeply and meaningfully, in ways that are beneficial to both the institutions and their communities. Higher education community engagement not only helps improve the public perception of postsecondary education, but directly illustrates institutions’ usefulness to the public. In today’s deeply divided political climate, engagement with community could not be of higher importance.

Working within higher education, specifically in a faculty role, involves a professional identity that embraces a commitment to advancing the public good through teaching and/or research (Austin, 2015; Shaker, 2015; Tierney & Perkins, 2015). Though individual faculty members’ commitments and ideologies differ based on location, appointment type, and the various configurations of campus and community, by virtue, giving to the public good is “at the heart of academic work” (Austin, 2015, p. 55). This is not to suggest that every faculty member on every university campus must be deeply involved with local communities. However, academic work dedicated to advancing the public good should not be considered something above and beyond what faculty are required to do, but rather something that is deeply engrained in what it means to be an academic (Austin, 2015; Tierney & Perkins, 2015). Though the professional identity and responsibility of those working in higher education involves at its core advancing the public good, the current academic labor market threatens to disrupt this notion. The increasing number of contingent faculty, limited to a narrow list of specific work requirements with diminishing time, resources, and autonomy, creates few opportunities for faculty to focus their work on advancing the public good (Austin, 2015).

As the academic labor market continues to evolve, faculty given less independence, resources, and rewards, are faced with the choice of where to employ their precious time and expertise (Rice et al., 2015). Concurrently, the American public increasingly questions higher
education’s impact and society’s return on their investment (Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). Institutions must hold themselves accountable to society by publicly rewarding, recognizing, and applauding the faculty who choose to engage their teaching and research with community. Academic reward structures, institutional and departmental culture, and practices that socialize faculty into pursuing various types of work must be designed in ways that support those who choose to leverage their expertise, resources, and time to engage community. Higher education can no longer remain silent and immobile when it comes to valuing and rewarding those within its institutions who engage with community.

Within this study, I explore the practices by which faculty’s engaged scholarship is evaluated within the processes of promotion and tenure. The direction of my study is laid out in the remainder of this introductory chapter. Included below are the problem statement, purpose, and significance of the study, research questions, study design, and definition of relevant terms and concepts. This chapter concludes with a brief overview of the study, followed by chapters Two and Three which provide a review of current literature and methodology, respectively.

**Problem Statement**

Research suggests institution-level rhetoric praising community engagement and the rewarding of faculty through promotion and tenure who pursue engaged research are often inconsistent (Alperin, Munoz Nieves, Schimanski, Fischman, Niles, & McKiernan, 2018; Diamond, 2005; O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). The perceived misalignment between institutional rhetoric and rewarding engaged faculty is problematic, specifically for institutions seeking the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement classification – a national recognition that an institution is meaningfully engaged in community (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). As universities work
toward infusing community engagement into their institutional missions and strategic plans, and are recognized and praised for doing so, there is a need for research that explores this suggested dissonance between institution-level support for engagement and how engaged faculty are rewarded through promotion and tenure at the school- and department-levels.

It is well documented that the values, beliefs, and personal experiences of school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees influence their likelihood to reward and promote faculty who pursue engaged research (Diamond, 2005; O’Meara, 2002; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). Studies show that changes to institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines reflecting an increased acceptance of community engaged research do not necessarily ensure a similar acceptance of such research in school- and department-level guidelines (Alperin et al., 2018; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). Though school- and department-level reward processes are undoubtedly influenced by promotion and tenure guidelines and committee members’ values and beliefs, there is currently a gap in the literature exploring the evaluative processes of school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees when it comes to faculty’s engaged research.

To date, research has not yet explored the evaluative processes school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees use when evaluating faculty’s engaged research or how evaluative judgements are made. Multiple resources such as Purdue University’s The Guide (Able & Williams, 2019), Community-Campus Partnerships for Health’s Community-Engaged Scholarship Review Promotion and Tenure Package (Jordan, Wong, Jungnickel, Joosten, Leugers, & Shields, 2009), and IUPUI’s Public Scholarship Faculty Learning Community’s Strategies for Developing and Documenting Products of Public Scholarship in Research and Creative Activity (Wood, Price, Stanton-Nichols, Hatcher, Hong, Haberski, Silverman, Goodlett,
& Palmer, 2018) have been created to assist in the evaluation of faculty’s community engaged research, but there is currently a lack of knowledge regarding if, or how, such resources are being used. Further, research has not yet explored how promotion and tenure committees’ evaluative processes align, or fail to align, with institution rhetoric when it comes to community engagement. As community engaged research often operates in historically non-traditional ways, in that it includes community members as co-researchers, seeks to produce additional scholarly products outside of peer-reviewed publications, and often favors local impact over national recognition, engaged research cannot be evaluated in the same ways as traditional research (Boyer, 1990; Deetz, 2008; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002). As such, there is a need for a better understanding of how promotion and tenure committees at the school- and department-levels make evaluative decisions regarding faculty’s community engaged research. This study explores this gap in current research.

Study Purpose

In this study the processes by which school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s community engaged research are explored utilizing a multi-site case study design. There is currently no research that examines school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees’ evaluative processes of faculty’s engaged research. Scholars have explored the role faculty values and beliefs play in rewarding engaged scholarship (O’Meara, 2002), department heads’ perceptions of engagement (Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014), and the prevalence of engagement terminology within institution- and department-level promotion and tenure guidelines (Alperin et al., 2018; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). However, there is a clear gap in the literature regarding the evaluation
of engaged research by those who are involved in promotion and tenure decisions at the school- and department-level. This exploratory study builds upon the previous research of scholars such as Alperin et al. (2018), O’Meara (2002), Sobrero & Jayaratne (2014), and Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, and Buglione (2009) to take a more focused look into how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees not only define, understand, and value faculty’s engaged research, but how they evaluate it. Specifically, this study explores what goes into making evaluative decisions, if and how committees utilize tools for evaluation, and ultimately how evaluative decisions are made regarding faculty’s community engaged research. Insights gained from this exploratory study will inform current discussions concerning the institutionalization of engagement in higher education and what it means for an institution to be classified by the Carnegie Foundation as an engaged campus.

Research Questions

The processes of evaluating faculty’s community engaged research by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees will be explored using the following research questions as a guide:

1. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members evaluate faculty’s community engaged research?
   a. What guidelines, tools, and/or processes, or lack thereof, guide school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members’ evaluation of faculty community engaged research (e.g., school/department-level guidelines and language, institution-level guidelines and language, peer review/letters, rubrics, other tools, etc.)?
2. How are community engaged research processes and community engaged research products (community engaged scholarship) evaluated by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees?
   a. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees differentiate community engaged research processes (e.g., co-creation of study design, research questions) and products (community engaged scholarship) when evaluating the engaged work of faculty?

3. What supports do institutions have in place to attract, retain, and reward faculty who do community engaged research?

4. How have the events of 2020 (e.g., global pandemic, nation-wide protests for racial justice) affected engaged faculty and their institutions?

**Study Significance**

Research within the field of higher education community engagement is expansive, as is its history. The field of higher education community engagement predominantly identifies the scholarship of engagement effort in the late 20th century, sparked by Ernest Boyer’s (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, as the catalyst for today’s modern movement. Major professional organizations such as the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Colleges championed Boyer’s work and brought it to the forefront of university discourse. However, it is extremely negligent to push forward the narrative that university/community engagement began with Boyer in the early 1990s. Though primarily white institutions have recently experienced a resurgence of interest in community engagement, historically black colleges and universities and other predominantly minority
serving institutions were founded with such intentions and have maintained a mission of community engagement throughout their histories (Gasman, Spencer, & Orphan, 2015).

Though the literature of higher education community engagement is quite expansive, it is a relatively young field. Past research has primarily focused on the institutionalization of engagement (Benson, Harkavy, & Hartley, 2005; Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Holland, 1997, 2016), how institutions and faculty engage in community (Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2012), and the inclusion of community engagement in promotion and tenure guidelines (Alperin et al., 2018; Day, Delagrange, Palmquist, Pemberton, & Walker, 2013; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 2005, 2011). It is notable that research has yet to study the processes by which promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s community engaged research. Thus, this study is significant because it investigates the specific ways school- and department-level committees define, understand, evaluate, and ultimately value, or fail to value, faculty’s community engaged research through the traditional reward structures of promotion and tenure.

A first step in better understanding the evaluative processes of school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees is to explore the experiences of committee members when making decisions, the environments in which decisions are made, and the tools used to evaluate faculty’s engaged research. Research in this area will help expand the current body of knowledge regarding the institutionalization of engagement within higher education by shedding light on promotion and tenure committee practices and decisions that are often not easily accessible to those on the outside. This study explores the evaluative processes of promotion and tenure committees at a handful of select institutions while not being bound by academic
discipline or the evaluation of a specific engaged research methodology. Findings add depth, detail, and nuance to what is known about the current processes of valuing and recognizing faculty’s community engaged research.

As community engagement is becoming more infused into institutions’ strategic planning, organizational structure, and promotion and tenure guidelines, the lack of research systematically exploring how and in what ways faculty’s engaged research is evaluated is much needed. As more institutional leaders work to infuse community engagement into their missions, identities, and strategic plans, the study’s findings have will have benefit to all those who wish to better understand how faculty’s engaged research is evaluated, legitimized, and ultimately valued within promotion and tenure.

Findings will benefit various higher education professionals – engaged faculty pursuing promotion and tenure, academic departments, community engagement professionals, and campus leadership. Recommended steps for institutions working to appropriately recognize and reward community engaged research and scholarship within promotion and tenure will be shared. Current metrics used to evaluate faculty scholarship will be identified and adjusted metrics to evaluate community engaged scholarship more appropriately will be proposed. Conclusions and recommendations will be made in the effort to enact real change within departments, schools, and institutions who are actively seeking to better support their engaged faculty and properly evaluate and reward their scholarship. As such, this research is a worthwhile endeavor.

**Study Design**

Research is completed in a variety of ways and may look different depending on the researcher’s discipline, expertise, interests, and/or desired outcomes. In this study, a multi-site case study design informed by and building upon current research within the field of higher
education community engagement (Alperin et al., 2018; O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014) was used. This study is qualitative in nature, due to the desire to emphasize participant voice and demonstrate meaning and understanding about issues that would otherwise be unidentified in quantitative research (Berg, 1995). Insights obtained in this qualitative study add texture to the analysis and presentation of findings, placing readers within the lived realities of participants (Luttrell, 2010b). These characteristics of qualitative research and accompanying methodological tools best allow for the generation of new information about the evaluative processes of promotion and tenure committees.

To better understand and demystify the evaluative processes of promotion and tenure committees, this study is couched in the interpretivist tradition which seeks to generate working hypotheses or ideas that are fundamentally grounded in the context-specific, constructed social realities of participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Institutions selected for participation in this study had all recently been classified or reclassified as community engaged by the Carnegie Foundation in spring 2020 and all are recognized as a doctoral university with very high research activity. Study participants were faculty within the selected institutions who (a) self-identified as engaged scholars and (b) have had experience sitting on a school- and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committee. Study participants were identified with the help of Community Engagement Professionals (CEPs) at each institution. All participants completed a one-hour Zoom interview. Participant sampling, data collection, and data analysis is described thoroughly in Chapter Three. Findings are presented and discussed in Chapters Four and Five.
Relevant Definitions and Concepts

This study sought to better understand the processes of school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees when evaluating faculty’s community engaged research. To ensure clarity and consistency, key concepts and definitions utilized in this study are detailed below:

Community Engagement

This study utilizes the Carnegie Foundation’s definition of community engagement, as it is the primary definition accepted across the field of higher education. The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement as “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Public Purpose Institute, 2021).

Community Engaged Research

Community engaged research refers to the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community that embodies the characteristics of community engagement (e.g., mutual exchange of knowledge, reciprocal partnerships) and scholarship (e.g., demonstration of knowledge within an academic field or discipline). Community engaged research is thus defined as the exchange of mutually beneficial and societally relevant knowledge that is created with, communicated to, and validated by members both within community and the academe (Driscoll & Sandmann, 2002). Within this study, the term community engaged research is used more broadly to refer to both the processes faculty use to conduct research with community, as well as the products that derive from such collaboration.
Community Engaged Scholarship

This study utilizes the term community engaged scholarship in specific reference to the scholarly products or outputs created when faculty carry out community engaged research. It is important to differentiate community engaged research from its scholarship (e.g., products), as they are not used synonymously within this study and should not be conflated.

Engaged Faculty

Engaged faculty, in the context of this dissertation, refer to faculty members who carry out community engaged research as part of their academic position. While faculty engagement includes a myriad of actions (e.g., publicly engaged teaching, publicly engaged commercialized activities, publicly engaged service, etc.) references to engaged faculty within this study include only those who pursue community engaged research (Glass et al., 2011).

Promotion and Tenure

Though the definition, requirements, and benefits of promotion and tenure differ across institutions, within this study promotion and tenure is understood considering the American Association of University Professors and the Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure which has been endorsed by and adopted into faculty handbooks and collective bargaining agreements in over 250 institutions of higher education throughout the United States: “A tenured appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency and program discontinuation” (AAUP, 2021b). Additionally,

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society (AAUP & AACU, 2021, p. 14).
Traditional Research

Traditional research or the *scholarship of discovery*, often synonymized with scientific research, is inquiry that is entirely faculty expert-led and promotes institutional-driven knowledge production (Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & O’Meara, 2008). The identification of the problem, research design, data collection and analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results to the academy are done in isolation, without community involvement. While community members or organizations may be involved as subjects or beneficiaries in traditional research studies, they are not active participants in the overall research process (Boyer, 1990).

Dissertation Overview

The remainder of this dissertation reviews the relevant literature and describes the methodology utilized within this study. In Chapter Two literature pertinent to this study is reviewed, specifically the practice of community engagement and community engaged research within higher education, the institutionalization of community engagement, and the concept and practices of promotion and tenure. Chapter Three focuses on study design and methodology. Chapters Four and Five present and discuss the study’s relevant findings, offer general conclusions, and provide implications for future research and practice.
Chapter Two: Review of Relevant Literature

The Historical Roots of Community Engagement in Higher Education

There is a longstanding historical tradition for institutions of higher education and their faculty to engage their scholarly work in the public sphere. However, higher education has never been stagnant. It is ever changing in response to internal and external pressures and needs both from within the academy and the greater public (Ferren & Mussell, 2000; McKay & Rozee, 2004; Stiles & Robinson, 1973). To better understand the relevance of faculty’s engaged work today, it is important to first consider higher education’s relationship to the public within a historical context.

The history of institutional community engagement dates to American higher education’s establishment in the 17th century. Since its foundations, the advancement of the public good has been deeply rooted in creating a more educated society of skilled citizens (Liang, Sandmann, & Jaeger, 2015; Thelin, 2004; Veysey, 1965). Early colonial colleges were created with service to the public good as a central tenant. As Europeans quickly expanded West, the fledgling colonies required a class of educated individuals who could ensure their new society’s survival. The colonial colleges were founded with public service as a central aim, seeking to educate individuals who could sustain the growing political, social, economic, and religious institutions and ensure the survival of the colonies (Benson, Harkavy, & Hartley, 2005; Chambers, 2005; Thelin, 2004). During this rapid expansion, faculty, then identified as tutors, were considered servants to the public. Their work did not merely include voluntary service, rather faculty existed to serve. As Thelin (2004) noted, “unlike lawyers or physicians who were expected to be paid for their ministrations, faculty were more like volunteers engaged in public service” (p. 27).
As the colonies grew into a new nation and higher education evolved to meet new social challenges, so did the scope of faculty work. By the early 1800s the majority of faculty were no longer considered volunteers and a core of permanent faculty positions began to emerge within institutions. Core faculty were met with the expectation not only to train those destined for civil service, but also to instruct individuals who desired a general education (Cohen, 1998; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003). Higher education continued to grow and change in the mid-19th century with the passage of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, which allowed for the creation of land-grant colleges and universities focused on advancing agricultural, mechanical, and military sciences to aid the design and expansion of the developing nation (Benson et al., 2005; Chambers, 2005; Thelin, 2004). It was after the Morrill Acts in the late 19th century that universities began to add service to their institutional missions alongside teaching and research. Universities, originally devoted to the moral and educational development of students, were now explicitly taking a more active role and engaging their local citizens and communities (Chambers, 2005; O’Meara, 1997; Thelin, 2004). As urban research universities became more established in the late 1800s, they too made service to the public a central goal. For most 19th century urban research universities and land-grant institutions a public, service-oriented mission was the central charge (Benson et al., 2005; Thelin, 2004).

In the first half of the 20th century, in alignment with the emergence of the modern university, the role of faculty continued to evolve and the work became more professionalized. Changes to the faculty role included reduced religious connection, a more solidified career ladder, stricter adherence to an academic discipline, and more widespread adoption of engagement in service to the public (Rice et al., 2015; Wade & Demb, 2009). The professionalization of the faculty role was solidified in the mid-20th century as the academic
workforce grew exponentially. Faculty were increasingly asked to focus their research on the needs of the public and serve as consultants to both political and industry leaders (Finkelstein 1984; Ward, 2005).

During the country’s two World Wars, the American government increasingly relied on and funded institutions to focus research on national defense, health, and science, further connecting higher education to public need (Chambers, 2005). After the World Wars faculty continued to focus their work on the public sphere. The quick growth of federally funded research sustained partnerships between the American government and higher education to produce knowledge for the public good (Chambers, 2005; Cohen, 1998; Thelin, 2004). However, as the emphasis society placed on faculty research continued to expand, slowly the priorities of faculty began to shift. Ward (2003) noted that by the mid 20th century, “the ethos of what it meant to be a faculty member, at all types of institutions, included teaching and research; the challenge was to strike a balance between those functions while maintaining allegiance to society” (p. 33). The growing emphasis on faculty research created divisions and a perceived hierarchy among academic disciplines and institutions. The hard sciences quickly became the model for good research and isolated controlled inquiry, removed from social bias, emerged as the most prestigious form of scholarly work (Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003).

In the 1980s and early 1990s, higher education saw a steady increase of university-industry collaborations spurred by Reaganomics and an extremely market-oriented economic environment. The public sector became more privatized as neoliberalism and economic rationalism guided national policy (Currie & Newson, 1998; Fairweather, 1988; Kezar, 2005; Rhoades, 2006). Not immune to this economic swing, higher education and its faculty went through a fundamental shift. National policies moved away from the belief that public interest
was best served by separating public entities from the market to an ideology that promoted advancement through higher education’s involvement in commercial activities. As such, the relationship between institutions and faculty became increasingly formalized (Slaughter & Rhoades, 1993). Understanding the change in faculty roles because of this economic shift is critical to recognizing the current state of faculty and academic reward structures. As Rice, Saltmarsh, and Plater (2015) emphasized:

> During the past four decades the faculty role itself has transformed – becoming unbundled and confused … the dominance of the research-oriented universities led to the rise of a faculty that rather than being publicly engaged became increasingly individualistic and aggressively entrepreneurial. Attention to … any professional notion of the responsibility for the public good lost its meaning. (p. 256)

**Community Engagement among Marginalized Faculty and HBCUs**

It is important here to note how incredibly neglectful it is to push forward the narrative that faculty engagement with community was relatively nonexistent in the last century. Though primarily white institutions have recently experienced a newfound interest in their faculty’s community engagement, as will later be discussed, faculty of marginalized identities and minority serving institutions, primarily historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have long maintained a commitment to their local communities and engaged faculty (Gasman et al., 2015). HBCUs and faculty of color have a long, rich history of community engagement, despite being ignored by most engagement scholars. Faculty and staff of color, within and outside of HBCUs have played significant roles in their local communities in the areas of public health, literacy, voting, and civic/political engagement, well before the more well-known movement to “reclaim the public dimensions of higher education” (Gasman et al., 2015, p. 377).

The engagement of faculty of color, specifically within HBCUs arose in response to the historical abuse of marginalized groups and communities by researchers who primarily utilized
them as subjects, not *partners* in research, failing to consider their needs, ideas, and assets (Ortiz, Nash, Shea, Oetzel, Garoutte, Sanchez-Youngman, & Wallerstein, 2020). As such, much of the engaged work done by faculty of color seeks to remedy and alleviate the oppression of these communities and generate agency for groups and communities that have historically been marginalized, often by those within the academy (Baez, 2000; Verjee, 2012). Despite the long and rich history and commitment of faculty of color and HBCUs to their local communities, their work is often overlooked as narratives by dominant groups are generally legitimized within the academy and larger society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Henry & Tater, 2010). The prioritization of White, male voices within the field of higher education community engagement is no exception, as it was ultimately the work of Boyer (1990) that launched a national conversation about the engaged work of faculty.

**The Scholarship of Engagement Movement**

In response to the belief that higher education was drifting away from its socially focused roots, an undertaking in the late 20th century, referred to as the *scholarship of engagement movement*, was born. The movement called institutions to be more engaged in their local communities and value faculty whose work had a public mission. Championed by Ernest Boyer’s (1990) groundbreaking work, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and supported by major professional organizations such as the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, the movement demanded that faculty step out of the ivory tower to apply their knowledge to community problems and that institutions recognize the multiple forms of scholarship faculty chose to pursue (Boyer, 1990; Checkoway, 2001; O’Meara, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Boyer (1990) advocated that
universities realign their missions and faculty reward systems to acknowledge multiple forms of scholarship, including what he called the scholarships of discovery, teaching, integration, and application. Traditional research, that which Boyer (1990) identified as the scholarship of discovery, was one form of scholarship, not the only form of scholarship. Boyer believed such narrow understandings of scholarship impeded faculty from engaging in research that directly advanced the public good.

The scholarship of application, Boyer (1990) noted, is that which is most aligned with community and public needs. The scholarship of application, later called the scholarship of engagement, extended beyond the traditional service duties of faculty and connected the abundant resources of academic institutions to the most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems in community (Boyer, 1990). Boyer argued that academic work and how it got rewarded must change if institutions of higher education were to stay relevant in the evolving social landscape of the 21st century (Boyer, 1990; Kezar, 2005; Tierney & Perkins, 2015).

Boyer’s work and the movement it sparked had both an immediate and long-term impact. In 1994, just four years after the publication of Scholarship Reconsidered, the Carnegie Foundation surveyed Chief Academic Officers at four-year colleges and institutions and found that 80% of institutions had or were planning to reexamine faculty workloads due to Boyer’s effort. Further, 62% of institutions noted that Boyer’s (1990) work had influenced new discussions regarding faculty rewards (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Huber, 2002; O’Meara, 2005).

However, it is critical to understand that while the scholarship of engagement movement has had many successes in terms of encouraging conversation around the role of faculty and institutional rewards, in the 21st century national policy, economic trends and crises, leadership transitions, and disciplinary pushback have heavily influenced its forward progress (Rhoades,
2014; Sandmann, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009). In today’s current political context there remains little incentive for faculty to engage in scholarly work grounded in community. This is most notably seen in the way external research funding is valued and prioritized within the current structures of promotion and tenure. The corporatization and commercialization of higher education ushered in by neoliberalism, in conjunction with the decline in government funding, have pushed institutions to prioritize external funding sources that narrowly define academic excellence based on traditional research models (Kezar, 2005; Rhoades, 2015; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016).

Though the role of faculty and their relationship to the public good may have been clearly understood in years past, specifically within HBCUs and among faculty of color, many faculty today exist in institutional environments with growing, yet often ambiguous performance expectations, decreased funding, and increased accountability (Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003). Change within higher education, specifically related to funding, is not new. Institutions have long reevaluated and adapted to external priorities. However, the growing privatization of the public sector now offers a unique test, encouraging institutions to become increasingly more private and commercialized (Holland, 2005; Kerr, 1998; Kezar, 2005; Rice, 2005). For American higher education to continue to retain its distinguished status as the producers of public knowledge and social growth, institutions and their academic schools and departments must make clear the value and legitimacy of engaged research and create internal structures to reward those within the academy who pursue it.

**Community Engaged Research**

Within American higher education there exists a “savage ambition” to promote and highlight the traditional research profile of institutions to claim national and international
Though the focus of the academy has changed and evolved over time, the current emphasis for institutional advancement and prestige remains focused on traditional research (Popovich & Abel, 2002). The goal of strengthening an institution’s research profile most often means underscoring and valuing traditional scholarship and devaluing community engaged research. The distinction between these two forms of scholarship lies primarily in the goals of the researchers, study design, and dissemination of results. Traditional research focuses on knowledge production and advancement, while engaged research seeks social change, equitable justice, or local/regional community improvement (Strand et al., 2003; Ward, 2005).

Institutions that exclusively value traditional scholarship, often seen as the “gold standard” of research, operate from the belief that knowledge is best obtained by faculty pursuing their individual research agendas and producing scholarly outputs in the form of peer-reviewed publications (Green, 2008; Marrero, Hardwick, Staten, Savaiano, Odell, Frederickson-Comer, & Saha, 2013, p. 204; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). Thus, calls for higher education to contribute research more directly linked to public need and produce outputs for non-academic, community-based audiences challenges the traditional conceptions of research, how it is disseminated, and how it is rewarded. Nevertheless, there is a growing desire among today’s faculty to conduct research that directly benefits community, includes the voices and ideas of community members, addresses social and environmental inequities, and directly speaks to community audiences (Kennedy, Vogel, Goldberg-Freeman, Kass, & Farfel, 2009; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2008; Nyden, 2003; O’Fallon & Dearth, 2002).

There has long been a wide array of terminology used to describe and articulate scholarly work done in and/or with community. Various terms include community engaged research,
community-based research, public scholarship, participatory research, and publicly engaged scholarship (Doberneck et al., 2010; Holland, 2016; Liang et al., 2015; O’Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles Jr., 2011; Strand et al., 2003; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2005; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002). Due to the myriad of terms used to articulate research done in and/or with community, confusion over these terms has been identified as an obstacle to institutional leaders seeking to better understand and reward such work (Doberneck et al., 2010; Holland, 2016). For the purposes of this research and to ensure consistency of terminology, within this study community engaged research is used more broadly to refer to both the processes faculty use to conduct research with community, as well as the products that derive from such collaboration. The term community engaged scholarship is used in direct reference to the scholarly products or outputs created when faculty carry out community engaged research.

Community engaged research has a fundamentally intellectual foundation. It is not a new way to interpret volunteer service or applied research, nor is it a unidirectional outpouring of intellectual resources into community. Rather, community engaged research is a “reflection on [an] institution’s high interest in aligning academic strengths and assets with community conditions and expertise” (Boyer, 1990, 1996; Holland, 2005, p. 250; Strand et al., 2003). Though community engaged research takes many forms, it is distinctively scholarly. It takes cues from, but is fundamentally different than, traditional scholarship which is faculty expert-led, hierarchical, often contained within a single discipline, and promotes institution-driven knowledge production (Sandmann et al., 2008). Community engaged research is inherently collaborative, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial. In direct opposition to traditional research, community engaged research shares design, data collection, and reporting decisions with external community partners, moving away from the conception of research done on or in
community, to the notion that research is best done *with* community (Boyer, 1990; Holland, 2016; Strand et al., 2003). Community engaged research does not adhere to or live within a specific academic discipline; it is inherently transdisciplinary. Further, community engaged research does not exist within a certain methodology or framework, and rather operates as a *strategy* to approach research.

Faculty who pursue engaged research bring to their work a moral responsibility to apply their scholarship and practice to address social problems and community concerns (Deetz, 2008; Liang et al., 2015). At its core, community engaged research is fundamentally responsive to the needs and desires of community and their desired degree of collaboration. Highlighting community and institutional reciprocity, engaged research underscores mutually beneficial partnerships that produce co-created solutions (Liang et al., 2015; O’Meara, 1997). As Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, & Buglione (2009) emphasized, “reciprocity specifically signals a shift in campus-community partnerships toward relationships that are defined by multidirectional flows of knowledge and expertise between campus and community in collaborative efforts to address community-based issues” (p. 27).

This orientation is a fundamental shift away from the nature and purpose of traditional research, as the scholarly roles, functions, and methodologies engaged faculty employ require them to step outside of the ivory tower (Colbeck & Drago, 2005; Deetz, 2008; Liang et al., 2015). Community engaged research encourages community-identified needs and questions to lead inquiry, it empowers community members to act and create change within their neighborhoods, sustains organizational learning and growth, and builds knowledge, skills, and relationships among institutions and greater society (Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002). Community engaged research done well is often interdisciplinary, integrates scholarship, teaching, and public
engagement, and impacts wide-reaching audiences outside of the academy through scholarly and community-based dissemination of outputs (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). See Appendix F for additional information differentiating traditional and community-engaged research.

**Characteristics of Engaged Faculty**

Though this study will explore the processes of school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees when evaluating faculty’s engaged research, it is first important to examine the factors that influence faculty to pursue community engaged research which at times, is against their professional interests. The motivation for faculty to pursue engaged research is due not only to their personal characteristics, but also the environments in which they work (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011). There is an expansive array of literature exploring the characteristics and backgrounds of engaged faculty, most of which recognizes the complex intersectionality that affect faculty’s professional identities and orientations (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Holland, 2016; Nyden, 2003; Votruba, 2005; Wade & Demb, 2009).

**Gender, Race, Age, Epistemology, and Values**

Women are found to be more likely than men to carry out community engaged research (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Wade & Demb, 2009). Further, women reported that they were more likely than men (53% vs. 45%) to use their scholarship to address public needs (Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Faculty of color were also more likely than White male faculty to pursue community engaged research, provide services for local communities, or dedicate their scholarly work to promoting social change and equity (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011). Research by Ellison and Eatman (2008) revealed that many faculty of
color believe pursuing an engaged scholarly agenda is seen as unorthodox by their institution and a risky option for those early in their careers. Additionally, both women and faculty of color were identified as those most “disenchanted” with the tenure process; they reported less than favorable perceptions of the academic climate, fewer opportunities for professional recognition, and higher degrees of stress when compared to their White male counterparts (O’Meara, 2002; Sax, Astin, Arredondo, & Korn, 1996). The values and beliefs sustaining the traditional promotion and tenure processes do not appear to support the interests of a diverse faculty (Antonio et al., 2000; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). As Wade and Demb (2009) noted, like gender, it’s likely that race and personal beliefs about the role of higher education are “inextricably linked” and that “personal value and belief systems may be the critical factors which explain the patterns of involvement by gender and race” (p. 11).

Faculty’s age and epistemological stance have also been found to be important determinants in pursuing community engaged research. Faculty appointed to academic positions in the late 1960s and early 1970s who hold more traditional, objective epistemologies are less likely to pursue engaged research. However, a large percentage of those faculty are beginning to retire and be replaced by more diverse groups of faculty (Rice, 2005; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). Younger faculty, who are more likely to believe that there are multiple ways of knowing and creating knowledge are more likely to pursue an engaged scholarly agenda, though this stance runs counter to the standard epistemology of the academy (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011). This incoming wave of new faculty who are more racially and ethnically diverse, more female, and have an increased interest in non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., community engaged, interdisciplinary, web-based, etc.) reflect a more globally diverse world where information and knowledge are not as tightly controlled (Finkelstein, 2010;
Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). Holland (1997) found that this incoming generation of new faculty, along with their engaged peers currently in the academy, understand themselves to have a responsibility to apply their knowledge toward advancing the public good. However, most institutions are not equipped with formalized procedures or infrastructure to reward and promote such engaged work.

Gender, race, age, epistemology, and values of faculty have been shown to be significant determinants in faculty who pursue an engaged research agenda. Further, engaged faculty are those who find personal value in working with communities and have a clear orientation for social change and justice (Antonio, 2002; Ward, 2003). It is thus imperative to articulate that such findings clearly highlight the fact that the devaluing of engaged work and engaged faculty is an issue of equity. As engaged faculty tend to be those of marginalized identities, there is clearly a power differential in play.

**Appointment Type and Status**

In addition to faculty’s personal characteristics, the nature of the current higher education labor market and its evolution in the past thirty years has drastically affected faculty’s ability to pursue community engaged research (Giroux, 1999; Kezar, 2005). In many American institutions of higher education the majority of faculty are no longer full-time, tenure-track academics (Rice et al., 2015). At the beginning of the 21st century, over 50% of faculty were part-time, a figure that has risen dramatically since the 1980s when less than 15% of faculty were part-time (Kezar, 2005). Community engaged research and faculty’s dedication to working in community are greatly affected by these changes. The sharp rise of part-time and contingent faculty, to reduce institutional costs and emphasize corporatization, puts strain on faculty who
pursue engaged scholarship, as they cite insufficient time, energy, and resources to pursue their engaged work (Kezar, 2005).

The appointment type and status of faculty, specifically those who pursue an engaged research agenda, is an issue of equity. The diminishing number of available tenure-track positions intensifies the growing pressure on junior faculty to publish and further aggravates inequalities between white faculty and faculty of color. Faculty of color are considered late entrants into the academy compared to their white counterparts and are disadvantaged by the recent increased publication requirements to secure tenure which evidences racial inequities in the academic hiring and tenure processes (Rucks-Ahidiana, 2019; Warren, 2019). A study by Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, and Bonous-Hammarth (2000) found that Black faculty are often less tenured, have lower academic rank, and less academic stature than their white faculty counterparts. When considering that studies have also found faculty who are committed to pursuing community engagement tend to be those with “less status”, it is not difficult to recognize the inequitable nature of promotion and tenure, specifically for engaged faculty of color (Wade & Demb, 2009, p. 11).

The connection of motivation and individual characteristics when it comes to engaged faculty illustrates that most engaged faculty act on their own intrinsic and personal motivations, either initially by either not pursuing a tenure-track position, or after extrinsic motivations (e.g., tenure) have passed (Jaeger & Thornton, 2006). Studies have found that of tenure-track faculty who do pursue an engaged research agenda, mid- and late-career faculty were more likely than early-career faculty to do so (Braxton, Luckey, & Hellend, 2002; Karpiak, 1996; O’Meara, 2003). As tenure-track faculty become more comfortable with their professional responsibilities and face less pressure to produce traditional scholarship once they have received tenure,
community engaged research and community engaged scholarship become a more viable option. Tenure-track faculty seeking promotion and tenure earlier in their careers are deterred from pursuing community engaged research as it was viewed by their peers as an insufficient way to achieve promotion and tenure (O’Meara, 2003). Extrinsic rewards, such as tenure, influenced faculty’s direction of work more in the early stages of their careers and intrinsic motivators were more likely to influence faculty once they had achieved tenure (Austin & Gameson, 1983; O’Meara, 2003). In a study that measured the engagement of faculty by rank-type, Hurtado, Eagan, Pryor, Whang, and Tran (2012) found that the pressure to produce peer-reviewed publications was much greater in the pre-tenure years, as the percentages of faculty who pursued community engaged research was higher for tenured assistant professors than for untenured assistant professors (46.9% vs. 38.7%).

**Characteristics of Engagement Within Academic Disciplines**

In addition to individual faculty characteristics, academic disciplines and department standards play a large part in influencing or deterring faculty from conducting community engaged research. The majority of faculty are socialized into discipline-specific expectations in graduate school, quickly embedding their identities within disciplinary and departmental norms and values (O’Meara, 2005; Rice, 2002; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). Disciplinary norms carry much weight influencing or deterring the type of scholarship faculty pursue and how they understand the nature of faculty work. These norms and values have been found to hold across many institutional types and environments (Antonio et al., 2000; O’Meara, 2005).

Each discipline’s unique subject matter helps to establish how faculty within those disciplines defines the dimension of knowledge, modes of inquiry, and reference and/or expert groups (Doberneck & Schweitzer, 2012). As such, disciplinary characteristics are primarily seen
as stronger influence on faculty’s engagement than institutional affiliation or norms (Antonio et al., 2000; Ward, 2003; Zlotkowski, 2005). There are certain disciplines that consistently report higher levels of community engaged research including the health sciences, social sciences, education, nursing, and social work (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Cope & Leatherwood, 2001; Holland, 2016; O’Meara, 2005; O’Meara, et al., 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Conversely, academic disciplines that report lower levels of engaged research include the physical sciences, humanities, math/statistics, and engineering (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Holland, 2016; O’Meara, et al., 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2010).

The variation in disciplinary orientation to community engagement is often attributed to the fundamental differences between disciplines such as the physical and biological sciences and more community-oriented, applied disciplines such as education, health professions, and social work (Wade & Demb, 2009). Studies have also shown that the type of engagement varies among disciplines, as engaged faculty in STEM disciplines are most likely to believe it essential to be involved in work regarding environmental sustainability and clean up, while faculty in social science disciplines are more intent toward actively solving the problems of society (Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Because of these recognized disciplinary variations in engagement, there is clear evidence for not adopting a “one-size-fits-all” approach to supporting, recognizing, and rewarding faculty engagement.

However, it is not unusual that community engaged scholarship is more readily accepted in some academic disciplines than others. Because research has shown that faculty in the social sciences tend to be more inclined to adopt an engaged research agenda than those within STEM-based disciplines, this study specifically recruited participants from the larger social science and STEM fields to ensure an adequate representation of disciplinary perspectives. Acknowledging
that the way faculty and review committees within certain disciplines define, understand, and reward engaged research differ, this study sought to include voices of faculty within across various disciplines, within the general fields of social science and STEM.

**Institutional Characteristics of Engagement**

Institutions that want to develop and strengthen a culture of community engagement on their campuses do not need to mandate or even encourage all faculty to conduct community engaged research. However, institutions must ensure that those faculty who do elect to carry out engaged research are not penalized, and rather that engaged work is equally valued across all academic disciplines and departments (Cope & Leatherwood, 2001). As such, it is becoming increasingly important to understand more broadly how institutional contexts, missions, and cultures encourage engagement to “take root in some institutional contexts more readily than others” (Holland, 2005, p. 235-236). Studies have shown institutions that are more likely to adopt an engagement-centered mission: (a) emphasized teaching and learning more than research, (b) enrolled mostly local students, (c) were centered in areas with significant social and economic challenges, and (d) exhibited some confusion about the institutional mission, priorities, and/or focus of academic programs (Holland, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

In line with Holland’s (2005) work, research universities were identified as the institution-type most resistant to adopting a community engaged mission, as they “often lag in developing the intellectual frameworks, policies, and infrastructure to support academic public engagement” (Ellison & Eatman, 2008, p. xiii). At elite research institutions, community engaged scholarship is still often identified as volunteer service, even when it adheres to traditionally rigorous academic standards for research and dissemination (Holland, 2005; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities, 1999). Thus, it is the
comprehensive research universities that have been found to struggle most with understanding, valuing, and institutionalizing engaged research on their campuses and within their academic departments (Rice, 1991).

It is no surprise that faculty at research institutions displayed higher publication rates in traditional academic journals in comparison to their peers at teaching-oriented institutions (Braxton et al., 2002; Creswell, 1985; Finkelstein, 1984; Fulton & Trow, 1974). In the same vein, it is not surprising that in promotion and tenure decisions, research institutions assigned greater weight for publication in traditional academic outlets than all other dissemination types combined (Alshare, Wenger, & Miller, 2007). Thus, faculty at research institutions are more likely to struggle with conceptualizing community engaged research and community engaged scholarship, due to the heavy pressure to excel in traditional research while seeking promotion and tenure (O’Meara, 2003). The fact that research institutions have such deeply held norms valuing traditional research and traditional scholarly outputs over all other forms of scholarship and dissemination severely limit not only faculty, but the institution from adopting a more engaged-focus mission and culture.

As many research institutions have found success through more traditional conceptions of research and scholarship, it is understandable that such institutions would not elect to change or pivot away from their current respected identities. For some research institutions that have chosen to adopt a more engaged mission, the answer might lie in their relationship to their surrounding environment and desire to distinguish themselves from peers. Weerts and Sandmann (2008) found that land-grant institutions struggled more than their urban counterparts to infuse engagement within their institutional missions and formal reward structures. Conversely, urban institutions more easily embraced and infused engagement into their...
institutional structures, likely due to their proximity to community (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Holland (2005) noted that the language and values of engaged research were more easily digested and institutionalized by urban universities since most are relatively young and more pliable. Further, as Holland (2005) and Weerts and Sandmann (2008) hypothesized, urban research institutions used engagement to differentiate themselves from their more traditionally established and prestigious peers. Understanding that they lacked the resources to excel as traditional research universities, urban institutions were more likely to carve out identities founded on more unique academic pathways with different standards of excellence (Holland, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

While the stereotypical description of American higher education is that traditional research isolated within an institution is most prestigious, the movement to increase the value and respect for those who conduct research in and with community is growing (Glassick et al., 1997; Holland, 2005). The issue, however, is that if the traditional research university is seen as the ideal model of American higher education, the push to institutionalize and legitimize other forms of scholarship will be increasingly difficult. The previous scholarship identifying research universities as those most hesitant to adopt structures, policies, and procedures to reward engaged faculty informed the selection of institutions within this multi-site case study, which will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Three.

**Institutional Culture and Community Engagement**

While academic discipline or institution-type are not definitive determinants of which faculty will conduct engaged research, an institution’s culture, mission, and structures to reward scholarship of any type will inevitably play a role in faculty’s academic pursuits. In the diverse American higher education landscape there is no one model of an engaged institution that excels
over others. Just as institutions, their missions, environments, and faculties differ, so too do the ways they may choose to infuse community engagement into their university culture and reward structures. Benson et al. (2005) noted that in the early 21st century higher education appeared to be slowly changing and diversifying in ways that promoted institutional engagement. However, the movement to legitimize and value community engagement within institutions must go beyond pure promotion of such work and rather should, “manifest an alignment of commitment, mission, public declaration, resources, policies and procedures, planning, measurable goals, and accountability” (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006, p. 22; Sandmann et al., 2008; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). Institutional culture greatly affects what types of scholarship faculty pursue, as the academic culture quickly informs faculty if their engaged scholarship will be valued or readily discarded (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011). As such, without an alignment and purposeful commitment to engagement, institutions will not be able to support and retain innovative young faculty, diversify their mission, or serve the communities of which they are a part – the fundamental purpose of higher education (Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016).

Research has shown that institutional culture plays a substantial role in a university’s commitment to the institutionalization of engagement, as well as the commitment of its members to such an endeavor (Noel & Earwicker, 2015; Thornton & Zuiches, 2009). Institutional culture is understood as the way things are done, that which is embedded in an institution’s language, stories, rituals, and traditions and drives university members’ purpose and passion for their work (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Thornton & Zuiches, 2009). Though a specific university culture might not be actively created and encouraged, a unique culture in any institution will emerge from the values held by its leadership, faculty, staff, and students (Cope & Leatherwood, 2001). In many cases, institutional cultures evolve and change over time, ebbing and flowing with the perceived
values, attitudes, and traditions of its members and leadership (Cope & Leatherwood, 2001; McKay & Rozee, 2004). While blatant attempts to quickly and radically change an institution’s culture have been found to be unsuccessful, intentionally developing and cultivating an institutional culture that values and rewards faculty who pursue community engagement requires changes not only in policies and procedures, but a change in the attitudes and beliefs of institutional leadership, academic/department leadership, faculty, and staff (Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005; Cope & Leatherwood, 2001; Schein, 1992).

Institutional mission is widely understood to be one of the most important influences on faculty’s values, attitudes, and beliefs. Institutional missions work to clarify and reveal institutional priorities and serve as a means by which members come together to work toward a specific purpose (Braxton et al., 2002; Holland, 2005; O’Meara, 2002; Ruscio, 1987). Interestingly, Holland (2005) asserted that in the 21st century engagement remained a perplexing matter to institutions that were “relatively self-assured about their current mission, priorities, and status, [those] that [were] highly regarded in various ranking and classification systems” (p. 240). Additionally, Holland (2005) found that creating and cultivating a mission centered on public service and institutional engagement resonated most strongly with institutions that felt a need to refocus or rebrand their image, address competing institutional visions, or realign their work with their historical roots. Thus, scholars assert that infusing an institution’s mission with a commitment to advancing the public good is fueled primarily by opportunities to shape, reshape, or overhaul institutional identity (Holland, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

While there are numerous approaches, philosophies, and methods institutions may take to cultivate a culture of engagement, success in doing so largely occurs as an individual choice of institutional leadership and a commitment to ensuring measurable results (Furco & Miller, 2009;
Sandmann & Plater, 2009). Though institutional leadership is wide-ranging and multifaceted, institutions that have successfully adopted and maintained a culture of engagement have leaders that speak consistently about their engaged mission, embed it in institutional planning, create infrastructure to support and strengthen it, and publicly embrace faculty who pursue community engaged research (Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Votruba, 2005).

**Institutionalizing Community Engagement**

Though faculty, specifically those of marginalized identities, have long been engaged with their local communities in mutually beneficial and reciprocal ways, the reconceptualization of scholarship and conversation about what should be considered legitimate scholarship within the academy was only recently ignited in the early 1990s. Discussion of the formal commitments of institutions to the engaged work of their faculty through leadership, infrastructure, mission, and culture has made the term institutionalization “the pinnacle indicator of success” (Holland, 2009, p. 85). Institutionalization, broadly defined, is understood as “the process whereby specific cultural elements or cultural objects are adopted by actors in a social system” (Clark, 1971, p. 75). It is the point where novel practices and ideas lose their specialness and become routine, moving from the periphery to an institution’s core functions (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974; Braxton et al., 2002).

Scholarship that addresses the institutionalization of community engagement within higher education has primarily discussed issues related to institutional leadership (Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Votruba, 2005), rewarding community engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure (Alperin et al., 2018; Alshare et al., 2007; Day et al., 2013; Glass et al., 2011; Marrero et al., 2013; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr. Ward, & Buglione, 2009), the evaluation of institutional engagement (Burack & Saltmarsh,
2006; Franz, Childers, & Sanderlin, 2012; Furco & Miller, 2009), community partnerships (Accardi, 2018; Beere, 2009; Janke, 2009), and service-learning and curricular-based engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; 2009).

For any innovative practice to be institutionalized, it must be advanced to the level of second-order changes, moving beyond isolated programs, departments, or offices (Sandman et al., 2008). Braxton, Luckey, and Hellend (2002) argued that institutionalized change must occur within three levels – structural, procedural, and incorporation. At the structural level, institutionalization occurs when new knowledge and behaviors are understood and there is some form of measurement in place to assess the newly learned behaviors. Structural institutionalization includes the creation of additional infrastructure and personnel to administer change (Braxton et al., 2002). At the procedural level, behaviors and policies are standardized and become part of normal operating procedures across academic departments, schools, and the entire institution (Braxton et al., 2002). Incorporation, the deepest level of institutionalization, occurs when the values and norms of the change are incorporated into the institution’s overall culture and there is a consensus and awareness of all members that the change is valued and supported (Braxton et al., 2002; Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Specifically, in relation to the institutionalization of engagement within higher education, Holland’s (1997; 2005; 2009; 2016) extensive research identified the following most important organizational factors influencing an institution’s commitment to engagement: (a) mission, (b) promotion, tenure, and hiring practices, (c) organizational infrastructure and funding, (d) student involvement and curriculum, (e) faculty involvement, (f) community involvement, (g) external communications and fundraising, (h) leadership, (i) policy, and (j) internal budget. Holland (2005) noted that these concepts represent the most common elements supporting the
institutionalization of engagement across a campus, however acknowledged that attention given
to each varies among institutions and their specific environments, needs, and goals. Holland
(2005) further explained that for community engagement to be valued and institutionalized
within a university it must be present within structures, guidelines, and procedures not only at the
institutional level, but also within school- and department-levels. Though change often occurs in
a top-down fashion with the hopes of trickling down to influence school and department norms
and values, it is essential that such change reaches leaders within academic schools and
departments.

For a mission and culture of engagement to be institutionalized throughout all areas of a
campus, there must be acceptance of and support for engaged research among upper-level
institutional leaders (e.g., presidents and provosts), faculty across multiple disciplines and
departments, and leaders within the middle ground of institutions (e.g., department chairs, senior
faculty, and center/program directors) (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). For such innovative and
transformative change to occur, it is imperative that all members within an institution become
aware of and value the change and ultimately alter the ways they think about and perform their
academic duties (McKay & Rozee, 2004; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, &
Buglione, 2009). As academic disciplines and departmental cultures are known to heavily
influence the type of scholarship faculty pursue (Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014; Wade & Demb,
2009; Ward, 2003), changes, specifically those within promotion and tenure policies, must be
made and supported at all levels within an institution (Braxton et al., 2002; O’Meara, 2005).
Thus, the creation of a supportive environment for faculty who pursue community engaged
research requires of most institutions changes in both the institutional and departmental culture.
Institutions will fail to achieve lasting, transformational change unless it is infused throughout all
academic homes (e.g., departments, disciplines, graduate, programs, etc.) (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). Valuing at an institutional level the work of scholars who conduct community engaged research but dismissing it within the discipline or department-level is not only dysfunctional but debilitating. As Ramaley (2000) noted:

Unless the institution embraces the value as well as the validity of engagement as legitimate scholarly work and provides both moral support and concrete resources to sustain the work, engagement will remain individually defined by the interests of committed faculty and sporadic in nature. (p. 9)

To ensure engagement is infused throughout the entire campus and not relegated to certain departments, offices, or programs, it must align with existing institutional structures and procedures. Though the creation of new centralized offices or units with professional staff to support engagement highlights commitment by campus leadership, engagement cannot exist solely within newly created structures. Rather, it must also be infused into existing units, offices, and procedures to fully take root (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2016; Hudson, 2018). While the movement to explicitly incorporate engagement within the missions, culture, and infrastructure of institutions is a relatively new phenomenon, it is understandable that most organizational structures to assist such institutionalization are young. Accardi (2018) noted that in a study of 95 universities who have made a commitment to institutionalizing engagement on their campuses, 88% had a central campus-wide office to coordinate engagement. The average age of a central office was less than 20 years old (Accardi, 2018).

Even with centralized infrastructure, committed leadership, and a mission espousing the values of advancing the public good, efforts to institutionalize engagement may easily encounter resistance. Faculty and staff may initially resist change because they either do not feel in control or fail to understand it. Further, institutionalization is quite difficult to measure in that engagement itself, specifically community engaged research, challenges many of the traditional
values of academic success and prestige. Due to this and the various other difficulties campuses face when attempting to institutionalize engagement, faculty frequently run up against many barriers at both the institutional and school/departmental levels that prevent them from pursuing community engaged research.

**Barriers to Institutionalizing Community Engaged Research**

Though the benefits of community engaged research are far-reaching, within institutions of higher education such work exists in “space[s] of omission” (Shaker, 2015, p. 9). However, the movement dedicated to furthering community engagement within the academy is expansive and ever-growing. There is much existing literature dedicated to better understanding faculty who pursue community engaged research and the institutions that support them. Such research focuses primarily on the personal characteristics of engaged faculty (Antonio et al., 2000; Baez, 2000; O’Meara et al., 2011), faculty motivation or influences to pursue engaged work (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Holland, 2016; Nyden, 2003; Votruba, 2005; Wade & Demb, 2009), levels of faculty engagement (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006), types of scholarly engagement (Boyer, 1990, 1996; Deetz, 2008; Doberneck et al., 2010; Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2011; Schomberg & Farmer, 1994; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002), and institutional influences and barriers to engaged work (Ahmed, Beck, Maurana, & Newton, 2004; Alperin et al., 2018; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Day et al., 2013; Diamond, 2005). Most pertinent to this study is the strand of scholarship identifying institutional barriers that prevent faculty from pursuing engaged research and what hinders them from being appropriately recognized or rewarded within the structures of promotion and tenure.
Holland (2016) found that the most frequent institutional barriers cited by engaged faculty preventing them from conducting engaged scholarship are concern about the length of time it takes, resources needed to conduct engaged research, and apprehension of how their engaged work will be evaluated within promotion and tenure. Time, a precious resource for tenure-track faculty, is a major barrier. The time needed to cultivate community partnerships, organize logistics, identify research questions with community, and ultimately carry out research with external partners often requires more time than traditional scholarship (Ahmed et al., 2004; Holland, 2016; Israel, Schultz, Parker, & Becker, 1998; Nyden, 2003). Further, research grants typically do not provide the needed time and resources for developing reciprocal faculty-community relationships, building community capacity, or sharing results with community stakeholders, all of which are essential tenants to quality community engaged research (Ahmed et al., 2014; Marrero et al., 2013; Nyden, 2003). In addition to time and resources, engaged faculty often find their work at odds with the way their institutions or academic disciplines and departments understand scholarship. Since the rise of the American research university and the professionalization of faculty, faculty roles and identities have become increasingly tied to a discipline or department-centric culture. (Rice, 2002; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). The transdisciplinary nature of community engaged research which encourages faculty to step out of the traditional bounds of academic disciplines and institutions themselves, is at odds with how faculty have been socialized into specific, individual disciplines during graduate school and beyond (Rice, 2002; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014).

Further, the nontraditional timelines, organizational structures, and scholarly products produced by engaged scholarship are often confusing and difficult for nonengaged faculty to understand and appropriately evaluate. Many faculty who carry out community engaged
research organize their scholarship around *projects* that are more loosely framed to bring about specific community results, events, or resources and do not easily fit into rigid timelines (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Scholarly outputs also tend to differ drastically from those of traditional research, as community engaged research broadens the conception of what constitutes as scholarly output and who qualifies as a peer reviewer (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr. Ward, & Buglione, 2009). As such, department heads and promotion and tenure committee members who evaluate community engaged research are hindered by their departments and disciplines’ rigid definitions and reward structures that are not responsive to engaged scholarship’s varying timelines and scholarly outputs.

To ensure faculty members’ engaged research is appropriately evaluated at the school-, department- and institutional-levels, it is essential that institutions and the schools and academic departments within them redefine what constitutes scholarly and creative work (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). As engaged research encompasses various forms of knowledge production *with* community, it is vital that those evaluating engaged research acknowledge the different scholarly products engaged scholarship may produce (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 1997). It must be understood that engaged research is research done *with* community, utilizing faculty’s academic expertise and is an intellectual process that is just as rigorous and requires just as much commitment as that of traditional research (O’Meara, 1997). Though its location and scholarly products often differ from traditional scholarship, community engaged research is just as *scholarly* of a process and, like traditional scholarship, can be done well and can be done poorly (O’Meara, 1997).

Further, it is essential that when evaluating engaged research, what is counted and valued is expanded to outputs outside of traditional peer-reviewed publications. A large challenge for
engaged researchers is concern about where to disseminate their scholarship, as not all community engaged research results in peer-reviewed publications (O’Meara, Eatman, & Petersen, 2015). A broader spectrum of creative and scholarly work is needed to encompass the nontraditional scholarly outputs of engaged research such as community presentations, technical reports, program creation/evaluation, and policy briefs (Ellison & Eatman 2008). In the same vein, local, regional, and national audiences must be equally valued, as engaged research directly addresses local/regional public concerns and includes scholarly endeavors that are jointly planned, carried out, and disseminated in conjunction with community members (Boyer, 1990; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara et al., 2015). It is important for promotion and tenure policies to articulate the value of local audiences to make clear that local/regional impact can be just as valuable as national or international reach (O’Meara et al., 2015). Further, the peer review process poses a challenge to many engaged scholars. To ensure community engaged research is equally valued in school- and department-level promotion and tenure review, it is necessary to make peer review more inclusive and expand who is considered a peer. Many times, those most appropriate to review community engaged work are outside of the academy and rather in K-12 schools, government, museums, or nonprofit organizations. (O’Meara et al., 2015). It is thus important for promotion and tenure committees to work within schools and departments to create a pool of potential community-based reviewers who can serve as experts (Ellison & Eatman, 2008).

Though an increasing number of faculty embrace community engaged research, there is still very little evidence that institutions formally value or reward it through promotion and tenure (Alperin et al., 2018; Driscoll, 2005; O’Meara, 2005; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). In a study exploring the engagement of faculty at five campuses of the University of Massachusetts,
Saltmarsh and Wooding (2016) found that over half of faculty claimed to be involved in community engaged research. However, those faculty who forgo traditional scholarship in favor of community engaged research do so to their own professional detriment (O’Meara, 2011). The gap between the number of faculty pursuing community engaged research and the lack of its institutional acceptance perpetuates the belief that community engaged scholarship lacks legitimacy and value within the academy (Holland, 2005). Though much has been done within and outside of the academy to encourage the adoption of reward structures that value community engaged research, most notably the Carnegie Foundation’s elective community engagement classification, faculty continue to cite institution-, school-, and department-level barriers to pursuing engaged work.

**The Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification**

Within the field of higher education, the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification for community engagement is widely acknowledged as the premier indicator that a campus has successfully institutionalized engagement (Driscoll, 2008; 2009; Noel & Earwicker, 2015). As such, only institutions who were classified or reclassified in 2020 were considered for inclusion in this study, as will later be discussed in Chapter Three. Influenced by early assessment tools and currently housed within Albion College’s Public Purpose Institute, the Carnegie community engagement classification has solidified the importance of assessing institutions’ commitment to engagement, while simultaneously “encompass[ing] the broadest conception of interactions between higher education and community to promote inclusivity” (Driscoll, 2009, p. 6). The classification, fundamentally grounded in recognizing the importance of mutually beneficial and reciprocal university-community partnerships, serves to guide campuses to institutionalizing engagement in a way that is most meaningful to their own institutional and community contexts.
Like the process of accreditation or self-study, the Carnegie community engagement classification is an elective classification that requires aspiring institutions to produce lengthy documentation of their efforts to institutionalize engagement across their campus. Documentation is evaluated by a national review panel of higher education community engagement experts to determine if a campus qualifies to be classified as engaged (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). The classification is not a ranking system or reward and is based on institutions’ voluntary participation. Adding to the national conversation of institutional engagement by capturing the engaged work of campuses in a more robust and systematic way, the classification involves data collection and documentation of important aspects of institutional mission, culture, identity, infrastructure, and procedures (McCormick & Zhao, 2005; Public Purpose Institute, 2021). The classification encourages individual institutions to create systems and procedures to better understand, evaluate, and improve engagement on their campuses (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). An institution receiving the classification is recognized for institutionalizing engagement and infusing it into their core aspects of mission, culture, reward structures, and commitments. Driscoll (2009) noted that the classification affirms that the practices of engagement, “have been developed to the extent that they are aligned with the institutional identity and are an integral component of the institutional culture” (p. 5).

The classification was created in 2005, the first of a series of additional classification schemes that were a direct result of the foundation’s reexamination of the traditional Carnegie classification system (Driscoll, 2009). Several large, national groups aided the foundation’s development of the community engagement classification including the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, National Campus Compact, and the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (Noel & Earwicker, 2015). The first institutions to
receive the classification were awarded in 2006 and a second round of institutions were named in 2008. Currently, the application cycle opens every two years. Institutions who have received the classification are required to reapply to maintain their status every six years (Public Purpose Institute, 2021).

Since its inception in 2005, the classification has steadily gained prominence within higher education. Although all institutional documentation efforts and applications are not made public, a national picture of engagement is beginning to emerge as more and more institutions receive the classification. As of today, 359 institutions have received the elective classification and almost all states have at least one institution represented (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). It is important to note, however, that due to the voluntary nature of the classification, there are likely many universities and colleges that are meaningfully engaged in their communities and have infused engagement into their institutional identities, missions, structures, and procedures, but have chosen not to apply.

Though the classification application and the questions which comprise it are not made public, the major components of the application seek to uncover how institutions have, or have not, institutionalized engagement on their campuses. Holland (2009) noted that the application includes questions on the following aspects of institutionalizing engagement: (a) leadership, (b) infrastructure, (c) internal and external funding and fundraising, (d) systems of evaluating engagement, (e) defining engagement in institutional planning documents, (f) professional development, (g) community voice, (h) curricular engagement, and (i) rewarding and recognizing engaged scholarship. For the purposes of this dissertation, focus is given to the question of institutional reward and recognition of engaged research and engaged scholarship. Community engagement, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation, cannot be fully
institutionalized if a campus lacks clearly defined pathways for reward, promotion, and tenure for faculty who conduct engaged scholarship.

In the first two rounds of the Carnegie community engagement classification, reporting on promotion and tenure as it related to engaged research was optional. For institutions that chose to report on how their institution infused engagement in reward structures, most noted that they made specific policy revisions to better accommodate the language of engaged work at the institutional level (Holland, 2009). The most common approach to revising reward structures was to make modest revisions in the guidelines to clarify where engaged work should be presented within a faculty member’s portfolio (Holland, 2009). Most revisions made room for engaged scholarship in the service section and made little mention of rewarding engagement in alignment with a faculty member’s research.

Although the changes to promotion and tenure guidelines were relatively modest for the first two groups of institutions who sought the classification, there was much evidence that institutions that merely applied for the classification benefited tremendously from the process itself (Driscoll, 2008; Furco & Miller, 2009; Noel & Earwicker, 2015; Thornton & Zuiches, 2009). The rigorous application process required institutions, if they had not already, formalize their institutional goals, mission, and strategic plan to include engagement and develop institutional strategies to ensure it was a fundamental component of their institutional identity. Driscoll (2008) contended that the application process motivated institutions, even those with deeply engrained commitments to community, to examine the underlying philosophies and processes that promoted or discouraged engagement on their campuses. Thus, the growing national recognition accompanying the classification and the increasing number of institutions seeking recognition of their engagement efforts led Driscoll (2008) to contend that the
classification has “enhanced both the prominence and promise of community engagement in higher education” (p. 41). A study of institutions that received the classification in 2010 helped to confirm Driscoll’s proclamation, as Noel and Earwicker (2015) discovered that to complete the application, 58% of applying institutions claimed they made at least some change to their institutional mission to better incorporate engagement. This led Noel and Earwicker to conclude that “there is clear evidence of institutional change as a result of applying for the classification” (p. 55).

However, the institutional change encouraged by the application process does not reach all areas of campus equally, if at all. Although the classification now requires institutions to provide evidence that they recognize and reward engaged research through formal policies and procedures, findings from a study analyzing applications, faculty handbooks, and interviews with key institutional leaders from institutions already classified highlighted the need for immediate and “significant revision of institutional policies that reward faculty for community engaged scholarship” (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, & Buglione, 2009, p. 28). Nearly half of the institutions in the study were still in the process of revising their promotion and tenure policies and noted that the most common change that occurred due to the revision process was the adoption of guidelines that broadened the definition and understanding of what is considered scholarly activity (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, & Buglione, 2009). Though it is promising that research (Driscoll, 2008; Furco & Miller, 2009; Noel & Earwicker, 2015; Thornton & Zuiches, 2009) has discovered the many institutions classified as community engaged, have, or are currently taking measures to broaden their promotion and tenure guidelines, Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, and Buglione (2009) suggested that most campuses maintained traditional approaches to evaluating community engaged scholarship and relied almost entirely on academic peer-
reviewed publications to count as the sole scholarly output valued in promotion and tenure decisions. As the scholarly products and outputs of community engaged research often differ drastically from those of traditional scholarship, there is a fundamental gap between how institutions say they reward engaged faculty and the evaluative actions of promotion and tenure committees. This alarming disconnect has broad and far-reaching implications for institutions with and without the Carnegie classification that say they value and reward engaged work, but do not properly understand or evaluate it within promotion and tenure.

**Promotion and Tenure**

Promotion and tenure have been the primary components of the academic reward system for decades. At the end of the 20th century, over 95% of traditional American higher education institutions had some form of tenure (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Although there have been various modifications to promotion and tenure throughout the last century (e.g., post-tenure review, probationary periods, adjusting the timeclock, etc.) such changes have not significantly altered the fundamental structures of the academic reward system (Chait, 1995; Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Tenure was originally created to allow faculty to take intellectual risks and advance and further define the academic profession (Tierney & Perkins, 2015). The 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sought to further establish public engagement within the academic profession declaring, “the conception of a university as an ordinary business venture, and of academic teaching as purely private employment, manifests also a radical failure to apprehend the nature of the social function discharged by the professional scholar” (AAUP, 2021a, p. 294).
However, in the second half of the 20th century the stakes for securing promotion and tenure and lifetime employment in a volatile job market rose so high that faculty became risk averse (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). As the research university culture increasingly expanded its influence over American higher education, scholars understood the pathway to promotion and tenure was paved with peer-reviewed articles in high-impact journals (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). As publish or perish quickly became the mantra for most scholars, there was a shift in the expectation of faculty that tenure was only about benefiting the individual and not the institutions or communities which they served (Rice et al., 2015). However, if, as the Carnegie classification suggests, community engagement is an essential component within American higher education, efforts to realign promotion and tenure structures to reflect and encourage the public outreach mission of higher education is essential. There are no issues as fundamental to the institutionalization and legitimation of engaged scholarship within the academy than the restructuring of promotion and tenure and ensuring that those who reward it (e.g., institutional leadership, department heads and committees, etc.) are knowledgeable and accepting of it.

Evidenced earlier, promotion and tenure, specifically when it concerns engaged faculty and faculty of color, is an issue of equity, as community engagement is most often pursued by faculty of marginalized identities (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011; Wade & Demb, 2009). Specifically for faculty of color, as Rockquemore and Laszloffy (2008) contend, “the challenge of winning tenure without losing your soul is situated against the backdrop of racial oppression” (p. 123).

With this, it is imperative that change in promotion and tenure must penetrate all levels of an institution. If engagement is recognized at an institutional level but dismissed at a school- or department-level, institutional values and norms supporting community engaged research will
not prevail (Braxton et al., 2002). At the school- and department-level, promotion and tenure review processes have been critiqued for disadvantaging interdisciplinary work, discouraging collaborative scholarship, and not recognizing outputs of scholarship that differ from traditional peer-reviewed publications (Alperin et al., 2018; O’Meara, 2005; Strand et al., 2003; Ward, 2005). Even in universities that tout institutional guidelines that are favorable to and encouraging of engagement, at the school- and department-levels, community engaged research exists in a space of omission. Most efforts to reform promotion and tenure guidelines have not addressed issues of peer review, local vs. national impact, or the appropriate evaluation of engaged work. Further, almost no reformed promotion and tenure guidelines address how to equip promotion and tenure committees to evaluate engaged research adequately and fairly (O’Meara et al., 2015).

As such, faculty members continue to cite school- and department-level policies and practices as substantial barriers to conducting community engaged research (Doberneck, 2016; Wegner, Hawkins, & Seifer, 2012). School and department cultural norms play a significant role in faculty’s uncertainty of how their engaged work will be evaluated by their colleagues (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; McKay & Rozee, 2004). In a study that surveyed over 700 Chief Academic Officers of nonprofit four-year colleges and universities, O’Meara (2005) identified that four of the most cited barriers hindering the advancement of engaged research in promotion and tenure policies were: (a) already tenured faculty members’ desire to maintain the status quo; (b) confusion about what type of scholarship should count, (c) graduate school training and socialization toward traditional understandings of scholarship, and (d) confusion regarding the placement of engaged research in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
Compartmentalizing Engagement: Teaching, Research, and Service

The issue of compartmentalizing engagement within the tightly defined categories of teaching, research, and service is difficult for most engaged faculty, as community engaged research is integrated and interconnected (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006). The way faculty believe their work will be classified, defined, and perceived by their institutions, departments, and colleagues in promotion and tenure greatly affects the extent to which they conduct engaged research. Further, conflict between the rhetoric of reward policies and the emphasis of research above teaching and service has been discovered as a significant barrier and source of dissatisfaction and stress in tenure-track faculty (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilkie, 1986; Rice et al., 2000; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Though expectations of faculty have expanded from excelling in only teaching, research, or service to excelling in all three, research continues to be heralded as the most prestigious within the academy, regardless of institutional type (Alperin et al., 2018; Braxton et al., 2002; Ward, 2005). The traditional structures of promotion and tenure best align with traditional scholarship, not engaged scholarship (Alperin et al., 2018; Ward, 2005). In a study that examined perceptions of scholarship in faculty reward systems, O’Meara (2005) found that though more and more institutions were beginning to recognize various forms of scholarship, most institutional leaders noted that traditional research was more heavily weighted than it was ten years prior. In such cultures that prioritize and privilege certain forms of scholarship over others, institutions feel required to operate under the narrow definitions of traditional research and often do not consider engaged research as research, but rather categorize it as service. This led Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, and Buglione (2009) to contend:

In the logic of a prestige hierarchy dominated by research universities, engaged research is neither basic nor applied research and therefore cannot be counted as research at all.
According to this logic, engaged scholarship can be counted as service, but not as research. (p 23)

The service category is the most ambiguous, typically understood as either service to an institutional discipline or volunteer service to the community (Ward, 2003). However, most institutions, schools, and departments continue to place engaged research and the scholarship it produces in the category of service while categorizing traditional forms of scholarship as research (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). An analysis of campus policies of institutions applying for the 2006 Carnegie classification found that faculty involvement in community, regardless of if it was focused on teaching or research, tended to always be placed in the traditional category of service (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). Further, when placed in the service category, a study analyzing over 400 promotion and tenure documents and faculty handbooks by O’Meara (1997) identified that documentation of faculty service generally required only simple lists of places, people, or events faculty worked with, gauging only the quantity of engagement, not its quality or impact.

The more institutions, schools, and departments separate faculty work into distinct and mutually exclusive categories, the less likely faculty are to infuse their teaching and research with community, believing that engaged work and its integrative and collaborative nature is not valued as scholarly. To combat the confusion that surrounds the classification of community engaged research, some scholars believe that it is essential that engaged scholarship be explicitly recognized within the research category and not relegated to the realm of service (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). However, other scholars argue that it is best to avoid the rigid divisions of teaching, research, and service and rather integrate all forms of engaged intellectual work into its own space (i.e., a fourth
engagement category) that recognizes the public purpose of academic work (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006). Though the discussions that currently exist around how to best ensure engaged faculty are appropriately recognized and rewarded differ, it is understood that efforts to effect such change are at odds with the current culture of higher education and feel like “adding to the edges of a system fundamentally at odds with the epistemology of engagement” (O’Meara, 2011, p. 278).

Though much work has been done by scholars, professional associations, and various institutions to create frameworks and structures to explain, legitimize, and reward engaged scholarship, the American higher education landscape continues to be dominated by a research culture and orientation that does not recognize the scholarly aspects of faculty engagement as true research. The norms of academic culture preference traditional scholarship, while engaged faculty continually find themselves having to make their justifications for promotion and tenure in those terms. Even within institutions that have aligned their missions and reward structures to support engaged scholarship, there is evidence that faculty are informally counseled to under-report their engagement when seeking promotion and tenure, being told it is not as valuable as peer-reviewed publications (Doberneck, 2016; Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Further, it is not uncommon for many faculty to wait until they have received tenure through traditional routes before pursuing engaged work. Even on engaged campuses, as Driscoll (2005) noted, there is a spirit of being safe and producing traditional scholarship and scholarly outputs to protect one’s career.

**Evaluating Community Engaged Scholarship**

It is widely acknowledged that the academy highly values and recognizes forms of traditional research, that which is most often removed from the complicated and collaborative
nature of community. As peer-reviewed publications in high-impact journals serve as the primary medium for communication of research findings to other academics, they in turn are viewed as the gold standard of faculty scholarly output (Braxton et al., 2002). The more peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals a faculty member produces, the larger their chances of being promoted and increasing their salary. The positive correlation between traditional research outputs and success in promotion and tenure has been found to hold across all different types of colleges and universities as well as across different academic disciplines (Fairweather, 1996; Tuckman, 1976). However, research universities prioritize the dissemination of peer-reviewed journal articles that reach the academic community over more locally disseminated work such as policy briefs, technical reports, and new media, intended to reach community audiences (Ward, 2005). Peer-reviewed journal articles do little to reach local community members and organizations, key stakeholders in engaged research. The most effective methods of scholarly dissemination to reach local community audiences are typically community-based presentations, local media articles, web-based content, and public testimony (Seifer, Wong, Gelmon, & Lederer, 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014).

As engaged scholarship falls outside the boundaries of the traditional methods of evaluation, this can lead to confusion and dismissal by review committees (Braxton et al., 2002). Engaged faculty members seeking promotion and tenure are understandably worried that their school- and department-level review committees are unable to appropriately understand and evaluate community engaged scholarship. The processes used to evaluate faculty scholarship play a large role in the current promotion and tenure structure, ultimately providing justification for reward (Braxton et al., 2002). As useful as current work in the field of community engagement may be in getting those outside the field to broaden their view of what counts as
scholarship, the issue of evaluating engaged scholarship is assumed to be extremely challenging for committees (Braxton et al., 2002; Glassick et al., 1997).

In their review of promotion and tenure guidelines across 129 American and Canadian institutions that identified various terms related to traditional and engaged research, Alperin et al. (2018) discovered that traditional outputs were mentioned in 90-95% of all research, masters, and baccalaureate promotion and tenure guidelines, the most consistently present grouping of terms across all institutional types and academic disciplines. This consistency led them to conclude that “if there is one thing that is certain to count towards faculty career progression, it is producing traditional academic outputs” (Alperin et al., 2018, p. 15).

The Great Divide: Inconsistencies between Institutional Rhetoric and Departmental Practice

While previous research such as Alperin et al.’s (2018) provides a holistic understanding of engaged terminology within promotion and tenure guidelines, there is a glaring need for more qualitatively based research exploring the ways community engaged scholarship is defined, understood, and ultimately evaluated by promotion and tenure committees in practice. There is a large gap between institutional support for community engaged research in theory and the actual practice of valuing it at the school- and department-levels within the formal policies, guidelines, and actions of promotion and tenure. As universities work toward infusing engagement into their institutional mission, structures, and strategic plans, this gap between theory and practice is extremely problematic. Institutions that have received the Carnegie classification for community engagement are not immune to this disconnect. Colleges and universities might believe they have accomplished the institutionalization of engagement after receiving the classification, only to learn that such a discrepancy between institution-level rhetoric and department-level practice
ultimately leaves institutional culture largely unchanged. If culture change reaches only high levels of an institution, pathways for faculty to pursue and be rewarded for engaged research at the school- and department-levels will continue to thwart the true institutionalization of engagement across the entire campus. Unless faculty members can comfortably and securely conduct engaged research and produce engaged scholarship without jeopardizing their status or positions, faculty will be unlikely to engage with community in mutually beneficial and reciprocal ways. Until promotion and tenure policies and evaluative processes change to provide supportive environments for engaged faculty at the school- and department-levels, campuses will never truly institutionalize engagement and American higher education will never reach its full potential.

In a study exploring how faculty understand and value community engaged research, O’Meara (2002) demonstrated the critical role department-level values and beliefs play in the process of institutionalizing engagement. O’Meara (2002) noted that even when institutional policy, language, and mission change to include the recognition of engaged work, “unconscious values and beliefs held by faculty facilitating the reward system can prevent newer forms of scholarly work from being accepted and rewarded” (p. 76-77). Rice (2005) further emphasized the dangerous gap between policy and practice and noted that among campuses that have worked to broaden their definition of scholarship, there was an indication that within promotion and tenure, the institutions’ public recognition of engaged work was not being applied. Thus, it appears that no matter how genuine and far-reaching an institution’s commitment to engagement is, the commitment will amount to very little if school- and department-level leaders are unwilling or unable to appropriately recognize faculty’s engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure.
Research has shown that engaged faculty feel they receive mixed messages from their institutions that support broader definitions of scholarship and department heads that encourage traditional research (Calleson et al., 2005; Foster, 2010; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). Academic departmental culture and leadership is a very important factor that contributes to the institutionalization of engagement across a campus, as departments are at the center of hiring, promoting, and mentoring campus faculty (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). However, issues arise when senior department leaders maintain a comfortable relationship with the traditional status quo of scholarship. Most senior leaders were trained to define scholarship as rigorous and valuable only when it appears in peer-review journal articles and is geared toward an academic audience. In a study by O’Meara (2009), senior faculty and administrators who had been at their institution for over 15 years noted that they believed new faculty should be required to live up to the same harder standards that they had to overcome when seeking promotion and tenure, where harder equates to producing traditional, rather than engaged scholarship. Sobrero and Jayaratne’s 2014 study exploring department heads’ perceptions of community engaged research further confirmed the seemingly ubiquitous bias department-level leaders and promotion and tenure committee members hold toward engaged scholarship. When department heads were asked if engaged research was valued, it ranked between minimally valued and somewhat valued (Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). Further, department leaders reported that they are unlikely to promote or grant tenure to faculty who publish primarily in peer-reviewed community engagement journals or pursue other non-traditional avenues of dissemination because they found it difficult to understand the metrics used to evaluate engaged scholarship.

The lack of department-level support for and understanding of engaged scholarship illustrates the critical need for research that explores that gap between institutional rhetoric and
department-level practice, values, and norms. There has been over three decades of work by engaged scholars, national organizations, and dedicated institutions to change promotion and tenure guidelines and reward community engaged research at the institutional level. However, there is still a long way to go to ensure changes made to institutionalize engagement throughout a campus do not remain on the surface levels and instead seep into all areas of the institution – its schools and academic departments.

In a 2009 study that assessed how campuses who applied for the Carnegie community engagement classification addressed promotion and tenure structures, Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, and Buglione (2009) identified that most campuses worked diligently to broaden the categories of review and provide pathways for engaged scholarship at the institutional level. They found that many campuses utilized Boyer’s (1990) four categories of scholarship to include a broader view of what counts as scholarly activity (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). However, school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees struggled with the language, definitions, and discourse surrounding community engaged research and continued to maintain traditional views when valuing community engaged scholarship, even when institutional guidelines and procedures were more accepting (Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., O’Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). What this suggests is that even though an institution expands its definition of scholarship in promotion and tenure policies at the campus level, it does not mean that individuals across campus will wake up the following day with a new appreciation and understanding of engaged scholarship. Rather, this new definition of scholarship will continue to be seen as illegitimate in schools and departments within the campus where traditional scholarly products and measures of evaluation are the basis of what it means to be a successful scholar (O’Meara, 2002).
Scholars agree that there is no issue as central to the institutionalization of community engagement than the restructuring of promotion and tenure guidelines and policies (Beere et al., 2011; Doberneck, 2016; O’Meara, 2011; Ward, 2005). I argue that while this is true, such restructuring cannot occur only at an institutional level, but also must infuse itself into the core of where faculty work is evaluated and critiqued – the school- and department-levels. Scholars are hopeful that as more institutions receive the Carnegie classification for community engagement the models and evaluation of scholarship will become more universally accepted and rewarded across institutions (Cope & Leatherwood, 2001). However, I contend that in the issue of legitimizing community engaged research within structures of promotion and tenure, the Carnegie classification itself does not signify that an institution has truly accomplished change because change is assessed only through the structuring of guidelines at the institutional level. To advance higher education’s progress towards institutionalizing engagement, research is needed to explore and better understand how institutions are, or are not, building engagement into their core academic schools and departments’ evaluative processes rather than just at the top levels of their institutions.

There is much evidence demonstrating that academic disciplines and departments heavily influence how faculty understand, frame, and execute their scholarship (Buzinski, Dean, Donofrio, Berger, Heighton, Selvi, & Stocker, 2013; Vogelgesang et al., 2010; Wade & Demb, 2009). However, research is needed to explore how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees’ understanding of and potential biases toward engaged scholarship manifest themselves in mid-level institutional promotion and tenure evaluative processes. Such research must include a holistic understanding of how those who have the agency to hinder or push forward engaged work at the school- and department-level understand and evaluate faculty’s
engaged scholarship. The discrepancy between institution-level support for community engaged research in theory and the evaluative practices of school- and department-level committees who review, critique, and reward faculty’s engaged work will be examined using the following research questions as a guide.

**Research Questions**

1. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members evaluate faculty’s community engaged research?
   a. What guidelines, tools, and/or processes, or lack thereof, guide school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members’ evaluation of faculty community engaged research (e.g., school/department-level guidelines and language, institution-level guidelines and language, peer review/letters, rubrics, other tools, etc.)?

2. How are community engaged research processes and community engaged research products (community engaged scholarship) evaluated by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees?
   a. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees differentiate community engaged research processes (e.g., co-creation of study design, research questions) and products (community engaged scholarship) when evaluating the engaged work of faculty?

3. What supports do institutions have in place to attract, retain, and reward faculty who do community engaged research?

4. How have the events of 2020 (e.g., global pandemic, nation-wide protests for racial justice) affected engaged faculty and their institutions?
Chapter Three: Methodology

This study utilized qualitative methods which seek to accurately represent the “lived experiences, social processes, and complex webs of meanings and values” that individuals and groups ascribe to complex social issues (Luttrell, 2010a, p. 160). Qualitative research gathers data from natural settings through inductive means to establish patterns and identify emerging themes to understand multifaceted social processes (Creswell, 2007). The detailed knowledge gained by qualitative research provides meaning and texture to phenomena that might otherwise go unnoticed (Berg, 1995). Though qualitative inquiry is sometimes believed to lack the rigor of quantitative research, good qualitative research is based on calculated strategies to increase methodological rigor, of which I will detail in this chapter.

I am most drawn to qualitative research because of its expansive nature and ability to shed light on social beliefs and practices as they are understood and enacted in the context of the individuals who live them. Qualitative research is committed to using the words of participants to contextualize their own lives. It is inherently dialectical, utilizing both inductive and deductive reasoning to make sense of the often-conflicting human experience (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Further, data collection and analysis within qualitative research is naturally interpretive, as I, the researcher, draw conclusions about data by filtering words, ideas, and beliefs through a personal lens that is positioned in a specific historical and sociopolitical moment (Creswell, 2018; Luttrell, 2010b). Since qualitative research is fundamentally emergent, dialectic, iterative, and does not easily lend itself to tightly configured methods often employed in quantitative research, data collection and analysis methods cannot be completely controlled (Creswell, 2018). As will later be discussed, the global pandemic of 2020 required a shift to virtual data collection.
The organization of this chapter aligns with the overarching principles of qualitative research regarding the detailed information presented about researcher paradigm and positionality requiring me, the researcher, to intentionally reflect on myself as a component of the overall study. Further, an outline of the research design, institutional sites and participants, and an overview of how data was collected and analyzed is presented. Chapter Three concludes with considerations of data validity and trustworthiness. Cumulatively, this chapter details the principal philosophies, methods, and underpinnings of this study. It is worth noting, here, that this dissertation proposal was accepted in Fall 2019, prior to the COVID-19 global pandemic. Due to the subsequent imposed restrictions to travel and in-person gatherings, the proposed data collection method of in-person focus groups was revised to accommodate individual Zoom interviews.

**Researcher Paradigm: Interpretivism**

Within any study it is important to examine the epistemological premises and research paradigms one brings to the work, acknowledging how they limit and shape the inquiry process. Bogdan and Knopp Biklen (2010, p. 32) asserted that researchers bring specific paradigms, or “loose collection[s] of logically related assumptions, concepts, or propositions that orient thinking” to their work and guide action and decision making. An interpretivist paradigm grounds this work, as I believe that social reality is neither singular nor objective but is instead shaped by individual reality that cannot be divorced from one’s lived experience (Pelz, 2019). Operating from an interpretivist paradigm, I believe that reality is best studied through participant voice, interpreting how individuals view and make sense of their worlds (Pelz, 2019).

The interpretivist paradigm is a sociological approach to research that seeks deep understanding of an issue through interaction with participants. Knowledge gained from
interpretivist research is comprised of the meanings individuals ascribe to certain issues or events and is inherently time- and place-bound (Greene, 2010). As such, interpretivist knowledge is context-specific and does not warrant generalizable conclusions, as will later be discussed in greater depth (Greene, 2010). Interpretivist methodology is embedded in the world of practice, seeking to understand how individuals view and operate within their various contexts to “transform ignorance and misapprehensions into more informed consciousness” (Bernstein, 1976; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110). The interpretivist paradigm and the knowledge it produces is heavily value-bound, as I, the researcher, and participants are “interactively linked” through a dialectical relationship (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 110).

I have chosen to employ an interpretivist paradigm due to the unique social process I seek to explore – the evaluation of engaged research by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees. Because I wish to dive deeply into the complex, multifaceted, and highly political social process of promotion and tenure, an interpretivist paradigm that encourages the use of participant voice is well suited (Pelz, 2019). Interpretivist research is fitting for the study of unique, context-specific events and processes, as it can help uncover additional questions and issues for future research (Pelz, 2019). Due to the unique and context-specific nature of community engagement within academic reward structures and the profoundly political processes that guide promotion and tenure decision making at the school- and department-levels, an interpretivist lens is the best approach to addressing the study’s guiding research questions.

**Researcher Positionality**

Qualitative research is inherently subjective (Stake, 2010). Good qualitative researchers acknowledge that their personal, cultural, and historical experiences within the world shape how they interpret and position themselves with the data (Creswell, 2018; Peshkin, 1988). While
eliminating the entire influence of myself as the researcher is impossible, the goal of qualitative research is not to eradicate influence but rather to acknowledge it and use it constructively (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). Within this section, I discuss my presumptions, personal beliefs, and biases in relation to this study. It is important to do so prior to the presentation of the methodology because it grounds the study’s formulation and allows me to reflect on the steps I took as a researcher. By doing so, I will present the study’s findings, implications, and suggestions for future research and practice in a more transparent manner (Peshkin, 1988). This section reflects on my personal experiences with higher education community engagement and faculty engaged research. As Peshkin (1982; 1988) noted, researcher subjectivity operates throughout the entire inquiry process and the mere act of divulging one’s positionality is not entirely sufficient. As such, I identify safeguards taken to manage my biases throughout the stages of data collection, analysis, and the presentation of findings.

As a doctoral student in the Indiana University Bloomington Higher Education program, a former Graduate Assistant within the IUPUI Office of Community Engagement, and a working professional at Collaboratory, for the past five years I have operated both personally and professionally within the sphere of higher education community engagement. I strongly believe that the foundational purpose of higher education is to contribute to the public good and my work as both a scholar and professional has reflected this belief. My professional trajectory and personal beliefs have been heavily influenced by my time spent at IUPUI, a highly engaged institution that is seen as a leader in higher education community engagement (IUPUI, 2019). Through my professional experiences at IUPUI and Collaboratory, I have come to believe that most faculty who pursue community engaged research are not adequately rewarded and their
engaged scholarship is not appropriately evaluated within the traditional structures of promotion and tenure.

However, I understand that the recognition and evaluation of faculty’s engaged research and scholarship is not an easy undertaking. Institutions today face many barriers impeding such work including, but not limited to, the difficulties of evaluating non-traditional scholarship, budgetary concerns making it more cost-effective to hire non-tenure track faculty, and the conventional norms of academic disciplines. Nevertheless, it is my belief that community engagement and the recognition of engaged faculty is a fundamental way by which universities improve institutional effectiveness and achieve success. Further, as more institutions seek to increase their level of engagement and tout institutional policies that embrace a public mission, I believe such institution-level rhetoric must align with school- and department-level action, specifically within the formal structures of promotion and tenure.

As is the case in qualitative research, I understand that as the “instrument of data gathering and analysis”, my beliefs and values have ultimately framed how I approached this study (Creswell, 2018; Luttrell, 2010b, p. 3). To acknowledge the values and beliefs I bring to this inquiry and increase clarity and transparency throughout the research process, I continuously reflected on my positionality and guiding interests about each decision made at every stage of the inquiry process – the formulation of research questions and methodology, data collection and analysis, and the representation of findings (Luttrell, 2010b). Understanding my potential bias and stake in the research is critical for lending credibility to the study and acknowledging both the limitations and strengths of myself as a researcher (Luttrell, 2010b; Schwandt, 2001).
Research Design

The purpose of this study is to explore the evaluation of faculty’s community engaged research by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees. This study is guided by four major research questions:

1. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members evaluate faculty’s community engaged research?
   a. What guidelines, tools, and/or processes, or lack thereof, guide school- and department-level promotion and tenure committee members’ evaluation of faculty community engaged research (e.g., school/department-level guidelines and language, institution-level guidelines and language, peer review/letters, rubrics, other tools, etc.)?

2. How are community engaged research processes and community engaged research products (community engaged scholarship) evaluated by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees?
   a. How do school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees differentiate community engaged research processes (e.g., co-creation of study design, research questions) and products (community engaged scholarship) when evaluating the engaged work of faculty?

3. What supports do institutions have in place to attract, retain, and reward faculty who do community engaged research?

4. How have the events of 2020 (e.g., global pandemic, nation-wide protests for racial justice) affected engaged faculty and their institutions?
Context and Audience

No qualitative study begins in a vacuum, as “prior conceptual structures composed of theory and method provide the starting point for all observations” (Creswell, 2018, p. 133). Previous scholarship exploring community engaged research within promotion and tenure (O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh, Giles Jr., Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014) has greatly influenced the foundational aspects of this dissertation (e.g., guiding questions, selected methodology). Most prominently influencing the direction and structure of this dissertation was Alperin et al.’s (2018) review of promotion and tenure guidelines across 129 American and Canadian institutions that identified the presence of traditional and engaged research terminology. Alperin et al. (2018) delivered the most thorough content analysis of promotion and tenure guidelines across various institution-types, to date, ultimately leading to the conclusion that “if there is one thing that is certain to count towards faculty career progression, it is producing traditional academic outputs” (p. 15). Alperin et al.’s 2018 study provided a great starting point for many scholars to explore and expand on a variety of issues as they relate to the inclusion of engaged research within the structures of promotion and tenure.

Though Alperin et al.’s (2018) analysis thoroughly explored the terminology found within promotion and tenure guidelines, it only scratched the surface when it comes to the many issues, policies, and procedures that influence the acceptance of engaged scholarship with faculty reward and retention. Additional research is needed to dive deeper into the nuanced aspects of rewarding engaged scholarship in practice, specifically through the real-life experiences and voices of engaged review committee members. There is a need for qualitative research to build upon Alperin et al.’s (2018) content analysis and investigate the way engaged scholarship is evaluated by review committees who leverage the written guidelines and policies established by
their departments, schools, and institutions. Content analyses of guidelines have been explored in many ways, by many different scholars (Alperin et al., 2018; Day, Delagrange, Palmquist, Pemberton, & Walker, 2013; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 2005, 2011). As such, there is a need for more qualitatively based research exploring the ways review committees interpret promotion and tenure guidelines and how they use those to evaluate the engaged scholarship of their peers.

Further, the work of Alperin et al. (2018) is intentionally more broad, extensive, and not grounded within the community engagement literature. Rather, it seeks to reach a much wider and encompassing audience across higher education. While such a broad scope helps to illustrate the far-reaching nature and difference of engaged research across institutions and their various schools, departments, and disciplines, this study is intentionally embedded within the literature of higher education community engagement, as illustrated in Chapter Two. This is to focus and sculpt out a definitive audience more specifically. As this dissertation is grounded within the literature of higher education community engagement, the primary audience for this study are individuals who work to support and institutionalize community engagement through policies and structures (e.g., school and department leaders, review committees, community engagement professionals).

**Multi-Site Single Case Study**

Due to the nature of this study, desire to build upon prior research, and the complex phenomenon of evaluation within promotion and tenure, a multi-site single case study was identified as the most appropriate approach to investigate the research questions. The case study design is becoming increasingly more popular among social-science researchers due to its open-ended nature and flexible methodology which is often used in situations where there is no precise
solution or answer to an issue (Merriam, 2009; Meyer, 2001; Stake 2005). Although some scholars believe that case study research is not a methodology, and rather a choice of what is studied (Stake, 2005), most scholars understand it to be a robust methodological strategy of inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). Further, VanWynsberghe and Khan (2007) highlight the “fit” between case study research and the interpretivist paradigm, emphasizing that case study framing can make a substantial connection to interpretivist research.

Case study research is a primarily qualitative approach that Merriam (1998) noted is:

- Particularistic: focusing on a particular phenomenon, event, program, or activity,
- Descriptive: yielding a rich, thick description of the issue(s) under study, and
- Heuristic: serving to illuminate the readers’ understanding of the issue

The purpose of a case study is to generate information about a specific phenomenon, event, or activity. Employing a case study design is a good approach when the researcher has a clearly identifiable case or cases to explore (Merriam, 1998; Gustafsson, 2017). Further, the use of a single case study with multiple embedded sites provides the researcher the ability to explore a phenomenon both across the sites and within the sites located inside the larger case (Yin, 2003).

When employing a multi-site single case study design, it is important to consider how the individual case, or phenomenon, is defined and bounded. The notion of a case being bound is widespread. Many methodologists understand a case as a system, issue, or phenomenon that is bounded by definition, context, time, and/or setting (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). Case study methodologists insist that bounding cases is essential to maintaining a reasonable scope for the study, though there is no major consensus as to how cases must be bound.
This study was very intentionally bounded in terms of the identified phenomenon (case), sites (institutions), and participants (faculty). While the purposeful inclusion and selection of both institutional sites and participants will be shared in greater detail in the following sections, it is important here to clarify the way in which the case itself was bounded. Acknowledging that the evaluation of faculty’s engaged research within promotion and tenure exists across multiple institutions and is expressed in various ways, this study utilized Yin’s (2003) understanding of case bounding. Yin explained a case is “a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, [where] the boundaries between [the] phenomenon and context are not clear, and the research has little control over the phenomenon and context” (p. 13). Thus, rather than bounding an institution as a “case”, the phenomenon or act of evaluating engaged scholarship within school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees is the “case”, which is traced across multiple institutional sites to better understand how the act of evaluation exists and operates in practice (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017).

Binding the case in this way allowed for greater flexibility of design and data collection and encouraged the consideration of how other actors and entities affect the phenomenon being studied. It acknowledges that school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees are not the entire, bounded case in and of themselves, but are influenced and affected by a handful of other entities – including, but not limited to institutional missions and guidelines, school, department, and institutional cultures, and external organizations and/or associations.

**Institution Sites**

The phenomenon, or single case, of evaluating engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure was explored across multiple institution sites with individual participant interviews being the primary method of data collection. The single case multi-site approach allowed for an
exploration and rich description of real-life data that was bounded by both space and time (Alpi & Evans, 2019; Creswell, 2007). As such, the selection of sites and participants was crucial. When selecting sites for a case study Luttrell (2010b) stressed that researchers should be more concerned with assessing the fitness of specific individual sites as opposed the number of sites, since there is no “magic number” that ensures data quality (p. 6). This multi-site case study employed purposeful sampling where the selection of both study sites and participants (institutions and promotion and tenure review committee members) was based on whether a site and participant possess specific characteristics of interest that make them uniquely suited for the research (Creswell, 2007).

The goal when identifying institutions to be included in this case study was to find those that would be able to provide deep insights into the specific situation being studied. Unlike quantitative research that seeks samples which are more representative of the larger population to generalize findings, qualitative research, specifically case study research, encourages smaller sample sizes that are straightforward, clear, and have a depth of knowledge about the specific phenomenon being studied (Schoch, 2019). In this study I sought to include sites that would provide the richest data to answer the identified research questions rather than a broad, more encompassing sample. I created a narrow scope when selecting institutions to extract deeper, more focused experiences and minimize the variance of both institutions and individual participants within my study sample. As the goal of case study research is to better explore, understand, and explain the how and why of a specific phenomenon within a very particular context, a narrow sample selection is best (Schoch, 2019). The selection of “information-rich” sites helped explore the issue in greater detail and yielded in-depth understanding from those
central to the study rather than more broad generalizations from those who are not personally connected to the issue at hand (Patton, 2002, p. 230; Yin, 2003).

To ensure information-rich sites that could appropriately shed light on the research questions, institutions for this study were first required to have received an initial classification or reclassification for community engagement from the Carnegie Foundation in the 2020 classification cycle (N = 119). Narrowing the site selection to 2020 Carnegie classified institutions was done to involve institutions that have most recently been identified as the most advanced in institutionalizing community engagement across their campuses. As noted, the Carnegie community engagement classification is widely acknowledged as the premier indicator that a campus has successfully institutionalized engagement (Driscoll, 2008, 2009; Noel & Earwicker, 2015). As the classification encourages institutions to create systems and procedures to better understand, evaluate, and improve engagement on their campuses, institutions recently receiving the classification, or reclassification, are understood as those that have most fully infused community engagement into their core aspects of mission, culture, reward structures, and commitments (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). Including only 2020 Carnegie classified institutions provides more assurance that individual participants within these institutions are more familiar with community engagement and engaged research as it is assumed to be more steeped in their institutional culture, though this could not be guaranteed.

In addition to including only 2020 classified or reclassified engaged Carnegie institutions, the scope of this study was further narrowed by including only R1 institutions within the 2020 Carnegie classification list (N = 28). R1 institutions were intentionally chosen due to their high nature of research activity, research expenditures, and focus on the advancement of research (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2021). Due to R1 institutions’
significant focus on traditional research, there is inherently more tension surrounding the movement to better recognize and reward community engaged research and place it on par with traditional research within promotion and tenure. As noted, Holland (2005), Ellison and Eatman (2008), and Rice (1991) have found research universities to be the institution-type most resistant to institutionalizing engagement (e.g., adopting a community engaged mission, policies, infrastructure). Further, as this study specifically sought to explore the evaluation of engaged research within institutional structures, systems, and procedures and not teaching or academic service, the selection of R1 institutions was warranted.

The outlined criteria for the selection of institutions within this multi-site case study was intentional, to encourage a deep exploration of promotion and tenure committees’ evaluative practices of engaged research, rather than attempting a broader look at evaluative practices across less similar institution-types. Exploring the evaluative practices of 2020 Carnegie classified, R1 institutions allowed for greater insights into how such institutions understand, evaluate, and reward faculty’s community engaged scholarship in practice and if participants felt such practices align with their institution’s classification as an engaged campus by the Carnegie Foundation. Though this narrow scope is warranted, it offers and encourages future research exploring similar research questions across other institution types.

In 2020 there were 119 institutions that received the Carnegie community engagement classification or reclassification. Of those 119 institutions, 28 were categorized as R1s with very high research activity. This study includes five of those 28 institutions. The 5 participating institutions were included and requested to participate because professional relationships with Community Engagement Professionals (CEPs) at those institutions previously existed, which significantly aided in the recruitment of individual participants, as will be detailed in the
following section. The five participating institutions along with some notable characteristics of each are identified in Table 1.

**Table 1**

**Institution Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Institution A</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th>Institution C</th>
<th>Institution D</th>
<th>Institution E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size and setting</td>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>Midsize city</td>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>Midsize city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE enrollment</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE faculty</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in inst. mission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in strategic plan</td>
<td>Plan not public</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest engagement leadership</td>
<td>Vice Prov. of Engagement</td>
<td>Vice Prov. for DEI and Engagement</td>
<td>Vice Pres. For Public Service</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Vice Pres. Gov. and Comm. Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

In order to better understand participant data in light of their individual institutional contexts, a review of the institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines of each university was completed. It is important to note that the review of guidelines was intentionally completed after all participant interviews were conducted in order to focus on participant voice and how participants understood the guidelines to operate in practice, within their own experiences. The review of the guidelines helped, post-data collection, to validate, confirm, and at times question the perspectives of participants.
The review of the institution-level guidelines was exploratory in nature and focused on the frequency of engaged terminology within all areas of the institution-level guidelines. For the review, 20 engaged terms were selected for identification within all five institutional guidelines. These terms, presented in Table 2, below, are identified to be the most frequently used to reference engaged scholarship (Alperin, 2018; Wendling & Bessing, 2018). The selection of terms was influenced by a thorough review of the most recent literature regarding engaged scholarship.

Table 2

Terms Searched in Guideline Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Engaged Research</th>
<th>Community Engaged Scholarship</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>Trans-</td>
<td>Technical Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab-</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>Technology Transfer</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communit(ies)</td>
<td>Community-Partnered Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
“Application” is identified exclusively as the application of knowledge. Excluded is language that discusses the promotion and tenure application itself, the submission of grant applications, or any physical application being referenced.
“Collab-“ describes collaborative work.
“Trans-“ encompasses a variety of terms (i.e. transdisciplinary, translational, translation)

Initially, in addition to the institution-level guidelines school- and department-level guidelines were also going to be reviewed. However, a focus on only the institution-level guidelines was warranted, as the majority of the school- and department-level guidelines for institutions within this study were not publicly accessible. Only 25% of the school-level guidelines and 22% of the department-level guidelines were publicly shared. However, four of the five institution-level guidelines of the universities within this study were made public. For the guidelines that were not publicly shared, they were either not published online, password
protected, or did not exist due to departments instead deferring to their university’s or school’s guidelines. The findings of the guideline review are presented, in conjunction with participant voice, in Chapter Four.

**Study Participants**

Study participants were recruited from the identified institutions with the help of CEPs at each institution. Higher education CEPs are a tight knit group and have established vast networks (e.g., HE-SL listserv, Anchor Initiative, Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities network, etc.) to discuss, assist, and continue the work of community engagement within higher education. Leveraging professional and personal connections both myself and members of my dissertation committee have developed, CEPs at each of the five selected institutions were contacted via email to request their assistance with participant recruitment (Appendix A). Within the initial email requesting help to source study participants, I provided each CEP with background on the study, a study information sheet, and criteria each participant was required to meet. Once a CEP agreed to assist with participant recruitment, I provided them with a template recruitment email (Appendix B) they could send to potential participants that included all pertinent information and a link to a pre-interview participant questionnaire (Appendix C).

The sample group of participants was narrowly defined to include only those who could lend their voices and share detailed insights into the evaluation of engaged research within promotion and tenure. A tightly defined, small sample size in case study research is warranted and inclusion criteria should be straightforward and clear due to the uniqueness and specificity of the case being studied (Schoch, 2019). Thus, a broad sample was not desirable, because deeper experiences from unique participants were needed to collect the best data and answer the
research questions. Acknowledging the need to narrow the participant selection in ways that allowed for a detailed exploration of the research questions, the following participant inclusion criteria were established:

- Are a tenured faculty member and are currently serving on their school and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committee or have served on their school and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committee within the past 12 months
- Have a primary appointment in either:
  - Social science field
  - STEM field (e.g., Science, Technology, Engineering, Math)
- Have some familiarity with community engaged research as an approach to inquiry

Inclusion of only tenured faculty members who have current or recent experience serving on their department- or school-level promotion and tenure review committee ensured that all participants were knowledgeable about current review committee practices and guidelines and have experience evaluating the work of faculty seeking promotion and tenure. If participants did not have such a recent experience, or only had experience as a junior faculty member seeking tenure, they could not provide the necessary insights into the research questions that are specifically geared toward the evaluative practices and procedures of review committees.

Participants were further required to have a faculty appointment in either a social science or STEM field. The larger categories of social science and STEM were broad, though still focused enough, to encompass a wide range of disciplines that allowed for a pool of potential participants with diverse perspectives rather than limiting inclusion to only one or two specific disciplines. The broader categories of social science and STEM were employed because the
disciplines within them have been found to have similar approaches to community engagement. Further, there has been shown to be differences in how faculty within each broader category carry out community engaged work. Such variance is often attributed to the core, fundamental differences between the norms of the social sciences (e.g., education, health professions, social work) and STEM (e.g., physical and biological sciences) disciplines (Wade & Demb, 2009).

Lastly, participants were required to have some familiarity with community engaged research as an approach to inquiry. This requirement helped to ensure that each participant was knowledgeable about engaged research and could “speak the language” of community engagement. Such a requirement allowed for participants to speak with consistency and understand common terminology and methodology unique to community engaged research. As warranted by case study research, more specific and narrowed inclusion criteria helped to guarantee the construction of a uniquely qualified participant pool that was knowledgeable about engaged research and had experience evaluating it within promotion and tenure.

When potential participants notified me of their interest to be interviewed, I emailed them a study information sheet and a brief pre-study questionnaire to ensure they met the criteria of the study, obtain basic demographic data, and to gauge their experiences with community engaged research (Appendix C). Within the pre-study questionnaire, participants were asked to gauge how frequently they currently carry out engaged research, their level of familiarity with their school/department and institution level guidelines, and their level of experience evaluating community engaged research within promotion and tenure, among other things. Knowledge of participant characteristics such as these provided insight into how such experiences might influence how they currently understand and evaluate their colleagues’ engaged research. Absent from this questionnaire and the interview protocol were questions about the participants’
experiences when they themselves sought promotion and tenure, including how engagement factored into their dossier. Information about when participants typically carried out their engaged work (pre- or post-tenure) was also not obtained within the pre-study questionnaire or interview protocol.

The participants’ experiences as junior faculty seeking promotion and tenure and the level to which engaged research factored into their case likely influenced how they currently operate as reviewers and advocate for change within their departments, schools, and the institution as a whole. The absence of this data is a clear limitation to this study. However, throughout their interviews much can be inferred about the role community engagement played in their individual journeys to full professor which will be expanded upon in greater detail in Chapter Four.

After each participant completed the questionnaire and was confirmed to meet the study’s criteria, I scheduled their 60-minute, semi-structured interview via Zoom. Prior to each interview, participants were randomly assigned a three-digit number to assist with data organization and ensure anonymity. Each participant was also assigned a pseudonym using a random name generator. These pseudonyms are utilized in the following chapters. In total, 12 faculty members across five institutions participated in this study. Table 3 outlines key characteristics of each participant.
### Table 3

**Study Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Years at current institution</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Experience evaluating engaged research</th>
<th>Frequency of their engaged research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ag. Science</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ag. Science</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant Characteristics**

The above table highlights the variety of experience, positioning, and characteristics of the study’s participants. While there is much diversity among the participants’ years at their current institution, experience evaluating engaged research, and frequency with which they currently conduct engaged research, there is noticeably a lack of diversity in race, as all participants identified as white. There are several key factors that likely contributed to the racial makeup of the study’s participants. Key among them include the racial and gender makeup of
CEPs who assisted the study, and the inclusion of only R1 institutions and full and associate professors within in this study.

As detailed earlier, the primary recruitment of participants for the study was done in conjunction with CEPs at each identified institution. As a group, CEPs are predominantly white women. In her 2017 study identifying the competencies and qualities of CEPs, Dostilio (2017) surveyed over 400 CEPs and found that over 87% of respondents were white and 80% identified as female. Within this study, all of the CEPs who assisted with participant recruitment were white. In working with all white CEPs to recruit for the study, it makes sense that a larger percentage of white participants might be sourced, as gatekeepers likely have access to and social-professional circles comprised of individuals with characteristics similar to themselves (McFadyen & Rankin, 2016).

Further, the institutions from which participants were selected were intentionally all R1s with a very high research focus. Research has shown that faculty at R1 institutions are predominantly white and the racial diversification of tenured and tenure-track faculty at such institutions is minimal (Vasquez Heilig, Flores, Souza, Barry, & Barcelo, 2019). Interestingly, of the five R1 institutions in this study only two had undergraduate student populations that were over 50% white. However, when considering the racial breakdown of each institution when it comes to the number of white vs. non-white tenured and tenure-track faculty, white faculty are heavily overrepresented when compared to the student racial breakdown. Among the five institutions within the study, the average percentage of white tenure and tenure-track faculty is 73%. Though no official data on the racial demographics of faculty who serve on promotion and tenure committees could be found, it is not a far leap to reason that promotion and tenure
committees have historically been, and continue to be largely white, as the pool from which they are sourced is heavily white.

Historically, as the foundational structures of American higher education were created by white males and purposefully excluded people of color, the creation of privileged spaces (i.e., review committees) for white men within the academy became the standard (Frazier, 2011; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2010). Though data illustrates the hiring of faculty of color has increased in recent years, white academics continue to be tenured at higher rates. In 2017 24% of hired faculty identified as a ‘person of color’, but only 11% were tenured (NCES, 2017). The lack of racial diversity among tenured professors and, by proxy, promotion and tenure review committees, is indicative of how Whiteness continues to operate within both individual institutions and the academy as a whole.

**Participant Interviews**

Individual participant interviews were the primary method of data collection. Originally, this dissertation proposed focus group interviews to collect data, with the plan of travelling to the selected institutions to conduct focus groups and obtain data within a social environment where participants discussed their own views in the context of others. However, due the COVID-19 imposed restrictions to travel and in-person gatherings in 2020 and 2021, the proposed in-person focus groups were revised to accommodate individual Zoom interviews. As the object of this study was to obtain high-quality data from knowledgeable participants who could discuss their own views and experiences evaluating engaged research within promotion and tenure, individual interviews were identified as an ideal method for data collection given the current circumstances. Individual interviews are most useful and highly recommended when participants cannot be observed or convened directly (Creswell, 2018).
In general, interviews are designed to understand the experiences of others and the meaning they make out of those experiences (Seidman, 1998). Defined as a “conversation with a purpose”, interviews are used to:

- Obtain unique information and insights about participants’ experiences,
- Collect similar information across an identified sample group, and
- Find out about an issue or phenomenon of interest that a researcher is unable to observe or experience themselves (Berg, 1995, p. 29; Stake, 2010).

As the goal of this study was to understand the meaning participants make of their experiences and gain insights into their behavior when evaluating engaged research, interviews were identified as an acceptable and preferred avenue of inquiry (Seidman, 1998). Further, Seidman (1998) noted that interviewing is a particularly powerful method of data collection when studying issues of education:

The primary way a researcher can investigate an educational organization, institution, or process is through the experience of the individual people … who make up the organization or carry out the process. Social abstractions like ‘education’ are best understood through the experiences of the individuals whose work and lives are the stuff upon which the abstractions are built (p. 4).

The interviews in this study were semi-structured, lasted roughly 60 minutes each, and were all conducted online via Zoom. In semi-structured interviews the exact wording and sequence of questions are determined in advance and all participants are asked the same major questions in the same order, with all questions worded in an open-ended format (Patton, 2002). A semi-structured interview format was specifically chosen for this study to increase the comparability of participant responses, as all respondents answered the same questions. This allowed more complete, consistent data across the entire participant group, facilitated the future organization and analysis of all collected data, and helped determine when data saturation was
achieved (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Patton, 2002). Though the semi-structured interview questions were predetermined and asked of each participant in a systematic and consistent order, the researcher is encouraged to digress slightly and probe beyond the participants’ answers to the prepared questions (Berg, 1995). In doing so, I was able to explore and delve into participant responses that necessitated additional context or generated further questions which were worth exploring.

Interview questions were constructed to address the central research questions guiding this study and incorporated a series of structured neutral probes to elicit additional information about the participants’ experiences (Berg, 1995). When constructing the questions I was careful to avoid both double barreled and affectively worded questions so as not to elicit a confounded or heavily emotional response from participants (Berg, 1995). The interview protocol included ten major questions. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), the total number of questions in a semi-structured interview should be between five and ten. Within the interview protocol the ten major questions were categorized into three specific phases:

1. Phase One: Building Understanding
2. Phase Two: Evaluating Community Engaged Research – Processes and Products
3. Phase Three: Looking Forward

The full interview protocol is presented in Appendix D.

All approaches to data collection have their unique challenges and pose concerns to which researchers must attend. Though semi-structured interviews were identified as the best data collection strategy for this study given the current circumstances, it is important to recognize that they have their limitations. Data collected via participant interviews is inherently indirect and filtered through the views of participants (Creswell, 2018). However, because this
study specifically sought to understand the evaluative practices of review committees through their own experiences, interviews were warranted. Further, interviews collect data in a designated place rather than in an often preferred natural field setting (Creswell, 2018). This limitation is particularly unavoidable as the discussions and actions of review committees are private and unable to be observed by researchers, regardless of travel restrictions. Additionally, semi-structured interview protocols allow only small degrees of flexibility when attempting to relate to a specific participants’ circumstances and the standardized wording of questions may constrain and limit natural conversation (Patton, 2002). However, the need to collect complete and consistent data across the entire participant group justified the choice of a semi-structured protocol and a lesser degree of flexibility.

Finally, as with most all qualitative research and data collection, the mere presence of the researcher within an interview, focus group, or observed setting could potentially bias participants’ responses or actions (Creswell, 2018). Attending to and being conscious of researcher influence is essential. The semi-structured nature of the interviews was used to combat researcher influence, as guiding questions and discussion topics were consistent across all participants and left little room for unrelated conversation. Though there are concerns with any data collection strategy, individual, semi-structured interviews connected via Zoom provided the most robust data to assess the research questions, a flexible and efficient means of data collection, and allowed the best opportunity to collect a great deal of data from participants during a global pandemic.

Throughout the process of participant communication, data collection and analysis, and the presentation of findings, every effort was made to safeguard all information that was collected. Participants were asked to participate on a voluntary basis. No personal names,
institution names, or other identifying information are included in any final presentations of data. All data was stored in a secure password protected electronic file format. All research notes and memos recorded before, during, and after participant interviews were taken electronically and also stored in a secure password protected electronic file. Participants were given the ability to exit the study at any point. The opportunity to leave was presented during the initial request to participate, data collection, and member checking phases of the study. There were no repercussions for withdrawal from the study. Participants were not compensated for their participation.

The recruitment and interview process unfolded over a seven month period, April 2020 to October 2020. Communication with CEPs began in late April 2020 and recruitment of individual study participants began shortly thereafter in May 2020. Interviews were held during the months of June through October 2020. The interview process spanned five months, providing participants with a large window to schedule interviews to most accommodate their busy schedules. As the interviews progressed and as participant recruitment continued with the assistance of CEPs and snowball sampling, it was evident that trends among those who were answering the call to participant were forming. While there was nice distribution of participants who identified as male and female and who worked in either a STEM or social science field, it became clear, as noted earlier, that the sample included no faculty of color.

Though interviews too place over five months which allowed for the observation of such trends, all interviews followed the same protocol and the protocol was not revised or adapted as interviews progressed. The choice not to adapt or edit the interview protocol was intentional, in an effort to ensure consistency across all participant interviews. However, this choice likely influenced those who were both recruited and those who ultimately participated. As only white
participants answered the call to be interviewed, it was only white participants who were asked to identify tenured colleagues as part of the snowball sampling approach. All participants identified through the snowball approach were also white. Though this is a clear limitation, and one that was observed as the interviews progressed over five months, the choice was made to not address this phenomenon within the interview protocol in an effort to ensure consistency with data collected from each participant. The fact that this study’s participant group included all white faculty will later be unpacked in much greater detail in Chapter Five.

Data Saturation. There is no one-size-fits-all approach or answer to data saturation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). However, scholars agree on some general concepts and principles to assist researchers ensure that they have reached data saturation:

• No new data, themes, or codes are identified at the end of the data collection process, and
• The researcher feels they can replicate the study with similar results (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).

When and how a researcher attains those levels of data saturation varies by study. It was thus why I chose to consider data saturation in terms of the richness, thickness, and depth of collected data, rather than attempting to hit a preidentified number of participant interviews (Dibley, 2011; Burmeister & Aitken, 2012).

Throughout the coding phases and initial development of themes I sought to find as many examples, stories, events, and incidents as possible, shared across participant interviews, that provided support for all emerging themes. In doing so I was able to reach a point where all emerging themes were saturated and no new information or data was adding to my understanding of a theme (Creswell, 2007). Thus, data collection and analysis were dictated by and directed toward attaining data saturation and repetition of information within participant interviews. I felt
Data saturation was reached at 12 participant interviews because there was enough information to replicate the study, new information was not being collected, and additional coding was no longer needed (Guest et al., 2006; O’Reilly & Parker, 2012).

**Data Analysis**

While there is no one clear-cut path for data analysis in qualitative research, I aligned my analysis with the principles and procedures of rigorous qualitative inquiry as understood by Charmaz, (2010), Lincoln and Guba (1985), Merriam (1998), and Strauss and Corbin (1990) to have a guide for coding, data reduction, and the development of themes. Qualitative research rejects the belief of universal social laws allowing for empirical generalizations, acknowledging that knowledge is bound to time, context, and participant values (Greene, 2010; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, the data and knowledge generated by this study is not definitive. Rather, it provides a starting point for additional inquiry and considerations for practice. Though all analysis is somewhat flawed and subjective, I sought to uphold the principles of rigorous qualitative inquiry – credibility, transparency, utility, and analyzability as championed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Using this systematic analytic approach to data analysis assisted in my pursuit of rigor. Its set of explicit strategies that are inherently self-correcting in nature and its emphasis on constant comparison guided me through the analysis process (Charmaz, 2010; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). The process of data analysis consisted of these phases:

1. Transcription of participant interviews
2. Data exploration, review, and memoing
3. Open coding
4. Axial coding
5. Selective coding, data reduction, and development of themes within each participant interview, each institutional site, and across multiple institution sites.

6. Examining the data in light of current literature.

**Transcription of Participant Interview Data**

Data analysis began with the transcription of all participant interviews. All transcribed data was loaded into the appropriate computer-assisted software (NVivo) to aid analysis.

**Data Exploration, Review, and Memoing**

The data exploration, review, and memoing phase included a review of all transcribed data from a holistic perspective with the goal of understanding the breadth and scope of all data within single participants, institutions, and across multiple institutions. This more general, explorative overview helped identify potential patterns and emerging ideas to later be analyzed in greater depth (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). Within the review of the data, memo writing was employed to help spark initial thinking and encourage the evaluation of data in new ways to assist with coding. Memo writing encouraged the elaboration of processes, assumptions, and actions identified within the data (Charmaz, 2010). In the initial exploration and review of the data, over 25 memos were created, as larger themes were beginning to appear from the data. The following list includes a few examples of memos that were written during this phase:

- “Bean counting. Many evaluative metrics used in P+T review are easily quantified; reviewers lack time to dive deep into qualitative/engagement-friendly metrics.”
- “Who counts as an author? Who is valued as a contributor in the process of evaluation? Only those who have received tenure themselves – seems like community voice not valued in P+T review?”
• “Impact. This is super hard to define and is understood in lots of different ways by people on committees, those who are doing the engaged research, and the community members.”

Open Coding

Open coding, or the development of raw codes to illustrate the major categories of information identified within the data, occurred after and were influenced by the more general data exploration and memoing phase (Creswell, 2007; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Within the open coding phase, emergent coding was used to avoid the use of a priori templates that could introduce bias (Crabtree & Miller, 1992). Line-by-line coding helped me remain attuned to the data and the participants’ views of reality. By analyzing the data line-by-line as opposed to broadly, ideas and concepts were generated more inductively and helped to deter the imposition of extant theories or researcher bias into the data (Charmaz, 2010). In addition to coding the data line-by-line during the open coding phase, the constant comparative method of data analysis was used. The constant comparative method involved comparing:

- Data across different participants (e.g., their views, actions, and experiences)
- The data of individual participants throughout the entirety of their interview
- Data from one institutional site to other institutions
- Categories of coded data with other categories of coded data (Glaser, 1978)

The constant comparative method was used throughout the entire analysis, allowing for a continuous and in-depth examination of all data.

Many of the larger raw codes that were developed during the open coding phase were influenced by the memos written in the first stage of data analysis. Drawing from insights that
were gleaned from the memos and initial reading of interview transcripts, 25 larger categories of codes were developed. Examples of these larger, raw codes included:

- Supports
- Suggested/Hopeful Change
- Community Voice

**Axial Coding**

After the initial first round of raw codes were identified and named during open coding, the process of axial coding began. Axial coding was essential to building out and clarifying the original ideas and categories that were discovered in the open coding phase. More focused axial coding involved the creation of additional codes and subcodes focused on specific ideas and concepts, allowing for more in-depth theorizing about the original concepts (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Axial codes focused on the following issues suggested by Creswell (2007), as they relate to the initial codes identified:

- Causal conditions – what factors initiated the identified issue(s)
- Strategies – what actions are or were taken in response to the identified issue(s)
- Contextual and intervening conditions – what factors influenced the identified issue(s)
- Consequences – what outcomes resulted from the identified issue(s)

From the 25 larger categories of codes that were developed during the open coding phase, 38 additional subcodes were generated to further build out and clarify ideas and meaning within the larger codes. Examples of subcodes that were identified included:

- Supports
  - Institutional supports, Individual supports, Department supports
- Suggested/Hopeful Change
Changes to institutional policy, Changes to institutional practice, Changes to school/department policy, Changes to school/department practice

- Community Voice
  - External letters, Audience, Authorship

Selective Coding, Data Reduction, and Development of Themes

Selective coding, with the goals of reducing superfluous data and clarifying themes from the connected categories, followed the iterative processes of open and axial coding (Stake, 2010; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Selective coding was more conceptual than the previous process of line-by-line coding, as it sought to identify codes that frequently appeared throughout the data. Decisions were made about selected codes and emerging themes that guided the construction of the major themes (Glaser, 1978). The iterative processes of open, axial, and selective coding were used to take both a horizontal and vertical look across and within institutions. A horizontal analysis not only compared and contrasted data from one institution with another, but will also trace participant voice, themes, and influences across institutions (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017). A vertical analysis compared and contrasted participant data within a single institution, identifying similar or dissimilar data (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017). Employing both a horizontal and vertical analysis of the data in these ways allowed for the reduction of data to only those pieces that directly related to the remaining, relevant categories and themes. During these processes, the data naturally slimmed down into more connected, cohesive, and manageable themes.

Of the total codes and subcodes previously identified, one larger code and eight subcodes were reduced to result in a full code set of 24 larger codes with 30 subcodes within them. The larger code, Institutional characteristics, which housed all participant references to the size, demographic makeup, etc. of their specific institution was discarded, as that information was
already compiled from external sources (e.g., IPEDS, institutional websites) and shared within Table 1. Similarly, subcodes were either discarded or subsumed into other subcodes if they did not contain many codes or were best understood in light of other codes. For example, the subcode *Preferred methods of communication* was subsumed into the subcode *Audience*.

**Examining the Data Considering Current Literature**

Following the analysis and emergence of solidified codes and themes, findings are presented in Chapter Four using thick description and aided by participant voice (Geertz, 1973). Major themes and sub-themes are detailed and grounded within the current context and literature of higher education community engagement to better understand the findings and make the results more reliable (Gustafsson, 2017).

**Ensuring Trustworthiness**

Qualitative research is based on a different set of ontological and epistemological assumptions that fundamentally differ from the positivist notions of rigor (e.g., reliability, internal validity, generalizability, etc.) and thus requires an alternative set of evaluation criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The concepts of rigor and validity are inherently relative and must be addressed in relation to the “purposes and circumstances of the research, rather than being a context-independent property of methods or conclusions” (Maxwell, 2010, p. 279). In order to ensure this study was both rigorous and produces valid data, steps were taken to align with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria for trustworthiness in qualitative research.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the primary question relating to trustworthiness is simple: “How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?” (p. 290). Lincoln and Guba
(1985) answer this question through the establishment of four fundamental aspects which must be present in qualitative research:

- **Neutrality** – the degree to which findings are generated by participant data, not by the biases, motivations, or interests of the researcher
- **Consistency** – the study’s findings can be repeated with similar participants, in a similar context
- **Applicability** – the study’s findings can be determined to be applicable in similar contexts with similar participants
- **Truth Value** – the establishment of confidence that the study’s findings are true both among the participants and within their specific contexts

Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria for trustworthiness served as a guide throughout the study’s data collection, analysis, and presentation of findings. The above criteria was also aided by key techniques encouraged to establish trustworthiness – member checks, thick description of findings, and data triangulation.

Member checks, also known as respondent validation, were employed as a systematic way to solicit feedback from study participants about collected data and initial conclusions to help improve the accuracy and credibility of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Yanow, 2006). Member checks included taking initial conclusions, themes, and analysis back to participants via email to test for factual and interpretative accuracy and provide evidence of credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The initial member check highlighted issues needing further revision, definition, or expansion that required an ongoing cycle of analysis and edits (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As Maxwell (2010) noted, the member check and editing process it elicits is “the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what
participants say and do … as well as being an important way of identifying [researcher] bias” (p. 281). Member checking was a key component to ensure trustworthiness.

In addition to member checks, trustworthiness was sought by the use of thick description to convey the study’s findings. Geertz (1993) and Creswell (2018, p. 196) encouraged the use of thick description within qualitative research to “transport readers to the [study’s] setting and give the discussion an element of shared experiences”. Due to the extensive qualitative data that was collected, thick description was employed to provide a detailed context of the interactions, understandings, and participant voice. It is through the use of thick description that a full and revealing picture of the data is painted, highlighting and grounding conclusions in participant voice.

Lastly, triangulation of data, the examination of data across multiple institutional sites and participants was used as a strategy to ensure trustworthiness and build coherent and justified themes (Creswell, 2018; Merriam, 1998). It is essential that the development of themes and conclusions be drawn from evidence across the entire dataset and not selected segments, sites, or individual participants. Conclusions were drawn using multiple participant perspectives in relation to the same issue, rather than reliance on a single participant voice (Denzin, 1978). Triangulation of data across multiple institutions and participants helped to refine the conceptual linkages within all data and strengthen the study’s ultimate findings (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Data triangulation also helped to ensure data saturation was reached (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

**Study Limitations**

Like any research, this study has limitations that are important to acknowledge and clarify prior to the presentation of findings (Creswell, 2018). As this study included only a select number of R1 institutions that received the Carnegie community engagement classification or
reclassification in 2020, the transferability or applicability of findings is less strong for non-R1 institutions that have not received the classification (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This study intentionally narrowed its site and participant selection to extract deeper, more focused experiences and minimize the variance of both institutions and individual participants within the study sample. As the goal of case study research is to better explore, understand, and explain the how and why of a specific phenomenon within a very particular context, a narrow sample selection was warranted (Schoch, 2019). The further narrowing of participants to those within either a social science or STEM field does not include all academic disciplines, departments, or schools, but still provided a balanced sample of faculty perspectives across multiple disciplines. Though the emphasis on recently classified, R1 universities and additional criteria required for participants was warranted, it does open the door for future research exploring other institution and faculty types.

In addition to the narrowed study sample, the semi-structured interview approach presents its own unique challenges and limitations, even though such an approach was identified as the best data collection strategy for this study. The data collected via participant interviews was inherently indirect and filtered through the views of participants. Further, the interviews collected data in a designated online location (Zoom) rather than in a natural field setting (Creswell, 2018). This limitation, however, was particularly unavoidable as COVID-19 restricted all travel and the ability to conduct in-person interviews of focus groups.

An additional limitation more prone to qualitative research than quantitative research is that of researcher influence and interaction with participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The “mutual shaping” both myself and participants underwent was somewhat influenced by my values as a researcher and cannot be eliminated from the data collection process itself (Lincoln &
Guba, 1985, p. 100). As qualitative research is inherently subjective and because eliminating my presence as a researcher was impossible, good qualitative researchers must acknowledge this presence within any study and understand how to use it constructively (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Peshkin, 1988; Stake, 2010).

It should again be noted that the goal of this inquiry is not to make universal generalizations or construct conclusive theory about the evaluative practices of promotion and tenure committees. Rather, the intent is to generate new knowledge and provide insights into how promotion and tenure committees understand, evaluate, and make judgements regarding faculty’s engaged research, and to encourage additional research and evaluations of practice. Any system of generalizations drawn from qualitative research will likely fall short because qualitative research does not aim to make universal generalizations since no one perspective is able to tell the full story (Kaplan, 1964; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As such, Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) concept of “fittingness”, or the degree of congruence between various contexts, was a more appropriate concept to guide potential findings (p. 124).

Lastly, a clear limitation of this study is its lack of a more racially diverse, non-white participant group. Though the recruitment of participants was not restricted to any specific racial or ethnic group, it was limited by the availability and willingness of faculty within the identified institutions. Unfortunately, only white faculty were interested in participating in this study and reached out to schedule interviews. Though it is not certain as to why only white faculty were interested in participating, research has illustrated that faculty of color are more frequently asked to spend their time and energy serving diversity-focused campus initiatives and mentoring students, creating an often invisible *cultural taxation* that leaves them with little leisure time (Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Jimenez, Laverty, Bombaci, Wilkins, Bennett & Pejchar, 2019;
Matthew, 2016; University of Oregon Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group, 2017;). Including the perspectives of faculty of color would greatly enhance this study and provide additional insights into the nuances of how issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are impacted by and fueled through the current structures of promotion and tenure.
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of chapter four is to present the findings from this research study. The participants’ unique experiences as they relate to evaluating community engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure are shared and the research questions are addressed. Though there were differences in the experiences and characteristics of each individual participant, there were many shared themes and sentiments across the participant group as a whole. These major themes were identified across participants of different academic disciplines (e.g., STEM, social science), institutional characteristics, and personal experiences producing and evaluating community engaged scholarship. In this chapter findings are presented and organized within seven major themes:

• Definitions of Community Engaged Research Do Not Matter to Promotion and Tenure Committees: “Most People Have No Idea What it Even Means”

• “If it isn’t in the Guidelines, I Don’t Care How Much I Like it. It Just Doesn’t Matter”: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are too Rigid to Appropriately Categorize or Value Faculty’s Engaged Research

• “It’s an Old School System that Needs to Change”: Traditional Metrics to Evaluate Faculty Research Do Not Work for Community Engaged Scholarship

• “It’s Catch as Catch Can”: Institution-Wide Supports to Assist with the Evaluation of Community Engaged Research Do Not Exist

• Institutions and their Leaders are “Talking out of Two Sides of their Mouth”

• The Events of 2020 Have Both Positively and Negatively Affected Community Engaged Research
Each major theme provides an in-depth look into different aspects of the evaluative process of promotion and tenure committees, as described by participants. Participants identified that within their departments and schools, a lack of clearly defined and accepted terminology to refer to community engaged research, coupled with rigid promotion and tenure guidelines and traditionally standardized metrics limits the ability of review committees to appropriately evaluate engaged scholarship. Further, the complications that result from using a standard set of metrics to evaluate both traditional and community engaged scholarship is explored through participant voice, as is the inherent tension of relegateing faculty’s engaged scholarship to the service, and not research, category of a faculty’s dossier. Building upon the issues of how to define, evaluate, and properly categorize community engaged scholarship within the traditional structures of promotion and tenure, the notion that engaged scholars are best suited for non-tenure track positions is also explored through participant voice. Additionally, participant-identified campus supports and resources for community engagement are shared, as are the roles of school, department, and institutional leadership. Lastly, as data was collected from June through October 2020, it is necessary to unpack how the COVID-19 pandemic and increased national push for racial justice impacted the way participants understood and spoke about community engagement. However, before the study’s themes are discussed in detail, an analysis of the participating universities’ institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines is warranted, to provide background and greater depth to participant voice.

Institution-Level Guidelines

As noted in Chapter Three, a review of each university’s institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines was completed following all participant interviews in an effort to better understand the perspectives of participants in light of their institution’s specific guidelines. The
choice to review the guidelines after the completion of all interviews was intentional, in order to first focus on participant voice and not cloud the interview process with preconceived notions that could have been generated during a guidelines review. The review provided, post-data collection, additional context to the participants’ voice and further grounded it in their specific contexts.

The review was broad and exploratory in nature, seeking to identify the frequency with which each engaged term was referenced in the institutions’ guidelines. Table 4, below, highlights the number of times an engaged term was cited within the guidelines, along with the perceived level of engaged terminology in each guideline, and the terms or phrases that were most heavily cited. Table 5 notes where within the guidelines engaged terminology was found (e.g., introductory sections, research section, service section). Table 6 identifies the engaged terminology that was not found within any of the institutions’ guidelines.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Engaged Terms</th>
<th>Guidelines Last Updated</th>
<th>Use of Engaged Terminology</th>
<th>Most Frequently Cited Engaged Terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Guidelines not public</td>
<td>Guidelines not public</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>“communities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>“application”; “public”; “patent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>“trans-“; “public service”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>“collab-“ “communities”; “trans-“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**Frequency of Engaged Terminology within Guideline Sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Introduction or Closing</th>
<th>Teaching Section</th>
<th>Research Section</th>
<th>Service Section</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

**Engaged Terminology Not Present in any Institution-Level Guidelines**

- Volunteer
- Action Research
- Community-Based
- Participatory Research
- Neighborhood
- Community-Partnered Research

The review identified that engagement terminology does not feature heavily within the guidelines of any of the institutions involved in this study. Especially in comparison to institutions considered highly engaged (Alperin, 2018; Wendling & Bessing, 2018), the universities in this study do not boast high levels of engagement terminology within their guidelines. Only two of the four guidelines reviewed could even be considered to have a moderate level of engaged terminology cited. However, for the institutions in this study with a perceived moderate number of engaged terminology in their guidelines, such terminology did feature more within the research section of the guidelines (as opposed to teaching or service). For the institutions in this study with a lower frequency of engaged terminology, the majority of
engaged terms were found within either the service or introductory/closing sections of the guidelines.

Interestingly, the institutions in this study who had the highest frequency of engaged terminology were those who had most recently updated their guidelines, perhaps in an effort to receive the 2020 Carnegie Community Engagement classification. However, it is clear that a high frequency of engaged terminology within institution-level guidelines is not necessarily a requirement for R1 institutions seeking the classification, as all institutions in this study successfully received the classification in spring 2020. The lack of engaged terminology within each institution’s guidelines provides additional depth and context to the perspectives of the study’s participants, as the majority of participants did not feel as though their institution was doing enough to adequately recognize, reward, and appropriately evaluate the scholarship of their engaged peers.

**Definitions of Community Engaged Research Do Not Matter to Promotion and Tenure Committees: “Most People Have No Idea What it Even Means”**

Within this study, community engaged research refers to the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community that embodies the characteristics of community engagement (e.g., mutual exchange of knowledge, reciprocal partnerships) and scholarship (e.g., demonstration of knowledge within an academic field or discipline). Community engaged research is thus here defined as the exchange of mutually beneficial and societally relevant knowledge that is created with, communicated to, and validated by members both within community and the academy (Driscoll & Sandmann, 2002). Further, it is important to again distinguish how the term *community engaged research* differs from the term *community engaged scholarship* and how they are used within this study. Here, community engaged
research is used as an umbrella term to describe the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community and the processes by which such work is completed. Community engaged scholarship is used specifically in reference to the scholarly products (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, conference presentations, community presentations, policy, community programs/reports, delivery of community products) that result from research done with community.

All participants affirmed that their personal definition of community engaged research aligned with the study’s umbrella definition. However, participants noted that within their departments, schools, and disciplines, other terminology was simultaneously used to refer to what is defined here as community engaged research. Other terminology included:

- Community-based research
- Participatory research
- Community-based participatory research
- Community-partnered research

Though the terms listed above were often used interchangeably by participants to signify faculty work done outside of the academy, participants acknowledged the frequent use of the term community engaged research, by both themselves and colleagues within their school and department, as an all-encompassing term to name the many ways faculty engage with community. More broadly, the term community engagement was described by many participants as a way faculty may choose to operationalize their area of expertise not just through scholarship, but through teaching as well.

While all participants’ personal definition of community engaged research aligned with the study’s definition, it is necessary to highlight that there was a range within which their
departments and schools define the concept of *reciprocity* within the larger understanding of community engaged research. Though their colleagues might consider and label their research to be community engaged, many participants believed it is not always operationalized in a manner consistent with how community engaged research is here defined. Felix shared the following example of how he believed a colleague incorrectly referred to her work as community engagement:

A project that [a colleague] did was just videotaped a tour of one of the worst parts of [local community] so that she could show it to her colleagues, so they would understand about the community. We are six miles from the community! She could easily go to the community and look around, but no, her community engagement was taking a videotape bus tour of the community so she can show her colleagues, so they’re more familiar with the community. I mean, that’s what they saw as community engaged research!

Many participants voiced frustration with the lack of consensus around a formalized definition of community engaged research or community engaged scholarship, sharing that many colleagues within their departments and schools do not operationalize engagement in a manner consistent with the above definition. Rather, some of their colleagues believe that any type of research involving the external community (e.g., as study participants or recipients of unidirectional services) could be defined as community engaged. Many participants noted that the label *community engaged* is often applied to research that would be better described as *community-based*:

Many people just define it as collaborating with the person next to you. You’re working in the community and you’re collaborating … that’s not really community engaged research. A lot of what is done is still bringing what we want to do to the community, rather than having the community engaged. And so, the school doesn’t have a formal definition. (Felix)

Additionally, many noted that while the majority of faculty within their department and/or school would define community engaged research similarly, leaders and groups within
their departments and schools (e.g., deans, faculty chairs, promotion and tenure committees) tended to operationalize and thus value it differently:

I find differentiation between individuals, or groups, or among them as it relate[s] to what does engagement mean to them … it [is] always different based off of which level you’re looking at. From the administrative level to the research, or more of director oversight level, versus those who are actually on the ground working. There is some variation in terms of how they operationalize it. (Thomas)

The absence of a clear definition within departments, schools, and among leadership was the source of many participants’ frustrations. Some participants acknowledged that few within their school or department even know what community engaged research even is:

I’m not sure that other people in our department or college know what it means. And certainly, when I have been involved in discussions about it, most people have no idea what it even means. . . . I’m not sure that within my college or within my department it’s certainly understood. (Kathleen)

Without an agreed upon definition highlighting the requirements of reciprocal partnership and mutual exchange of knowledge, community engaged research is often left out of the conversation entirely, leading to its frequent dismissal as a legitimate form of scholarship.

Further, as community engaged research is relatively new, participants shared that there are far fewer tenured faculty knowledgeable about the unique methods and products of engaged research. As all participants within this study were tenured, engaged scholars, many noted that they themselves are quite unique. Participants shared that the smaller number of tenured, engaged faculty in their departments and schools mean that it is very likely that a promotion and tenure committee will not include anyone knowledgeable about engaged scholarship:

I think one of the tougher issues is … community engaged research is relatively new and there are fewer people doing it. So, you're going to have fewer people on the committees who actually have good knowledge … they really don't have the kind of in-depth knowledge needed. And that's a developmental issue that will hopefully improve over time as more people get promoted and join the committee. (Jerry)
Many participants shared the need for their departments and schools to define what they mean by community engagement and community engaged scholarship, as it specifically relates to their disciplinary field:

I think that at a departmental level within the promotion and tenure criteria, being able to define what … service and engagement implies. . . . For our criteria we have things that are like indicators of success, indicators of excellence … and here are some things that count toward that. And so, I think at the departmental level, the faculty could come to an agreement, you know, they vote on those things and say, ‘Yeah, this is the criteria we're going to work toward. This is our document.’ If they all came to an agreement and said, ‘Look, here's what we believe engagement is. Here are some indicators of quality engagement that somebody could demonstrate in their dossier’, then I think that would be an outstanding place to start. Because if the university is talking about it and if it's part of their strategic plan. I mean, that's great. But the departmental level is where those discussions are going to start, you know. That's where I think you're going to have your greatest impact, with department heads and departments who can then go to their senior faculty and say, ‘Okay, we're going to propose adding a definition like this, adding this to our criteria.’ If it's going to count, it's got to be explicitly put in the criteria, that document for promotion and tenure. (Philip)

A more formalized definition and criteria for what is understood as engaged scholarship would provide greater clarity for both junior faculty pursuing promotion and tenure as well as the committees who must evaluate it.

“If it isn’t in the Guidelines, I Don’t Care How Much I Like it; It Just Doesn’t Matter”:

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines do not Appropriately Categorize or Value Faculty’s Engaged Research

With no clear definitions for community engaged research or engaged scholarship within participants’ schools and departments, it is not surprising that the term community engaged research, or other terminology used to describe scholarship done in and/or with community, was not frequently used in the majority of participants’ institution-level guidelines. Only a few participants noted other terminology within their department and/or school guidelines that could be considered somewhat parallel to community engaged research or community engaged
scholarship: “community work”, “extension”, or “service learning”. The participants’ perceived lack of engaged terminology in their department- and school-level guidelines is consistent with the findings from the institution-level guideline review where only two institutions were identified to include a moderate level of engaged terminology. All participants acknowledged that the lack of clearly defined terminology leads to difficulty when faculty who produce engaged scholarship do not see their work represented or valued within promotion and tenure guidelines. Further, the rigidity of and strict adherence to department and school guidelines when evaluating faculty’s work was highlighted by almost all participants. As Andrea shared, “When we have P and T meetings, those department guidelines are continually referred back to and adhered to when actually casting a vote.” Another participant went as far as referring to the departmental guidelines as the “Bible” for review committees.

If it isn’t in the guidelines, I don’t care how much I like it; it just doesn’t matter. And it’s not because I don’t care in my heart about it, but it’s because the promotion and tenure committee is going to use those guidelines. (Douglas)

Many found the complete lack of such terminology within their guidelines to be both frustrating and antithetical to how their departments, schools, and institutions publicly identify as an engaged institution and praise their community engagement efforts. While many participants noted their departments’, schools’, and institutions’ mission statements and espoused values publicly laud community engagement and indicate a deep commitment to it, when it comes to engaged research being recognized within promotion and tenure participants noted a clear disconnect. When it comes to recognizing and evaluating community engagement within promotion and tenure, all participants agreed that engaged research, and the scholarship it produces either do not factor into evaluative decisions or is incorrectly categorized and evaluated as service.
Engaged Scholarship Does Not Count Toward Research Requirements

During each interview, participants were provided with a list of examples of community engaged research products, also referred to as community engaged scholarship, which were referenced throughout the interview. This list included:

- Community presentations
- Creative products (e.g., art shows, videos)
- Laws/public policy
- Community programs
- Community reports
- Delivery of products and/or services to community

All participants shared that community engaged scholarship, like that listed above, are not given any special consideration or evaluated any differently than traditional research products within promotion and tenure. Many participants noted community engaged scholarship is often “nice to have” within a candidate’s dossier, but does not factor into evaluative decisions:

I think there's two ways that I would look at this. I think [engaged scholarship] factors in, but not necessarily formally. Because, again, I think we default to the traditional research outputs. And so that even conversations in a P and T meeting will be like, ‘Well, don't forget, we have to keep in mind what's considered a valuable output from the work that an individual is doing.’ Personally, I don't feel like I see enough of these community engaged research outputs. I feel like faculty are conditioned to think that P and T is truly based on the traditional research outputs. (Andrea)

Most participants noted that candidates’ engaged scholarship is not looked at in a negative light by their department and school’s promotion and tenure committees, but that it is only ever considered after a candidate has produced the required amount of traditional research products. Most often, engaged scholarship is merely a bonus that is “nice to have” and rarely factors into decisions of promotion and tenure:
You know, in my experience here at [university] … much of what you've got in the community engaged research column wouldn't count. I mean, it's nice and I don't think anybody's opposed to interacting with a community or doing community-based kinds of reports or videos or things like that. It's just, when it comes to the actual promotion and tenure process, or even the annual reports and annual merit pay raises. . . . These things aren't going to count for very much where I am. (Thomas)

If they're doing community engaged research it doesn't take away from them, you know, it's not bad. But I wouldn't say it gives them a bump up either. . . . If they're doing that, that would be kind of a little check next to their name like, ‘Yeah they did that. They're doing community engagement. They’re serving our stakeholders.’ (Douglas)

In the experiences of the study’s participants, engaged scholarship is seen as tertiary at best, a value add to any candidate’s dossier after the minimum for traditional research products is met. All participants agreed that at their institutions engaged scholarship does not count toward a faculty’s minimum requirements for research and is hardly ever a substitute for traditional scholarly products:

The committee will look at [community engaged scholarship] and add those, and put those in the report, and count them as dissemination, but they won't count toward the minimum requirements. So, they count, but you have to have the minimum and then you can go above that. . . . The thing that we hear the most is that those products you have listed under community engaged research are not valued as much as a peer-reviewed publication. So, you may have a creative product, like a video, that just made a tremendous hit … maybe the government using it. Maybe somebody told the CDC to stop being stupid and your video was successful. You could be on Oprah. You could be on a bazillion shows, but that doesn't count as much as a peer-reviewed publication. (Julie)

[Committees] would talk about community engagement. I think it would be … it would be great if a faculty member did that, but it's probably icing on the cake. And the cake is really their empirical bench science kind of work. (Philip)

*Engaged Scholarship is Incorrectly Categorized and Evaluated as Service and Weighted Less*

Though only one of the institutions in this study specifically referenced community “engaged research” and “community engaged scholarship” in their institution-level guidelines, participants shared that within all of their school- and department-level guidelines had direct references to *service*, which they noted is often confounded with community engaged
Participants shared that, in their memory, any references to community or
community engaged work was within the service or extension category of their guidelines and,
as such, given far less weight and priority in relation to the research and teaching components of
one’s dossier:

I don’t think that our guidelines say anything about engaged scholarship. And I could be
wrong, but it certainly isn’t a significant part … and if it does say anything about it, I’m
sure it says it within the context of the service component of the dossier. (Thomas)

The review of institution-level guidelines did highlight a lack of engaged terminology throughout
all sections, though one university in the study did specifically reference community engaged
research and community engaged scholarship in their institution-level guidelines as research.
However, the majority of participants in this study felt as though their school, department, and
institution rarely, if ever, understood community engagement as anything other than service,
especially when it came to the way their department and school review committees evaluated it.

Within evaluation committees, participants shared that community engaged scholarship
was often labeled a “gray product” or identified a “gray area” where promotion and tenure
committees would usually place engaged scholarship. Though engaged scholarship does not
count toward the minimum research outputs a candidate must hit in order to achieve promotion
and tenure, engaged scholarship is understood by reviewers to exist in in a “gray area” where it is
not considered a product of research, but rather a product service. As peer-reviewed publications
written for the academic community are usually considered the “gold standard” in scholarship,
scholarly outputs involving community are considered “gray products” and given little value in
promotion and tenure:

The way our P and T guidelines classifies [engaged scholarship] is service. Not as
scholarship. Even though these categories overlap. Yes, if I'm presenting to the
community results and implications of what we found … that is scholarship. But it's not
seen as that because it was at a community organized meeting, not at a professional
conference and there was no peer review. So, they still fall back on that. That's what they call grey publications, non-peer-reviewed reports. . . . Things of that nature just are not valued as highly. (Felix)

Participants felt that products that in differ from standard, traditional scholarship are quickly judged to be far less rigorous and thus are not usually counted or evaluated within promotion and tenure. Faculty who carry out engaged scholarship and include it in their dossiers are often viewed by promotion and tenure committees to be not as productive as their traditional peers because they usually publish less, or in community- or practitioner-based journals. Even though many participants noted engaged faculty will often provide lengthy explainers within their CVs detailing the intensive engaged research processes they undertook (e.g., building relationships and trust within community), engaged scholarship is usually not counted at all, or sometimes, even more discouragingly, categorized and evaluated as service.

Many participants highlighted a tension between the research/service divide when it came to categorizing engaged scholarship. None of the participants’ department or school promotion and tenure guidelines had a separate, explicit category for community engagement. However, participants at land grant institutions identified an extension category, which will later be discussed in greater detail. Participants noted that because there is no defined category to classify community engagement or engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure, it is either pushed under the umbrella of research and held to the evaluative metrics used for traditional research, or, more often, categorized as service. Most participants shared that committees use the designation of peer reviewed as the primary way to categorize scholarly outputs as either research or service. Any scholarly outputs that are not peer-reviewed (where peer is defined as someone within the academic community, with a Ph.D.) are automatically defined as service, regardless of the processes or type of scholarship. Joyce elaborated:
A policy brief would be a publication, but it would be a second or third tier … in terms of the value it's given. So, there's a lot of privilege given to your peer-reviewed research articles. So, you can count all that other stuff, but the weight it's given is very much smaller and will often just be counted as service for a lot of people.

The default categorization of engaged scholarship as service and not research is extremely problematic. Participants noted that in their experiences as reviewers, products within the service category are inherently devalued and rarely evaluated, or even considered to count within promotion and tenure. This sentiment was echoed by almost all participants who shared that the department and school committees on which they have served almost never consider service products to be of any value. Rather, they are instinctively marginalized and have no influence on decisions of promotion and tenure:

It's the research that is 75 - 95% of what counts. The teaching counts a fair amount. And service … you just want to do barely enough to get by so you can say you did something. You're not going to get anywhere in a promotion and tenure case because you have an outstanding service record. If you have an outstanding teaching record and a good research record, you might get by. But you have a really good research record and your service is virtually invisible … that probably won't work against you that much. . . . Some kinds of service are more credible than others and are viewed more favorably than others. But collectively, I just don't think they amount to much when it comes to that promotion and tenure decision, or even the annual or merit pay decisions. It's the peer-reviewed journals. . . . If [engaged scholarship] is understood only as service, it's … marginalized and doesn't matter. (Thomas)

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Must Explicitly Speak to Engaged Scholarship**

The exclusion of engaged scholarship in department and school guidelines can serve as a signal to review committees that there is no requirement, need, or incentive for committee members to appropriately understand, categorize, or value community engaged research or its non-traditional processes and products. All participants were unwavering in their belief that in order to better categorize and value engaged scholarship, explicit, detailed language defining and describing engaged research and scholarship is needed within department and school promotion and tenure guidelines. Every participant spoke to the need for their schools and departments to
revise their promotion and tenure guidelines to be more inclusive of engaged scholarship and actually name it as an acceptable form of research upon which faculty can be evaluated.

Participants were adamant in their belief that without naming engaged scholarship in school and department guidelines, committees are unable to effectively evaluate and reward it as anything other than traditional scholarship or service. Though such guideline revisions are often an arduous and lengthy step, they were identified by participants as the most necessary in order to ensure lasting change:

If it's not in the P and T guidelines I don't care how much I like it, it just doesn't matter. And it's not because I don't care in my heart about it, but it's because the promotion and tenure committee … they're going to use those guidelines. So, if you could get community engaged research recognized within promotion and tenure guidelines, it would immediately become really important. But that's very difficult to do. (Douglas)

I think you have to communicate the incentive. . . . There are some people that are going to do things because they count. And they're not going to do other things because they don't count. Count, you know, in terms of promotion and tenure. So, I think that you have to be explicit and have a conversation at the department level about what that means. And put that in writing. . . . I think if we're going to get people to embrace this within the faculty world, the R1 world, there's got to be that incentive. There has to be that direct line to promotion and tenure, to their evaluation. . . . It’s got to be tied back to the evaluation of a faculty member. (Philip)

I think more explicit language around community engaged scholarship in guidelines for promotion would be really important. Because without it being explicit, people just kind of revert back to the tried and true the old traditional research … I think that would be a huge, huge thing. (Joyce)

If promotion and tenure guidelines do not explicitly address community engaged scholarship, committee members are often unable to evaluate it as anything other than service or traditional research which then requires adherence to a rigid set of evaluative metrics.
“It’s an Old School System that Needs to Change”: Traditional Metrics to Evaluate Faculty Research Do Not Work for Community Engaged Scholarship

Participants noted that relegating community engaged scholarship to the service category of one’s dossier is only part of the issue. Without clear mention of community engagement in their department and school guidelines, faculty are given the choice to categorize their engaged scholarship as service (and not have it weighted as heavily as other aspects) or categorize it as research, to which it is then held to traditional research standards and metrics. Many participants lamented that anytime the word research was used as a way to define faculty work it automatically requires very specific and tightly defined outputs on which it must be evaluated:

As soon as there's an “R” attached to it for research, then the committee is going to be looking at the standard metrics. They're going to be looking at the number of grants you've had, and the size, the number of publications and the impact factor the journals in which you're contributing, and your growing national and international reputation. Again, which is more difficult to do, in a community engaged context. (Louis)

This lose-lose situation was echoed by participants across all disciplines and institutional types. As Felix shared, “Community engaged research is considered research, yes. It’s research. But it still falls under the umbrella of research and they look at it by, what’s your return on investment on that research.” The rigidity of traditional metrics to evaluate any type of research within promotion and tenure is an issue all participants addressed. Participants shared that their department- and school-level guidelines were all quite detailed in outlining specific traditional scholarly outputs (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles) required of any faculty work labeled research:

Some of our promotion and tenure guidelines explicitly say, ‘You will publish two research journal publication articles per year in order to earn the next step.’ I’ve never seen a P and T guideline that says, ‘You need to do so many workshops.’ Or ‘You need to do so many community level events.’ Those just don’t count. (Douglas)
However, because community engaged research is not explicitly referenced or defined within promotion and tenure guidelines, participants noted that committee members must either default to categorizing engaged scholarship as service or evaluate it with standard metrics designed to judge the quality and rigor of traditional, non-engaged research. Because community engaged scholarship is not identified as a specific type of research or scholarship within promotion and tenure, committee members are usually unable evaluate any differently than traditional research, regardless of how its processes and products differ.

**Standardized Metrics Lead to Inevitable Bean Counting**

Across the board, participants identified the following as the most common metrics used by department- and school-level promotion and tenure committees to evaluate the quality of all forms of faculty scholarship:

- Peer-reviewed publications
- Impact (on the academy)
- Funding
- Candidate’s national reputation

These metrics used for evaluation were identified by all participants, regardless of discipline, institution, or type of scholarship being evaluated. Thomas shared:

> When it comes to promotion and tenure, it is very traditional criteria that completely dominate. How many publications and in which journals? And it's not that people reject community engaged scholarship. I mean, that's nice. But that's not what people focused on in those kinds of decisions.

Jerry elaborated, acknowledging that their department and school lack the tools to effectively evaluate community engaged scholarship through a non-traditional lens:

> I don't think we’ve reached enough shared understanding among lots of stakeholders here regarding either the timelines or even the full range of criteria that should and can be used to evaluate how effectively people are doing community engaged research.
Additionally, many participants noted that when evaluating faculty’s scholarship committees often do not have enough time to dive fully into understanding the type of scholarship, even if they wanted to. Rather, they must be able to quickly identify the quality and quantity of faculty scholarship, which are usually reduced to a specific set of easily quantifiable metrics. All participants acknowledged that these somewhat superficial metrics are unable to fully account for the quality of non-traditional scholarship and put engaged faculty at a disadvantage. However, some participants noted that a short-list of easily quantifiable, standardized metrics allow for a more efficient and less subjective evaluation process overall, regardless of what type of scholarship faculty produce:

You can count peer-reviewed journal articles. It's very objective. If somebody says, ‘Well, I made this video and it changed the way we operate in a pandemic.’ … So what. And then you have to say what is the ‘so what’. And then it's up to a bunch of people to subjectively judge whether they buy your ‘so what’. . . . That's part of the fear that I understand for committees. (Julie)

Though a standardized set of quantifiable metrics may take away some of the subjectivity, bias, and ambiguity for committee members, participants noted that this approach usually always leads to “bean counting” and a focuses more on the quantity of traditional scholarship as opposed to the quality and overall impact of one’s work:

I think at the college level … I just know from serving on, that there are some bean counters in there that are going to count up, ‘They did this number of community presentations and they did this number of peer-reviewed journal articles. Oh, and these five at an impact factor of at least three.’ You know, they're going to be like that. . . . We have to be aware that there are people that are going to be counting. . . . Sadly, there are going to be people that are going to count stuff. So, we have to be aware that. Playing the game is part of this whole deal. (Philip)

Further, many participants shared that, in their experience, when a number is assigned to something it is inherently valued more – what is counted, counts. And by not providing a clear way to evaluate, or even count, engaged scholarship it is inherently and fundamentally devalued
within promotion and tenure. This devaluing, while acknowledged by most participants, is also felt by junior faculty. A few participants shared that they know of candidates within their departments and schools who are nervous to even include engaged scholarship within their dossiers in fear that it could be seen as illegitimate or childish:

It's this tension behind, ‘I know what I have to hit … and I did something really cool, but I don't know how the committee is going to judge it.’ The committee might just think it's something that kindergarteners can do. (Julie)

Regardless of the intention of a standardized, quantifiable set of metrics, when numbers are assigned to scholarly outputs and counted, those outputs are inherently more valued. By not considering the depth and nuance of engaged scholarship and instead holding it to metrics created to evaluate traditional scholarship, engaged faculty are put at a clear disadvantage. However, before turning attention more fully to the effects of using traditional metrics to evaluate engaged scholarship, it is important to first understand what specific metrics are used to evaluate all types of faculty scholarship. It is important to note that the metrics detailed below are those used only when evaluating faculty research.

**Peer-Reviewed Publications.** The weight given to peer-reviewed publications when evaluating faculty scholarship in promotion and tenure cannot be understated. Every participant was quick to share that peer-reviewed journal articles are the “gold standard” when it comes to assessing the quality of faculty research. Most participants noted faculty are required to produce, at minimum, two to three peer-reviewed publications per year to even be considered for promotion or tenure. Further, double-blind, peer-reviewed studies on which the faculty is the first, or solo, author were identified as the “cream of the crop” in terms of scholarly outputs. However, participants did note that the concept of first author was troubling to many of them, as solo authorship is antithetical to the concept of community engaged scholarship:
Solo authorship is not even really ethical to do in community engaged scholarship. But in my school … and I think in my university too … solo authorship is still valued above writing with other people. And I think that's a problem. Definitely a problem. To write out a community engaged project by yourself just doesn't work. It doesn't fit with the methodology, the ethos, the ethics of it. (Joyce)

Further, the notion of impact was often discussed in relation to publications. Though the concept and measurement of impact will later be explored in much greater detail, it is inherently tied to peer-reviewed publications, as journal impact factors were identified as the primary way by which scholarly impact is evaluated. Douglas explained, “You count how many publications they have; you look at the impact factor of the journals so you can get some feel for the quality of the research, you look at how many times they are cited by other people.”

All participants shared the understanding that the journals in which faculty publish, and their impact factors, are of extreme importance. However, many also acknowledged that this metric often puts community engaged researchers at a significant disadvantage:

The journals that [community engaged researchers] can publish in don't have very high impact factors and that hurts. And that's terrible, but that's the truth. And that's part of the problem. That if the journals don't have high impact factors, then people reviewing it, who are looking at this, are not recognizing the amount of work that goes into it. (Felix)

If it's only practitioner journals, if it's not research journals … then it's not judged as highly. So, it does put a lot of pressure on community engaged scholars, because we have to publish broadly, for multiple audiences. And for a non-tenured professor that can be tough. (Joyce)

Further complicating the issues of valued publication venues is the notion of audience and what audiences count when it comes to disseminating scholarship.

**Audience.** Most participants shared their belief that faculty who produce engaged scholarship have two audiences to whom they cater – the academic community and their non-academic community partners. Though participants agreed that the dissemination of scholarship to both audiences is understood as equal in the minds of community engaged researchers, the
primary audience that counts when it comes to recognizing and defining what is scholarship within promotion and tenure is the academic community:

You've got two audiences and one is the academic community who's going to take your research and replicate it to give it more strength, for example, and the other is [external] organizations who might take this information and translate it into decisions. But they are not equally valued because universities, all universities that I've had any experience with, have this traditional academic perspective. (Debra)

Most scholarship created for the community (e.g., white papers, policy briefs, community presentations, reports) is understood by promotion and tenure committees as a courtesy to the community and are not considered or evaluated as academic scholarship. Participants noted that a strict adherence to primarily valuing the academic audience when it comes to scholarly products allows them to define and quantify what counts as a scholarly output within promotion and tenure more easily. They shared that committees often struggle to understand what counts as scholarly or defining what is a “significant contribution” to a community audience. However, it is easier to define significant contributions to an academic audience when all that is measured are the number of peer-reviewed publications and journal impact factors. The need for easily quantifiable and clean metrics upon which to evaluate faculty helps to influence how committees define what audiences count and which do not.

With the growing prominence of open access publication outlets, some participants were optimistic that the notion of who is considered an acceptable audience is slowly evolving. However, they acknowledged that the academic audience is still the one to whom faculty must cater, as the language and terminology required to publish in such spaces is not often accessible to community partners. Joyce noted:

In the tenure dossier we make a case for the places that we published being high quality or, identifying top tier, second tier, third tier … so, scholars can make a case that less mainstream or commonly highly valued outlets still are valuable and are reaching broader audiences. You can make that case, and especially now with access through the internet
to all kinds of information about who's reading, or how much reading, it's shifting little bit. . . . But still the academic-to-academic audience thing is still highly valued.

Further, the number of community-based individuals who access and leverage traditional publications is minimal because such outlets are not widely known or accessed outside of the academic community. Rather, the spaces more frequently accessed by community (e.g., YouTube, blogs, community forums) are generally written off by promotion and tenure committees and considered to be less impactful than traditional academic journals. Douglas shared:

There's a professor in this department who . . . does all the things he's supposed to do, but he also has a YouTube channel . . . [and] it reaches about 8 million people nationwide. And so, he's constantly interviewing other researchers and showing off their work. I think what he's doing is brilliant. You know how many researchers here reach 8 million civilians? I mean, we just, we just don't. But this guy makes it happen. His YouTube channel . . . he probably gets about 25-30,000 people watching his YouTube videos. I look at that guy and I think, ‘Gosh, you know, he's doing it.’ I mean, he's doing really great things and I'm really impressed with how he does something different. But when we reviewed his packet, there were other people who said that all counted for zero. They said that it just didn't matter. They're like, ‘Well, it's neat, but who cares. How many journals does he have?’ I think any faculty member who was looking for an alternative way to document scholarship or do something like that is doing it at great risk to their own career.

For the community engaged researcher, the academic audience and community audience are equally important, but often for drastically different reasons. Andrea explained:

I feel like the valued audiences are those who are going to determine promotion or annual evaluation. But I feel like if you're going to do authentic community engaged research, your primary stakeholders are truly the community members or those community groups with whom you're working. And ultimately . . . those are the most important ones, but from an evaluation standpoint, it remains separate.

Engaged faculty feel compelled to disseminate scholarship, often in non-traditional ways, for the benefit of their community partners, as this is a foundational tenant of community engaged research. However, for the sake of their careers and to ensure their employment, faculty are
asked to cater to the academic community and, by extension, to their promotion and tenure committees.

**Funding.** All participants identified another very clear metric against which faculty are evaluated within promotion and tenure, external funding tied to their scholarship. Participants shared that external funding proves to committee members that a faculty member’s research is *worth it* and clearly illustrates a need for their scholarship. Further, participants noted that funding provides huge publicity and recognition for their departments and schools, which causes leadership to instruct faculty to follow the money and pursue a line of scholarship that can bring in the most external funds. As such, participants noted that department and school leaders and promotion and tenure committees are more supportive of community engaged research when it is connected to large funding streams (e.g., NIF grants, NIH grants). However, participants were quick to point out that large funders do not often support community engaged research and faculty pursuing an engaged scholarly agenda are far less likely to receive external funding.

Felix explained:

NIH [National Institutes of Health], they talk the talk but don't walk the walk. So yes, they enjoy hearing that you're doing community engaged participatory research, but they won't support it. They don't support it, even though they claim they are supporting it. I have written many grants where I've tried to write my community partners into the grant and the reviews come back, ‘This person is not qualified.’ They don't have a Ph.D., you're correct. That's because they're in the community. So, it's very difficult to get things funded that are truly community-based participatory research.

The notion that community engaged research is not supported by external funders directly informs how department, school, and institutional leaders understand and value it within promotion and tenure. Participants shared that in their experiences, leaders, and by extension review committees, place more value on scholarship that can bring in large sums of money for
the institution, which can lead to the devaluation of community engaged research. Louis elaborated:

The notion of community engaged or community partnered research is a bit of a poor stepchild. It doesn't generate a lot of revenue. It doesn't address the sort of priorities of people in charge of a $4 billion-dollar business. The attention goes to more revenue generating kinds of things, by far the highest priority … in order to keep the lights on and feed the overhead. . . . The university is a is a big business. . . . It doesn't make its money from engaging with the community. That has driven the blindness in some respects. . . . That's bit of an overstatement … of the university to the importance of community engagement and the scholarship that goes along with it. . . . [The university] still has a long way to go to become a truly community engaged system.

Because large funding streams to support community engaged research are few and far between, faculty are often dissuaded from pursuing an engaged research agenda believing that their scholarship will be less valued when it comes to answering to their promotion and tenure committees. The influence of funding on a faculty member’s research agenda cannot be understated. As Douglas confirmed, “The person who funds you is who gets to define your mission.” Elaborating further, Douglas acknowledged that if community engaged scholarship is going to be valued in promotion and tenure, change is more likely to occur not because departments, schools, and institutions ultimately value it, but rather, that national funders do:

[The university] moves at a glacial pace … getting faculty to come together and agree on promotion and tenure guidelines and saying, ‘community engaged research is important’, it would be very difficult. Another probably faster, more effective way to do that would be to get the granting agencies, like the US Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, to build that into their grants. That one of the expectations for products of this grant is that you produce community engaged research. Now that, that would really cause change to occur quickly. . . . Because we're all in a spot where we have to produce grants. I mean, we have to bring in money. . . . If they put that in their grant applications and required us to do it, the very next year we would all do it. Whoever won the grant would have to do it. And that is a much faster inroad. . . . It’s so tough to convince [university leaders] that community engaged research is of great value and we should start doing that. Unless you connected it to money, or publications, or something that they do value, because that's what a university values. (Douglas)
**National Reputation.** As articulated by this study’s participants, the number of peer-reviewed publications and amount of external funding are the primary metrics upon which promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty scholarship at their institutions. However, all participants also noted that in order for faculty to successfully advance, they must emerge as a national scholar by providing evidence that their scholarship reaches beyond their state and local communities. Many participants were quick to share that requiring faculty to establish a national reputation heavily discounts the locally or regionally based work most engaged scholars prioritize. This again points back to the issue of acceptable audiences for faculty’s scholarship and further solidifies the notion that the academic community is more heavily valued than one’s local community. Douglas noted:

> We're looking for you to emerge as a national leader. That’s a common thing that we would say and that may be in our P and T documents. And so, if you're doing community-based research at the local level … in your own state … you're not emerging as a national leader. So, unless you are replicating or you are doing community-based research and then replicating it in other states or something like that … the whole structure of our promotion and tenure process doesn't encourage you to do local. . . . So, if you're doing community-based work research outside of your state, then that would be well received. If you were doing community-based research within your state, it would not be valued as high. Because you're not emerging as a national scholar, you're not building a national reputation … if you are just doing research with community partners within your own state that would not be well received.

When discussing faculty’s national reputation some participants brought the concept of *rigor* into the conversation. They stated that locally based community engagement is usually not understood to be as rigorous as scholarship that has a regional or national reach, regardless of what processes or scholarly products are generated. Some even asserted that sitting on a national organization’s board is given greater value than the local dissemination of community-based scholarship simply because it had more of a national reach. Participants highlighted that non-traditional scholarly outputs of community engaged research are usually only reviewed if they
had a national audience. At their institutions, participants noted that a national audience, in the eyes of promotion and tenure committees, generates greater impact, regardless of the type of scholarship produced. Further, it provides a higher level of recognition and distinction for the institution, far more so than does the scholarship produced from locally based community engaged research. Jerry elaborated:

I think that what people would look at is if you developed a community intervention, or tool, or video that was particularly useful and other communities began picking it up and adopting and adapting. That’s evidence of impact. That's an evidence of influence … that your work is going beyond working with just a community in [local town]. And I think that would be seeing in a favorable light. . . . But I think what people would say is, ‘Show me the evidence of how this is going beyond [local town].’

**Impact.** Understanding, defining, and evaluating the impact of scholarly work is an incredibly tricky endeavor, as impact, especially within the context of community engagement, is not easily quantifiable. Most participants shared, and the review of institution-level guidelines revealed, that impact is not explicitly defined within their promotion and tenure criteria and it is most often left to those on review committees to come with a shared understanding about how to evaluate it. It is then left to the candidates to make the case that their work is impactful, based on how they believe their committee defines and measures *impact*:

> We don’t bring in metrics [around impact]. So, it's not certainly spelled out in the standards. I think that's why we have committees to apply their lens and think about it, and it's up to the candidate to make their pitch. It’s the person going up for promotion to explain and present data that they think support the assertion that they're having an impact. (Jerry)

However, participants noted the primary audience considered when evaluating impact is the academic community. As such, impact within the academic community is measured almost exclusively by journal impact factors, citation counts, and Google scholar ratings. Participants acknowledged that committees really struggle to define impact in ways other than the traditional notions of measuring journal impact factors. Any time faculty attempt to demonstrate impact in
non-traditional ways it is met with great hesitation, as it is not yet the norm for impact to be defined in any way other than journal impact factors and citation counts.

The traditional evaluation criteria for assessing impact puts community engaged researchers at a great disadvantage. Not only is scholarship directed to community audiences rarely, if ever, considered within promotion and tenure, but publication outlets or engagement-focused practitioner journals tend to have lower impact rankings than those that speak only to academics. For engaged faculty, impact is bifurcated. They feel personally compelled to ensure the products of their community-based work are disseminated in ways that are most advantageous to their community stakeholders (e.g., policy briefs, websites, YouTube videos), but they also feel forced to publish in journals with high impact rankings to achieve promotion and tenure because impact is assessed in very strict and non-forgiving ways. Philip elaborated on this tension:

If I write a journal article, I don't care what the impact factor is on the journal. How many people are going to read that thing? Maybe five grad students that are going to cite it? I mean, how many people are going to see [a community-oriented] TV show? I mean, there are millions of people that watch that. So, in my opinion, that is so much more valuable … that is so much more valuable, but the process, you know, promotion and tenure and all that is so much more about research at a place like this.

Within promotion and tenure, there little incentive for faculty to consider impact as anything beyond traditional peer-reviewed publications in high-ranking journals. Any attempt to define or illustrate impact in non-traditional ways is either not considered at all, or categorized as service, not scholarship, by promotion and tenure committees. And though many participants highlighted these tensions and recognized that the current ways to assess impact are quite flawed, from their position as tenured faculty on review committees, they feel powerless to change it:

Truly what ends up getting reviewed is the line on the CV. It’s a presentation at a conference or a published article in a peer-reviewed journal in one that has a high impact factor. And really, as a faculty member, you can sit there and think, ‘Well, big deal. Did
I really make a difference in the community?” Because otherwise, what's the point of the research if we're if we're focused more on the accolades that we're going to get out of it, as opposed to how the community benefits. (Andrea)

It's the tension. I look at [community-based scholarship] and I'm like, ‘Oh, these are all just fantastic things and they all have more impact to them than an article that's not read in a peer-reviewed journal!’ . . . . I just wish we didn't have peer review, that we didn't have [the] system that we have now. (Julie)

However, many participants shared that impact, while currently measured solely by journal impact factors, citation counts, and Google scholar ratings, could sometimes be addressed within external letters written on behalf of candidates. Though illusions to non-traditional impact within external letters were by no means able to take the place of traditional measures of impact, letters describing a faculty member’s impact in community might be taken into consideration provided that all other required criteria were met (e.g., enough peer-reviewed publications in high-ranking journals). However, the subject of external letters and who counts as an accepted and valued peer is one that comes with its own set of challenges for community engaged researchers.

**External Letters.** While all participants shared similar experiences when it came to the traditional metrics used to evaluate faculty scholarship thus far (e.g., citation counts, external funding, journal impact factors), their experiences differed when considering how much weight external letters hold when promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty scholarship. While all participants noted their committees heavily rely on external letters to speak to the depth and breadth of a candidate’s scholarship, who counts as an acceptable author of an external letter, and can be considered a peer, was split. Many participants noted that their department and school committees only took into consideration letters written by other academics, acknowledging that fellow committee members “don’t trust” non-academic, community-based individuals as experts able to speak to the impact of a candidate’s work:
You know, one of the things I had been involved in is a lot of discussions where we talked about how we develop definitions of [community engaged scholarship] and metrics for measuring it. One key issue is ‘How do we review it?’ How do you select reviewers who are the experts in this area? And I just can't see my department paying much attention to somebody who's an expert on engaged scholarship and writes a glowing letter for somebody … if that expert doesn't have a really strong record of publication and peer-reviewed articles, if they're not a full professor at a respected university. I feel like I'm a broken record. (Thomas)

Though a few participants noted that their departments and schools actively seek out letters from community-based individuals to speak to the impact of engaged candidate’s work, letters written by community peers were never weighted as heavily as letters penned by fellow academics:

I think, in principle, [community partners writing letters] is great. But I would tell you that maybe in our department, there might be some folks who would say, ‘Well, that's kind of cool, that the, the CEO of this organization or the Executive Director of this organization wrote this letter.’ But the short answer to it is that it's not going to carry nearly the weight at a place like this. Just being frank … that another tenured faculty member at another university saying, ‘This junior faculty member’s contribution is so great.’ I mean, and that's sad, but at a place like this, they want to hear from other scholars, other [academic] experts saying a non-tenured faculty member is worthy and has earned tenure. When it comes to a faculty member getting a teaching award or community engagement award or something like that, I think those letters from community organizations and leadership within them is great. But when it comes to promotion and tenure, you know, it's got to be another tenured scholar for it to carry value. In a way, sure that’s sad, but I think that that's just kind of how it is, you know. (Philip)

Some participants noted that letters written by non-academics would be acknowledged only within the category of service, as any impact described by non-academic, community-based peers would be considered impact on community and not the academy. This, they maintained, inherently relegates any input from community partners to be in the service category, as community partners are unable to speak to the value of faculty scholarship. However, a few participants noted that when community-based letters describe in greater detail the faculty’s partnership with community, it is extremely helpful for committee members unfamiliar with
engaged research, because they are able to better understand the amount of work that goes into it. As letters are usually the only place the unique and nuanced processes of community engaged research come out, letters are valued as one of the only places able to shed light on the depth and quality of the relationships faculty build with their community partners.

*Evaluating Engaged Scholarship with Traditional Metrics is like Trying to Fit a Square Peg into a Round Hole*

The traditional metrics: peer-reviewed publications, funding, national reputation, and external letters, upon which faculty scholarship is evaluated, were consistently referenced among all participants. Though these metrics were created to evaluate traditional scholarship, they are nonetheless the primary, if not only, metrics used to evaluate community engaged scholarship. For faculty who pursue an engaged research agenda, presenting their engaged scholarship in a way that adheres to traditional metrics is much like attempting to fit a square peg into a round hole. Any attempt of a candidate’s to document their engaged scholarship in non-traditional ways is extremely risky and jeopardizes their chance of receiving promotion and tenure. This sentiment was echoed by all participants:

> I think where I see some of the problem areas in terms of even just trying to figure out how to evaluate engagement, is because we oftentimes are traditionally looking at published articles or grant dollars that are coming in. We can frame it around engagement as long as there's publications and grant dollars that are coming in with it. But if there's alternative ways of output and products, it gets a little bit tricky to try to figure out if that’s valuable. . . . When faculty start having alternative ways to demonstrate impact or to share their research, there's kind of that cultural transition that hasn't quite taken effect yet, in terms of being able to see how we evaluate, or how can we effectively accept that type of work in place of the traditional articles, publications, research output, that individuals are easily measured. (Andrea)

As all participants themselves have an engaged research agenda, many voiced frustration with the way community engaged research and its non-traditional processes are generally misunderstood by their non-engaged colleagues. The general consensus of their non-engaged
peers was that community engaged research is not as rigorous as traditional research.

Acknowledging that their colleague’s misinformed beliefs are primarily the product of a misalignment between traditional metrics and non-traditional, engaged processes and scholarship, Felix lamented:

People think you're making an excuse for not being as productive as other people. And part of me is like, ‘I don't have a minute in the day that I'm not spending on something related to [engagement]’. So, it's not that I'm not being productive, but it's not in the metrics that you're focused on.

Evaluating Research Processes is “Not in the Conversation Yet”. During each interview, participants were asked to specifically address how both community engaged research processes and products (e.g., scholarship) are evaluated in promotion in tenure. When it came to evaluating research processes, all participants shared that at no point are research processes considered when evaluating faculty’s scholarship. A review of each participants’ institution-level guidelines also found there to be no reference to research processes in the written documentation. Andrea noted that engaged research processes “don’t factor in significantly to the evaluation of the work.” Further, Joyce shared, “Judging community-based or community engaged scholarship for the nature of the relationship … that’s not in the conversation yet.” Echoing this, Julie noted, “We’re not evaluating anybody’s research processes. We’re really just looking at products. We wouldn’t be doing anything like that.”

Most participants shared that processes do not factor into evaluative decisions mostly because there is no mention of research processes, or metrics upon which to assess them, in their department’s or school’s promotion and tenure guidelines. Because there is no shared understanding of engaged research processes among committees the intangibles of engaged research simply are not evaluated, valued, or recognized, by review committees. Only scholarly products are factored into evaluative decisions:
This promotion and tenure thing, if somebody [is an] assistant professor going up to associate professor and they said in the narrative of their dossier that, ‘We've been spending a lot of time on the process of building these relationships with these organizations and fostering trust and collaboration and we've done all this stuff’ … that is, that's great. And you have to do that. But I know that there would be faculty on that committee at the department level and at the college level and even at the university who would say, ‘Well, that stuff's great. That's great that, that you've written that up in your narrative. But where's the deliverables? Where are the articles that have come from that work?’ And there are people that would say, you know, it didn't happen unless it got published. (Philip)

Many participants noted that engaged faculty may choose to explain their more elaborate research processes within written addendums to their dossiers, or request external letters be written from community partner peers. However, both options are rarely given much weight when committees make evaluative decisions. Though the processes and methodology of engaged research differ from traditional research, and are usually much more time intensive, the quality of engaged research processes are not brought into the discussion when evaluating faculty’s scholarship. When asked how promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s engaged research processes, Julie shared:

We’re not evaluating [processes] . . . . There’s not a specific tool or resource to help evaluate [process]. It’s not evaluated any different than anybody else’s research would be evaluated because you’re expecting the same outcomes from everybody. . . . Outcomes, regardless of the type of research that somebody does, are really the same. So, it's an emerging national scholarship, its peer-reviewed publications, its peer-reviewed presentations. So, the metrics are the same for everybody, regardless of if it's community engaged research or not. . . . That’s just the tradition that continues.

Even if the processes of engaged research done with community peers (e.g., identifying shared research goals, shared study design, community-based scholarly dissemination) are brought into the conversation, many participants shared that they are understood by committees to be far less rigorous than traditional research done entirely within an institution or with academic peers. Participants noted many of their colleagues who sit on their department’s or school’s promotion and tenure committees question if community members are able to assist
with research, because they do not hold a Ph.D. Felix explained, “There is this mindset that, ‘We know best. . . . How could you possibly engage people in the community? They don't have the background.'” Other participants echoed similar sentiments of conversations they have had when serving on their promotion and tenure committees:

There's worry about rigor and legitimacy of questions. . . . So, the whole idea of science … the traditional notion of science and where hypotheses or questions come from, and who's in control of the design and the whole process. That is a conversation and I'm having to really make the argument and support the claims that this is rigorous research when you involve community members in identifying participants, for example, and especially in analyzing and writing up data. (Joyce)

The formal definition of community engaged research is interpreted very differently. This is where I've run into trouble with people is that people don't think the community can help you with the study design. You know, ‘They don't have the training to do that.’ (Felix)

The focus on traditional scholarly products and the dismissal of engaged processes seriously undervalues the total contributions and work of engaged faculty. In the experience of this study’s participants, engaged faculty do not get recognized or rewarded for the countless hours spent building relationships with community partners and working collaboratively. Rather, participants noted that engaged processes and methods are tolerated only if scholarly outputs that adhere to the traditionally defined metrics of quality scholarship are produced from the engaged processes. Even still, participants lament that their collaborative work is often seen as less rigorous than traditional scholarship by promotion and tenure committees. Participants shared that they know engaged faculty want to be recognized and rewarded for the time they invest building trust and strong relationships with their community partners. Quality engaged research requires faculty to devote significant time to relationship building, a process that often spans years. Participants recognized that this often puts engaged faculty farther behind their traditional counterparts when it comes to producing scholarship:
I think the challenge to do this type of work … it takes a long time, takes a long time to build the trust in the community, and to understand the community, and it takes a long time to get funding. It takes a long time for [funders] to believe in you, … that you'll be able to do what you say you're going to do in the community. (Felix)

Community engaged research is a slower process. And so, you are going to see fewer publications than if somebody is analyzing national data sets and becomes an expert in that, you publish a lot. . . . But the problem is, if there aren't people on the committee to speak up and say, ‘I do community engaged research. Let me tell you … ‘You're not going to see as many publications because it's a slower process and you're going to have to look at a broader portfolio of activities to really evaluate this candidate.’ And at this point, I don't think we have anything in our criteria that directly speaks to that. . . . I personally think calling those out is important because it's not unusual for people doing community engaged research to get discouraged and worry that they may not get promoted. They may have chairs who said the same thing … that, ‘You're not being productive.’ I don't think we’ve reached enough shared understanding among lots of stakeholders here regarding either the timelines or even the full range of criteria that should and can be used to evaluate how effectively people are doing community engaged research. (Jerry)

Participants shared that the lengthy and often messy processes of community engaged research, coupled with the fact that those processes are not valued within promotion and tenure, often cause junior faculty to either forgo an engaged research agenda until after achieving promotion and tenure or forgo tenure and chose a non-tenured track option (e.g., lecturer, clinician).

*Not Valuing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Discourages Junior Faculty from Pursuing an Engaged Research Agenda*

Often, engaged faculty are working on the margins of their academic communities. Though there are many groups and organizations that exist to support engaged faculty and provide resources, encouragement, and a space to convene, being an engaged scholar, especially at a large R1 institution that does not appropriately value or even understand the work, can be extremely isolating. Participants shared that they have seen many of their colleagues encourage junior faculty not to pursue community engaged research or invest time in relationship building.
with community because such work is not valued at their institution, especially within promotion and tenure. Rather, junior faculty are counseled to pursue a line of scholarship that will get them bigger personal benefit. Participants acknowledged that junior faculty usually only ever get tenured at their institutions if they wait to produce engaged scholarship after receiving tenure. For junior faculty committed to an engaged research agenda, such work is often presented as a reward for after they achieve promotion and tenure and have proven themselves to be a successful scholar:

[Community engaged research] is almost like it's a reward of making it to full professor or a reward for making it past the tenure process. You can finally slow down and do the research you want to do instead of trying to crank out the numbers to get through P and T. And I hate that’s the way it is, but if I’m just being an honest, that's mostly what it is. (Douglas)

At the assistant to associate level it's about getting your name out, it's about … in a place like this (R1 institution) it's about paying your dues and doing the article stuff so that after associate professor, you can do a little bit more of that community engagement. (Philip)

The road for tenure-track faculty who want to pursue an engaged research agenda is not an easy one. In order to carry out engaged research in ways that are equitable and in line with the foundational elements of community engagement, faculty must spend significant time developing relationships with partners. This puts them at a significant disadvantage, in comparison to their non-engaged colleagues, as their timelines are often prolonged and they receive little credit or acknowledgement of their investment of time and resources.

On the other hand, for junior faculty who do not want to delay their engaged research agenda, it is often suggested that they forgo tenure and seek a non-tenure track position (e.g., clinician, practitioner, lecturer). Participants at land grant institutions or situated within more clinically based professional departments and schools shared that faculty’s engaged scholarship is not valued at all, unless their role is specifically defined as an extension or clinical/practitioner
appointment. Participants shared that both themselves and their colleagues believe it’s more acceptable for faculty in non-tenure track extension and clinical roles to be more engaged with community than their tenure-track peers. This, they noted, is primarily because faculty within extension or clinical appointments are identified as practitioners, not researchers. Participants at land grant institutions noted that engaged scholarship easily fits into the extension category of a faculty’s dossier because the requirements for extension-based, engaged scholarship are not as rigorous as those for traditional research. The requirements for what can be considered scholarship, and who counts as an acceptable audience for the dissemination of that scholarship, change when evaluating it through an extension or clinical/practitioner lens. This sentiment shared by participants at land grant institutions aligned with the way engagement was framed within their institution-level guidelines, as more engagement terminology appeared in sections specific to the work of extension:

At the university level, we talk about community engagement … you know how there's teaching, research, extension, and service. You know those arms of a land grant university. . . . So, if you've got an extension appointment and you're doing community engagement, that's great. But when you put the word research on that … I immediately then go to, ‘okay, there's that scholarship, that’s peer review, that’s sharing’. And at a place like this, research has now become part of this bucket of … it’s got to be peer reviewed. I mean, don't even talk about research unless it is peer-reviewed. (Philip)

If they have an extension and outreach appointment, that gives them greater latitude to directly engage with civilians. But if they if they have a research appointment and no extension appointment, they need to be published in journals. . . . I've never seen a P and T guideline that says, ‘you need to do so many workshops or you need to do so many community level events’. Those just don't count. They count under extension, but they don't count under research. (Douglas)

Further, participants shared that the metrics used to evaluate the engaged scholarship of faculty in extension, practitioner, or clinical roles can more easily be adjusted to allow for its acceptance in promotion and tenure. This is primarily because engaged scholarship within an extension or clinical category is not considered “big R” research:
Most people who do community engaged research are going to fall into the teacher, clinician, scholar component. And that's in part because of the challenges of doing that kind of work, how long it takes. The fact that there are processes involved in laying a foundation for effective community engaged research that on average don't generate the kind of extramural grant funding that is the case for more traditional NSF and NIH funded grants. . . . That's the kind of payback that the university [is] going to be looking at. So, the metrics are a little different. So, we have an opportunity to reframe the metrics … for community engaged researchers. That's the point of the teacher, clinician, scholar thing, because as soon as there's an “R” attached to it for the research, then the external ad hoc committee is going to be looking at the standard metrics. They're going to be looking at the number of grants you've had and the size, the number of publications and the impact factors of the journals in which you're contributing, and you're growing national and international reputation. Again, which is more difficult to do in a community engaged context. (Louis)

Though faculty’s engaged scholarship is valued and appreciated more within an extension, clinician, or practitioner role, their scholarship is still not considered to be “big R” research. Further, as such roles are rarely on the tenure-track, this inherently relegates engaged faculty to a second-class status within their institutions and academic fields. Even more painful for engaged faculty who are relegated to non-tenure track positions is that they are frequently praised and publicly heralded by their departments, schools, and institutions who leverage their engaged scholarship to put forth an identity as an engaged institution:

Put somebody [who produces engaged scholarship] on a non-tenure track. You know, put them on it and let them have some fun. And look at the image that it can give to the university, to a college! You get the right person in there doing that engagement, being that, that face of the college, of the university, of the department. Oh my gosh. I mean, they're not worried about the review, the promotion and tenure. They're engaging with community. . . . I know that appointment matters, but in a place like this, with promotion and tenure … research is a big thing. (Philip)

Due to the current structures of promotion and tenure at the participants’ R1 institutions, faculty who want to be truly valued for their engaged scholarship are often left to choose between one of two careers – as a tenure-track faculty required to forgo an engaged research agenda until after they have achieved promotion and tenure, or in a non-tenure track clinician or practitioner role, whose engaged scholarship is not considered to be true, “big R” research.
“It’s Catch as Catch Can”: Institution-Wide Supports to Assist with the Evaluation of Community Engaged Research Do Not Exist

During each interview participants were asked if their department, school, and/or institution provided any internal supports (e.g., organizational structures, faculty committees, definitions, guidelines) or external supports (e.g., externally produced rubrics, definitions, guidelines) to assist promotion and tenure committees with understanding and/or evaluating engaged scholarship. All participants shared that they have never received any internal or external supports to help committees understand, define, or evaluate engaged scholarship:

I have been on the evaluation side, on the backside of those tenure applications, for roughly four years. And so, the first few times I had to do it … before I went into the college's tenure committee, I asked specifically for guidelines. Like what am I supposed to be looking at, how am I supposed to do that, and was basically told, ‘Well, there aren't any. You just look at it and see if you think that they're meeting their FTE.’ (Kathleen)

In terms of the actual promotions committee … there's some internal … usually the associate dean or senior dean for Academic Affairs who runs the promotions committee will meet with new people who are coming on and give them an overview, but that's probably about the extent of the training. Show them the handbook, read the handbook, read the guidelines, and then you learn from being on the committee. . . . If somebody has engaged research, I think there's probably an effort made to have somebody on the ad hoc committee, if not maybe the promotions committee itself, who has some knowledge of [engaged scholarship]. So, there may be informal exchange through that. But in terms of a formal education regarding community engaged research, I'm not aware that has happened in a formal way. (Jerry)

Participants were not able to reference any formal processes or documentation to assist with the evaluation of faculty’s engaged scholarship. They noted that any education in this area was on an individual basis, initiated by engaged senior faculty, on a “catch as catch can” basis with their non-engaged senior colleagues.

However, participants were able to list numerous internal and external supports for faculty interested in carrying out community engaged research and disseminating engaged scholarship. Though there existed no supports for promotion and tenure committees to evaluate
or understand engaged scholarship, the following institutional supports were noted as existing for engaged faculty. Participants shared that the supports are primarily geared toward helping engaged faculty carry out engaged research, construct service-learning courses, or learn how to best represent engagement in their dossiers:

- Junior faculty mentoring programs
- Engagement focused centers, institutes, offices, etc.
- Faculty learning committees
- University-wide awards
- Fellowship programs
- Workshops
- Working groups

**Mentoring Junior Faculty**

The most frequently cited internal supports for faculty pursuing an engaged research agenda were inter-departmental mentoring programs. Almost all participants noted their department had a mentoring program where tenured faculty would mentor junior faculty who had scholarly interests similar to their own. Such mentoring programs, either official or unofficial, were the avenue by which almost all participants took to support their engaged junior colleagues and make the path toward tenure and promotion smoother.

The majority of participants shared that they have served as a mentor for junior faculty wishing to pursue an engaged research agenda. Across the board, participants noted that when it came to mentoring engaged junior faculty they most often suggest that they forgo an engaged research agenda until after they have achieved promotion and tenure. This, they explained, drawing from experience as both an engaged faculty who achieved promotion and tenure and as
a someone who has sat on review committees, is due to the fact that engaged scholarship is not highly valued within their institution’s promotion and tenure structures:

There's a mentorship program between the full professors and … I'm one of the older guys so I'm paired up with younger faculty members and I help them prepare their research agenda and then I make sure that they are producing the right product so that they're successful in the P and T process. But I've never sat down and been like, ‘You know, you really need to focus on community engaged research’. (Douglas)

If you're very passionate about doing community engaged research and you're not tenured yet, you have to pick a university that values it. If you pick a university that just values bench research and you try to do this, you're not going to be successful. We usually tell people, ‘If you want to do research that you think is not going to be valued where you are, just do what you need to do to get tenure and work through the promotion process, and then you can do whatever research you want to do when you’re tenured and it doesn't matter.’ But that's not what you want to tell people to do because then they're miserable. (Julie)

However, participants noted that when mentoring junior faculty who choose to pursue an engaged research agenda prior to achieving tenure, they work closely with them to ensure they present their engaged scholarship within their dossiers to ensure committees will understand their work and can be evaluated through the lens of traditional research metrics:

For a lot of junior scholars in my school, senior scholars will help them and mentor them, and we'll have a lot of input into their statements and where they make the case about what their work is and how the outlets they are using are important. They don't do it by themselves. So, they're coached in how to write things in a way that the broader committee will understand or accept. (Joyce)

Interestingly, most participants felt that the best way to support and propel their engaged colleagues forward into promotion and tenure was generally not by working to reform their department, school, or institutional guidelines or methods of evaluation. Rather, it was to help their colleagues adapt to a system that they believed while unfair, was unlikely to change.

Though some participants did briefly discuss the desire for more systemic reform, the majority of participants felt a lack of agency to do so. Instead, it appeared as though they believed their voice and any social or political capital they held was best utilized in the mentoring of their
junior colleagues or creation of faculty development resources (e.g., workshops, seminars) instead of trying to change the structures of promotion and tenure in their departments or schools. The desire to spend their time assisting their junior colleagues maneuver within what they see as a flawed system, rather than upending the system itself, is an issue that will be further unpacked in Chapter Five as it relates to participant agency and institutional change.

**Supports for Engaged Faculty**

Though there are many hurdles engaged faculty face when navigating promotion and tenure, many participants shared how their departments and schools are actively working to build a culture of community engagement and an acceptance of engaged scholarship within the realm of faculty recognition and rewards, while simultaneously trying to provide resources to aid faculty pursuing an engaged research agenda (e.g., training on engaged research methodologies, writing community-based publications). However, there are two fundamental problems with the current supportive approach most participants described. Supports to assist engaged faculty primarily include workshops, working groups, and faculty learning communities focusing on methodologies and non-traditional product creation (e.g., op-eds, media publications). Though these supports are very much needed, they do not address the issue that engaged scholarship is currently devalued within promotion and tenure. It is troublesome that the only supports participants identified to assist with the valuing of engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure were mentoring programs to help faculty adapt their engaged scholarship to fit into the traditional “big R” research category, rather than adjusting how “big R research” is defined and understood.

Further, as engaged senior faculty, participants recognized that they are primarily working in pockets within their departments, schools, and institutions, and do not yet have
enough momentum or numbers behind them to effect larger structural change, contributing to a perceived lack of individual or group agency:

I think that there's a core group of us that do [community engagement] in the school. And we try to work together when we can, but it isn't . . . . We don't have any corner on the market and there isn't really, as far as I know, an active attempt to get more people involved. (Felix)

Aspirationally, participants spoke of a “two-pronged” strategy that they believe is needed for support and change – continued faculty support and training on engaged methodologies and non-traditional product dissemination and a more systemic, structural change that reaches the levels of promotion and tenure (e.g., updated guidelines that value engaged scholarship as research and supports for committee members about how to effectively evaluate it). However, it was clear that most participants did not believe that more foundational changes to their school and/or department’s promotion and tenure structures were a realistically achievable goal any time soon.

Though all participants identified a lack of institution-wide supports to evaluate engaged scholarship, they did not paint an entirely bleak picture of the current work being done throughout their campuses to institutionalize community engagement. Participants shared that their campuses have many resources to help faculty create strong external partnerships, infuse community engagement and service-learning efforts into their curriculum, and recognize their work in campus-wide awards and newsletters. However, all participants noted that while such supports exist, most are championed by campus-wide centers and/or offices dedicated entirely to community engagement efforts and there is no support when it comes to restructuring, rethinking, or understanding promotion and tenure guidelines or evaluative metrics through a community engagement lens. All supports participants referenced were directed toward improving the practices of individual engaged faculty. And while such supports are absolutely
needed and were praised by participants, there was noticeable frustration when discussing the lack of effort by campus leaders to rethink promotion and tenure.

**Institutions and their Leaders are “Talking out of Two Sides of their Mouth”**

Looking forward, all participants spoke about the necessity to have leaders at various levels throughout the institution dedicated to this work. Stephen noted, “You have to have people in certain positions who think this is important.” However, participants offered different opinions about how committed their institution seemed and how much they felt campus leaders actually value community engagement:

> [Community engagement] currently is not valued at this institution so … there's nothing you could do to change the values of this institution. You know what I mean? I can't think of a way for you to influence [university's] view of community engaged research. (Douglas)

Unlike Douglas, most other participants felt that their institutions generally supported community engagement outside of promotion and tenure. However, they hesitated to explicitly say community engagement is fully supported within their institutions because such support, public or otherwise, was not apparent in the structures used to reward and retain faculty:

> I think from an institutional standpoint, there are incredible community engaged efforts taking place. Now, how does that translate into what you're interested in, in terms of accounting for that in faculty evaluation and promotion? It's still in process. But yeah, overall, the university has some phenomenal opportunities to really delve deeper into those areas and understand it even more as a faculty member and a researcher. (Andrea)

On the other hand, some participants shared that they did not believe their campus leaders understood what community engagement is or how to define it. They also voiced concern that there is not enough of a shared understanding among mid-level institutional leaders (e.g., deans, department chairs) about how to define, evaluate, and/or generate a culture more accepting of engaged scholarship. While participants acknowledged that some campus leaders understand and operationalize community engagement in different ways, most shared that the lack of its
infusion into promotion and tenure guidelines and evaluative metrics illustrated the unwillingness of leadership to leverage their faculty’s community engagement as anything other than a way to improve the external image of their institutions.

This frustration was felt by the majority of participants who thought many of their campus leaders say they value community engagement, but when it comes to actually valuing it within promotion, tenure, and faculty rewards, it feels more like “lip service”. With the lower levels of engagement terminology within the institutional guidelines for most universities in this study, the participants claims are seemingly justified. Further, they noted that at their institutions community engagement and the faculty who pursue it are frequently championed in campus marketing materials, but are not valued where it really counts:

One of the things that our faculty learning community discussed is the importance of getting deans and [the] president and provost to make strong statements that this work is important. . . . They should be meeting with departments and telling them that these kinds of activities should count. They should be telling promotion and tenure committees that these kinds of things count. That doesn't happen. You might get lip service or a nice pat on the back or a pat on the head in a very patronizing way for doing something like this, but we called for a much more aggressive activity on the part of the leadership … along with pressure from below to get students and faculty to demand that this kind of work receive more care. . . . Our dean … he often used the term engaged scholarship in a lot of the branding and the marketing materials. . . . But that doesn't translate into concretely rewarding people engaged in the kind of engaged scholarship. (Thomas)

The public praise given to community engagement and engaged faculty by institutional leaders, but the dismissal of such work in promotion and tenure led many participants to feel their institutions are “talking out of two sides of [their] mouths” (Joyce). Department and school promotion and tenure committee members cannot promote engaged faculty on the basis that their president or provost publicly praises engaged scholarship in their Tweets or office’s newsletters. As has been previously discussed, participants felt very strongly that in order for faculty and their engaged scholarship to be truly rewarded and valued, it must be infused into promotion and
tenure guidelines and be evaluated with specific metrics that consider its unique nature. Otherwise, committee members are unable to properly evaluate and thus reward anything other than traditional scholarship.

Within some institutions, participants shared that their leaders’ goal to obtain the Carnegie community engagement classification was a big push for an increased acceptance of community engagement on their campuses. However, the majority of participants did not realize their institution applied for or received the 2020 Carnegie community engagement classification. For the few participants that knew their institution recently received the classification, they did not fully understand what such a classification means:

It helps that we got the Carnegie designation. . . . Aren't there's something like 300 institutions that now have the Carnegie designation? Yeah, I mean it annoyed me to say, ‘Hey, that's great. . . . Look at all the support,’ but then if there's so many of these institutions that have this designation, but there is not a whole lot of stuff going on, what exactly does that mean? And I know you have to do a lot of work to get it. I mean, we had to assemble a lot of information to make the application. (Thomas)

Though the Carnegie community engagement classification was not well known by study participants, other external classifications, awards, and national rankings were highlighted as a primary focus for campus leaders:

Get community engaged research connected to the US News and World report ranking of schools. Because that's all the presidents care about. And if you want the provost to listen, publish something in the Chronicle of Higher Education about it. Because the provosts just read the Chronicle of Higher Ed and then tries to move this up in the rankings because they all want to become presidents. I don't care if we're ranked fourth in the nation. It doesn't matter to me. Why are we letting a magazine … why would we let some entity, other than ourselves, dictate to us our own success? It’s just crazy. (Douglas)

The general consensus among participants was ultimately that leaders pay attention to and more highly value work that has a national audience and attracts national funding and awards because it ultimately provides better “PR” for their institutions and helps them move up
in national rankings. As such, the metrics used to evaluate the quality of faculty work in promotion and tenure are directly tied to this need established by institutional leaders. Specifically, within their colleges and schools, participants noted that their deans and deans of research are almost exclusively focused on holding faculty accountable for traditional research productivity to bring in grant funding and ensure a high “return on investment” in order to climb in national rankings. Thus, participants felt that engaged scholarship would only ever get traction within their departments or schools, in terms of promotion and tenure, if it is directly connected to national rankings or large-scale funding.

Advancing Sustainable Change

Another common thread throughout participant interviews was that just like campus leaders, institutional initiatives, specifically regarding community engagement, come and go. Participants recounted many stories of how various department, school, and institutional initiatives have ebbed and flowed throughout changes in leadership:

If you have people who say community engaged work is just as important as laboratory [research], or just as important as teaching, or just as important as doing research in other settings, then it's just as important. And then the institution evolves to recognize that. . . . Culture can continue and it can grow. But the question of whether five years from now, it'll still be the same or not? I don't know. (Stephen)

The university itself is a fairly conservative institution. So, the push to [be] a community engaged place has been over years. . . . Once we had a change in our president . . . maybe four years ago. . . . That opens things up. So, it was definitely [the past president’s] leadership that made it hard at the beginning. It was the interim president that actually really appreciated community engaged scholarship and help put resources toward becoming designated through Carnegie. (Joyce)

To ensure continuous, measured steps are taken toward sustaining a more accepting culture of community engagement and engaged scholarship, participants emphasized the importance of such initiatives to be written into policy, guidelines, and metrics, since those, they believed, are far less likely to change as quickly as leadership. Without acknowledging and valuing it in
policy or written guidelines, engagement, like many other initiatives, has no “legs to stand on”.

Some participants shared how other campus-wide initiatives (e.g., Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) have found success through intentional policy and procedural changes:

About seven or eight years ago I remember we had a dean who came to all the departments that were recruiting and gave us detailed instructions on what we had to do to make sure we had a more diverse pool of candidates. And we had to report the race, gender, and ethnic composition of the people we interviewed. It wasn't just, ‘Diversity is a good thing. Go out and do it.’ There were specific written guidelines to do what we needed to do. You know, we got to get into the weeds. . . . The devil is in the details they always say. And I think that has to happen. (Thomas)

Though all participants shared similar sentiments about the need for policy and procedural change pushed forth by institutional leaders, they differed on where they thought such efforts should originate – from the top and trickle down, or from a more bottom-up, grassroots approach. Interestingly, the concept of their agency as individual faculty members, as it relates to the restructuring of promotion and tenure guidelines and metrics, was not discussed by participants nearly as much as the need for action by their leaders. The concept of individual faculty agency will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five. Those who suggested a top-down approach believed that in order for community engagement and engaged scholarship to be accepted and rewarded, a mandate must come from institution-level leaders. Without buy-in and support from the upper levels of the institution, school and department leaders risk putting their engaged faculty “to the wolves” when their cases are reviewed by the institution-level committee:

One of the arguments against community engaged scholarship in my school is that once the case gets out to the broader university it will not be valued. And that we are, you know, maybe setting our junior colleagues up for failure when it gets to the larger university. (Joyce)
Many felt that if institutional leaders forcefully encouraged schools and departments, via policy statements and guidelines, to value and reward faculty on the basis of their engaged scholarship, school- and department-level leaders would have more leverage to create change:

We've got to get deans and the provost and the president to issue written policy statements and make statements saying that this kind of work matters. That it will count in, in promotion and tenure decisions. I think it will help if these folks, particularly deans, literally meet with departments when they have candidates coming up for promotion. (Thomas)

While such support and leverage from upper-level leaders is nice, other participants felt that although institutional leaders can talk about supporting engagement, the “rubber meets the road” at the department level and change would come more swiftly, and more effectively, if the charge was led by department leaders. They felt department leaders have the ability to make the biggest headway in changing promotion and tenure guidelines and metrics. Further, they shared their beliefs that if their school and department colleagues do not hear from their direct leaders (e.g., deans and department chairs) that community engagement and engaged scholarship is valued in promotion and tenure, they are less likely to pursue it or push for lasting change:

If the university is talking about [community engagement] and if it's part of their strategic plan, I mean, that's great. But the departmental level is where those discussions are going to start, you know. That's where I think, that's where you're going to have your greatest impact, with department heads and departments who can then go to their senior faculty and say, ‘Okay, we're going to propose adding a definition like this, adding this to our criteria.’ If it's going to count, it's got to be explicitly put in the criteria that document for promotion and tenure. (Philip)

I suspect [change] won't happen if there isn't more pressure from below. Like from the faculty who are interested in this kind of work to push up, to say that this kind of stuff needs to be acknowledged and not just as part of the service ghetto. (Thomas)

Though participants differed on where they believe such change should originate, all acknowledged that a both/and approach would best ensure lasting change.
The Events of 2020 Have Both Positively and Negatively Affected Community Engaged Research

COVID-19 has Been “Yet Another Nail in the Coffin” for Engaged Researchers

As all interviews for this dissertation were held throughout the months of June to October 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic and nation-wide protests for racial justice stemming from the murder of George Floyd were lenses through which all participants viewed the current state of higher education and community engagement. It is thus important to unpack how the unprecedented events of 2020 effected higher education community engagement, through the eyes of participants.

Participants shared that the pandemic and shift to virtual teaching and research was affecting almost all aspects of their work. As all participants are engaged scholars whose research is most often community-based, they shared that their individual scholarship and the scholarship of their engaged colleagues was far more disrupted than their peers who pursue a more traditional research agenda. Though most all participants shared that their institutions hit “pause” on the tenure clocks of all tenure-track junior faculty, the necessary shift to online engagement and data collection was far more difficult of a hurdle for engaged faculty whose data collection, among other research processes, is usually done in-person with community. This, many feared, was more negatively affecting the research quality and quantity of engaged faculty whose work was put on hold in order to maintain virtual relationships with their community partners. Many participants shared that the main focus of engaged faculty during the spring and summer of 2020 was maintaining relationships with community partners, not necessarily pushing the research forward. The already difficult task of balancing the intense time and effort required to build trusting relationships with community partners was made even more difficult in light of
the pandemic. While some participants acknowledged a few benefits that a virtual connection provides, they all spoke to the difficulties of relationship building in a Zoom setting:

Things have kind of grinded to a halt. . . . I don’t want to overstate this, but … many of the community engaged research projects have really slowed down. And certainly, the processes of developing those relationships on which the projects are built … it’s a lot more difficult when you can’t go and sit in their offices and develop trust relationships. And that is part of the definition of community engaged research! That input is necessary. It's just much more difficult [now]. (Louis)

We are still meeting the community partners’ need of [direct service], but we're not able to generate the research products right now. It's hard because before [the pandemic] we're dealing with [K-12] students and we've had a lot of challenges. Just even being allowed to talk to the [K-12] students. We had to jump through probably a year and a half of legal with our university and the [local] school. You almost wanted to just stop before you started because it's like, ‘Do I really want to involve people talking to these students because I have to jump through so many hoops to make this happen?’ It would have just been easier for us to say, ‘we'll go [and do the direct service only].’ But to me it was really important [to] engage with the [K-12] students. . . . I guess people who do this type of research are used to hurdles. But I think COVID has been a unique hurdle. Like yet another nail in the coffin of the process. (Kathleen)

[We] have a lot of rural communities that are also compromised in terms of connectivity and internet service. And so … where you might have a lot of really quality engaged programs and work taking place in a good number of counties, there's a lot of them who are completely shut off at the moment because there's just no way to be able to reach out to them virtually. (Andrea)

Another layer effecting engaged faculty was sourcing funding for their work. As any funding engaged scholars previously received was dependent on engaging community in their research, the required shift to more virtually based research processes had many fearing that their funding might be pulled if they and their community partners were not able to adopt to new virtual processes quickly and effectively:

We have a couple grants that came out of the [university center] and we may have to give some grant money back on one or two of those projects because we're not sure if they're going to let us twist it into a different kind of remote project or not. So yeah, it can really affect people. (Julie)
Right now, because of the pandemic, we're looking at a situation where everything is frozen. People are being laid off and … we're still encouraged to try to get grants and a lot of people … are raising money to support their work. (Thomas)

2020 Provided Opportunities for “Being Better Humans”

Though the effect of the pandemic on faculty research was an issue discussed by all participants, the nationwide protests, demands for racial justice, and glaring disparities between White individuals and people of color, exacerbated by COVID-19, was the overarching lens through which most participants viewed the current state of community engagement in higher education. Most all participants shared that issues of racial justice and equity highlighted by the pandemic had pushed more faculty in their schools, departments, and institutions to consider more seriously leveraging community engagement as a primary strategy through which to address such issues. And while community engagement is undoubtedly not a new phenomenon at any of the participants’ institutions, many shared how the current climate had opened up new pathways for an engaged agenda:

There's certain things happening because of Black Lives Matter. And like many places, [university] has had a very significant response. The president, the deans at various levels, myself, have come up with proposed strategies for moving forward. And there are some underlining implication that they will involve greater community engagement. It's hard to separate the two, because the movement is so community focused, right? So, if BLM hadn't just happened and there have been no COVID, and who knows what's coming next, right? These are all opportunities for being better humans. (Debra)

Here we are, deep in a change process related to the George Floyd murder and so many others, and Black Lives Matter. . . . And that’s finally made an impression in an important way in the university. There are signs here, as in many places around the country, of course, that people are listening in a different kind of way. . . . I think there's a real opportunity for change at the institutional level and understanding what community engagement means, driven by a lot of forces that relate to the light going off about systemic racism and the role that we play in in our community. (Louis)

One of the silver linings here might be that [the pandemic] has actually increased interest in looking at community issues, particularly because there's so much discussion of, race, class, and COVID. This cuts across virtually every discipline. . . . Last week I read something in a New York Times article … somebody did a study showing that parks in
White neighborhoods are twice as large as they are in Black and Latino neighborhoods …
and at the Black and Latino neighborhoods have four or five times the density in terms of
the number of people who were there. I mean, I never would have thought of parks being
an issue here. But that’s just one more example of structural racism and how it connects
to the pandemic. And it clearly touches all areas. (Thomas)

For many participants, their colleagues and institutional leaders are beginning to reframe
and reconsider community engagement and community engaged research as a strategy through
which their institution can empower the Black Lives Matter movement and pursuit of racial
justice. Further, they saw opportunities for increased support, acceptance, and traction when
community engagement could be tied to other, pressing institutional initiatives rather than it
being siloed as its own standalone initiative. More specifically, participants were hopeful that
the urgency and passion behind such issues will spark change in how community engagement
and engaged scholarship are valued in their departments and schools, specifically within their
promotion and tenure criteria:

I’m cautiously optimistic that our [promotion and tenure] criteria will improve. . . . I
think the push from Black Lives Matter will encourage deeper thinking about this
complex topic and hopefully better criteria that are more inviting to people doing this, so
people don't feel discouraged. (Jerry)

Additionally, participants spoke to their hopes that a more focused institutional agenda as
it relates to issues of racial justice and equity, diversity, and inclusion would push their
departments to hire more racially and pedagogically diverse faculty. They acknowledged the
immediate need for their departments and schools to focus future hiring decisions on junior
faculty’s commitments to working with their local communities and not hiring just to “replace
someone who is teaching a current class”. An explicit focus on such racial and pedagogical
diversity is needed to ensure a continued commitment to local communities in deep and
meaningful ways:
Well, community in context here really is people from underrepresented groups. And I think it’s the same story … our need is to continue to attract and recruit faculty from those underrepresented groups … and the research can flow from there. That’s the foundation on which it can be built. You can’t do it effectively without those folks being part of the system. . . . I think it's pretty simple. It's that we need to be more diverse and inclusive as a faculty in order to be able to do community engagement and the community engagement just becomes sort of a no brainer. When you're thinking about the contributions that can be made from more diversity and cultural inclusiveness. (Louis)

We have one open position. As we think about that, I would like to modify it so we throw a broader net that involves recruitment of people that are committed to this interaction with the community. I think that, in and of itself, would enhance the diversity of our department. And what we try and do is, or what our hope is, is that we are going to bring in the people that are most interested in things, important things, rather than the people that are going to replace someone who's teaching a current class. That's a whole other approach to faculty recruitment. (Debra)

**Conclusion**

The themes explored in this chapter establish the study’s findings and provide insight into the participants’ experiences as members on their school- and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committees. All participants offered a unique perspective as they, themselves, are engaged senior scholars with experience on both sides of the promotion and tenure table.

Further, their positioning at R1 institutions that were recently classified as Community Engaged by the Carnegie Foundation provides additional insights into how large research institutions are, or are not, recognizing and rewarding the engaged scholarship of their faculty within promotion and tenure.

The following chapter provides a summary of the study’s background, methodology, and a discussion of the findings in light of the current field of higher education community engagement. Recommendations and implications for practice and research are discussed for a variety of stakeholders.
Chapter Five: Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications

This study provides empirical evidence about the evaluation of community engaged research by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees at R1 institutions that were recently classified as engaged by the Carnegie Foundation. Individual participant interviews with faculty who have experience conducting engaged research and serving on a school- and/or department-level review committee allowed for a unique exploration into the processes of evaluating faculty’s engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure. Twelve faculty from five R1 universities participated in semi-structured interviews from June to October 2020. Interview transcripts were systematically analyzed through an iterative process of open, axial, and selective coding that led to the development of themes. Initial themes were shared with all participants via a member check. Following the consideration and implementation of participant feedback, the study’s findings were finalized and presented through six key sections.

Chapter five is a continued examination of the findings detailed in the prior chapter. It includes an overview of the study – its significance, rationale, research questions, and design – followed by a detailed discussion of the study’s findings organized in the same manner as Chapter Four, in an effort to create continuity and cohesion among the study’s six major themes. Discussion of the study’s major findings is grounded within the current context and literature of higher education and illustrates parallels, connections, and points of departure from previous scholarship. Major conclusions of the study are summarized and presented in this final chapter, highlighting the essential issues surrounding the evaluation of faculty’s engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure. Following the discussion are recommendations for institutions of higher education, college and university leaders, review committees, and community
engagement professionals. This dissertation ends with a few conclusions about the evaluation of faculty’s community engagement within promotion and tenure more broadly.

**Study Summary**

In the following section the study’s significance, rationale, research problem, research questions, and overall design is reviewed.

**Background and Rationale**

Traditional academic reward structures must be designed in ways that support those who choose to leverage their expertise, resources, and time to engage community. Research suggests that even though more institutions are actively working to cultivate an engaged campus identity, institution-level rhetoric praising community engagement and the rewarding of engaged faculty through promotion and tenure can be inconsistent (Diamond, 2005; O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). The perceived misalignment between institutional rhetoric and rewarding engaged faculty through promotion and tenure is especially problematic when institutions seek external recognition and are heralded as an *engaged campuses* by external entities, such as the Carnegie Foundation.

As community engaged research operates in historically non-traditional ways (e.g., community members are co-researchers, often favors local impact over national recognition), the scholarship that it produces cannot be evaluated in the same ways as traditional research within promotion and tenure (Boyer, 1990; Deetz, 2008; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Strand et al., 2003; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002). Though much research has been done exploring the institutionalization of community engagement and inclusion of engagement language in promotion and tenure guidelines, to date, research had not yet explored how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees *evaluate* faculty’s engaged scholarship or
how evaluative judgements are made. Scholar-practitioners have created resources to assist in the evaluation of engaged scholarship (Able & Williams, 2019; Jordan et al., 2009; Wood et al., 2018), however it is unclear if, or how, such resources are being used by review committees.

**Research Problem and Research Questions**

There is a need for research that explores how and in what ways faculty’s engaged research and scholarship is evaluated within promotion and tenure, specifically at the school- and department-levels. This study sought to contribute to the growing body of literature by investigating how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees not only define and understand faculty’s engaged research and scholarship, but how they evaluate it. Specifically, this study explores what goes into making evaluative decisions, if and how committees utilize tools for evaluation, and ultimately how evaluative decisions are made.

**Study Design**

**Paradigm.** An interpretivist paradigm grounded this study and assisted in the analysis and presentation of the study’s findings. An interpretivist paradigm provided the most appropriate approach and framework for this study, as it acknowledges that reality is neither singular nor objective but is instead shaped by an individual reality that cannot be divorced from one’s lived experience (Pelz, 2019). Interpretivist methodology is embedded in the world of practice and seeks to understand how individuals view and operate within their various contexts in order to make sense of and operate within the world (Bernstein, 1976; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). As knowledge gained from interpretivist research is comprised of the meanings individuals ascribe to certain issues and events, it was essential to present the study’s findings through the abundant use of participant voice (Greene, 2010). Further, due to the unique and context-specific nature of community engagement within academic reward structures and the
profoundly political processes that guide promotion and tenure decision making, an interpretivist lens that encouraged the substantial use of participant voice was warranted (Pelz, 2019).

**Institution Sites, Participants, and Data Collection.** This study included twelve faculty members across five different American institutions of higher education. The five institutions represented in this study spanned four states and all are classified as a doctoral university with very high research activity. All five institutions received the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement classification in spring 2020. Of the five institutions, three had been previous recipients of the community engagement classification, while two were first time recipients in 2020 (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2021). As this study focused on the evaluation of faculty engaged research, R1 institutions who had received the 2020 Carnegie community engagement classification were intentionally selected as sites due to their high nature of research activity and “evidenced-based documentation of institutional practices” which designated them as “community-engaged institution[s]” (Public Purpose Institute, 2021).

Across the five institutions, twelve tenured faculty were interviewed. To ensure participants could appropriately speak to and have knowledge of community engaged research and scholarship within promotion and tenure, all participants self-identified as engaged scholars and have experience sitting on a school- and/or department-level promotion and tenure review committee. With support from community engagement professionals at each institution and a pre-interview screening questionnaire, faculty participants were purposefully selected creating a stratified sample of experience (conducting community engaged research and serving on a promotion and tenure review committee). Participants were interviewed via Zoom for roughly 60 minutes each, following a semi-structured interview protocol. During the interview
participants were asked to reflect on their experiences evaluating engaged research and scholarship within promotion and tenure. To ensure a similar interview experience for each participant, the interview was broken into three different phases – building understanding, evaluating the processes and products of engaged research, and opportunities for change.

**Data Analysis.** Data analysis consisted of the following phases, adapted from Charmaz (2010), Lincoln and Guba (1985), Merriam (1998), and Strauss and Corbin (1990):

1. Transcription of participant interviews.
2. Data exploration, review, and memoing with the goal of understanding the breadth and scope of all data and identifying emerging ideas to be analyzed in greater depth.
3. Open coding and the development of raw codes to illustrate the major categories of information found within the data.
4. Iterative, axial coding assisted by participant member checks, to build out and clarify original ideas gleaned from the open coding phase.
5. Selective coding, data reduction, and development of themes within each participant interview, each institutional site, and across multiple institution sites.
6. Examining the data in light of current literature.

Throughout this process, the evaluation of faculty’s engaged research and the influencing factors, contextual conditions, and strategies and consequences of their experiences were explored. Based on the process of data analysis, I generated the study’s findings. The study’s findings appear in detail in Chapter Four and are briefly summarized them in the following section.

**Findings**

The study’s findings are organized in Chapter Four through six overarching thematic sections. The first section addresses the various ways community engagement and community
engaged research is, or is not, defined and understood by promotion and tenure committees. The second section details the lack of community engaged research terminology within guidelines, leading to committees’ difficulty to appropriately categorize or value it. The third section focuses on the metrics used by review committees to evaluate faculty scholarship, stressing that traditional metrics are unable to appropriately evaluate non-traditional, engaged scholarship. In the fourth section, department, school, and institution-wide supports are discussed, identifying a perceived lack of internal or external supports to assist review committees’ evaluation of engaged scholarship. The fifth section lays out the disconnect felt by participants between the public rhetoric of their institutional leaders and the current policies and procedures leveraged when it comes to actually valuing engaged work. Lastly, the events of 2020 were explored through the eyes of participants, specifically their effect on community engaged researchers and the public mission of higher education.

Discussion

In an attempt to bring both clarity and cohesion to the discussion of the study’s findings, the following section parallels the organization and structure of Chapter Four. The following discussion is organized through the following six major themes:

- Definitions of Community Engaged Research do Not Matter to Promotion and Tenure Committees: “Most People Have No Idea What it Even Means”
- “If it isn’t in the Guidelines, I Don’t Care How Much I Like it. It Just Doesn’t Matter”: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are too Rigid to Appropriately Categorize or Value Faculty’s Engaged Research
- “It’s an Old School System that Needs to Change”: Traditional Metrics to Evaluate Faculty Research do not Work for Community Engaged Scholarship
• “It’s Catch as Catch Can”: Institution-Wide Supports to Assist with the Evaluation of Community Engaged Research do not Exist
• Institutions and their Leaders are “Talking out of Two Sides of their Mouth”
• The Events of 2020 Have Both Positively and Negatively Affected Community Engaged Research

Definitions of Community Engaged Research Do Not Matter to Promotion and Tenure Committees: “Most People Have No Idea What it Even Means”

As evidenced by the experiences and lived-realities of participants, there is a growing desire among today’s faculty to carry out an engaged research agenda that directly benefits their local communities, includes the voices and perspectives of community members, and is in direct response to community-identified needs (Kennedy, Vogel, Goldberg-Freeman, Kass, & Farfel, 2009; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2008; Nyden, 2003; O’Fallon & Dearry, 2002). However, as more faculty pursue a research agenda in conjunction with community, such work is often named and defined differently based on a variety of intervening factors. Terminology and definitions used to describe faculty’s engaged work become more nuanced across disciplines and institutional units as practices, policies, histories, and values influence the way engaged work is realized (Janke, Medlin, & Holland, 2015).

Within this study, community engaged research is the terminology used to refer to the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community that embodies the characteristics of community engagement (e.g., mutual exchange of knowledge, reciprocal partnerships) and scholarship. Community engaged research, here, is used more broadly to refer to both the processes faculty use to conduct research with community, as well as the products that derive from such collaboration. The term community engaged scholarship is used within
this study in direct reference to the scholarly *products* or outputs created when faculty carry out community engaged research. However, throughout this study participants utilized a variety of terms to refer to what here is identified as community engaged research and community engaged scholarship:

- Community-based research
- Participatory research
- Community-based participatory research
- Community-partnered research

Within the promotion and tenure guidelines of the institutions in this study there were few references to community engaged research, engaged scholarship, or other engagement terminology (e.g., example products, metrics for evaluation). The overwhelming majority of references to community engagement in the institution-level guidelines were an attempt to define community engagement or expand upon a traditional definition of service (i.e. service to the academy or institution) to include community. However, when community engagement terminology was referenced and defined, such definitions were often quite vague and ambiguous. They did not provide definitive language or definitions to assist junior faculty or review committee members fully understand how community engagement could be defined or its products would be evaluated. For example, institution D defined service/community engagement as “useful contributions” to an academic unit, the university and/or a “civic organization”. However, soon after that definition, the guidelines noted that due to the limited time junior faculty have prior to tenure review and the fact that the bar to achieve tenure is very high, obtaining tenure based on a high rating of service or engagement is, “expected to be extraordinarily rare”.
Even when community engagement and engaged scholarship were identified in a positive light, all references were vague and ambiguous, simply noting that it could potentially be brought into one’s dossier for review. Institution E had many vague references to community engagement throughout its guidelines. Many references noted that a faculty member’s community engagement could be “considered in connection with promotion and tenure decisions” and should be “positively weighed” in evaluative decisions. However, institution E’s guidelines did not extend to providing an actual definition or examples of what engaged research and scholarship entail.

A good example of how institutions might infuse definitions of community engagement and engaged scholarship into their promotion and tenure guidelines can be found at IUPUI. They have done much work to define community engagement as “distinct from service, so that it can be explicitly captured and reflected in promotion and tenure guidelines” (IUPUI, 2014, p. 24). In 2015 IUPUI created the Faculty Learning Committee (FLC) on Public Scholarship to define public scholarship (i.e. community engaged scholarship), identify criteria to assist faculty when documenting their engaged work, and help deans and department chairs adapt their promotion and tenure materials and guidelines to reflect its acceptance (IUPUI FLC on Public Scholarship, 2016). In academic year 2015-2016 IUPUI adopted a campus-wide definition of public scholarship and it was added to the institution-level guidelines for promotion and tenure. IUPUI defines public scholarship as “An intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is responsive to public audiences and public peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing co-production of knowledge with community stakeholders” (IUPUI FLC on Public Scholarship, 2016, p. 2).
This study illustrates that within departments and schools, confusion, or a lack of common terminology upon which to refer when evaluating the engaged work of faculty within promotion and tenure is a significant barrier. As Douglas recalled, “I remember [faculty member] did a lot of community engaged research and none of us on the review committee knew, or understood, or appreciated what she was doing.” This study builds on the work of Janke et al. (2015) which identified that community engagement terminology is often conflated or incorrectly applied to faculty work that does not involve a mutual exchange of knowledge or reciprocal partnerships with community and perpetuates speculation about the rigor of engaged research. Because this study specifically involved the perspectives of promotion and tenure review committees, it enhances the current literature by identifying that such misconceptions by committees may lead to the oversimplification of engaged research and its unique scholarly contributions which can lead to its devaluation and improper evaluation within promotion and tenure.

Further, this study discovered that while consensus around definitions has proven to be a barrier, schools, departments, and institutions – even those designated as engaged – struggle when community engagement and community engaged research are not appropriately defined and articulated. This study clearly revealed that the absence of institution-wide terminology to point to the engaged research and scholarship of faculty may lead to exclusion from structures and policies to encourage, reward, and properly evaluate engaged research. As articulated by the study’s participants, within their institutions, this ultimately created the impression that the campus does not value its faculty’s contributions to the public. This sentiment was echoed across participants. They noted that no clear definitions nor consistent terminology to refer to
community engagement or community engaged research/scholarship ultimately devalues it in the minds of school and department-level leaders and review committee members:

I think my department … with some individual exceptions … the department and the school don’t really have much of a conception of community engaged scholarship … to the extent that they know anything about it. They don’t like it, or they think it’s useless … so it really doesn’t matter if they have an accurate understanding of it. (Thomas)

This study adds to the current literature suggesting that promotion and tenure committees and their methods for evaluation are directly and negatively impacted by a lack of clear terminology or definitions of engaged research. Ambiguity at the institution, school, and department levels can devalue community engaged research and impact how promotion and tenure committees understand, define, and evaluate it. As noted by participants in this study, in the minds of school- and department-level committees, if there is not a clear definition or terminology to reference the engaged work of faculty, it is a clear sign that leadership and the institution do not value it. This often leads to its exclusion from promotion and tenure documentation and signals to committees that there is no need for them to consider it as a valid and valued form of scholarship or evaluate it any differently than traditional research.

However, it is imperative to note that while clear definitions and terminology articulating the processes by which faculty engage with community are necessary, community engaged research can take many forms and is best understood as a strategy through which faculty may choose to carry out their research agenda. Thus, while there will likely always be diverse terminology used to articulate the broader notion of community engaged research across academic disciplines and units (e.g., community-based research, participatory research), acceptance and clear articulation of the umbrella concept of community engaged research and the various ways it might manifest in different schools, departments, and disciplines is essential. This study clearly identified that acceptance of and appreciation for the broader notion of
community engagement and community engaged research is critical if institutions are to demonstrate that they truly value it and expect it to be valued within their schools and departments through the traditional structures of promotion and tenure.

“If it isn’t in the Guidelines, I Don’t Care How Much I Like it; It Just Doesn’t Matter”:
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Do Not Appropriately Categorize or Value Faculty’s Engaged Research

Recent studies have shown that across a wide variety of both institution- and department-level promotion and tenure guidelines, there are few meaningful references to community engaged research, engaged scholarship, or similar terminology (Alperin et al., 2018; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). A review of the institution-level guidelines for campuses in this study produced similar results. This leads scholars to assert that faculty are discouraged to pursue research with community in mutually beneficial, reciprocal ways and rather are incentivized to conduct a research agenda that is more traditional. Further, when exploring promotion and tenure guidelines that were recently reformed to be more inclusive of community engaged research and scholarship, O’Meara, Eatman, and Petersen (2015) found that almost no reformed guidelines equip promotion and tenure committees to adequately understand or evaluate engaged scholarship.

While guidelines that explicitly reference and value community engaged research and engaged scholarship are not commonplace, there are a handful of institutions that are heralded as leaders in this space. Since the early 2000s the University of North Carolina Greensboro (UNC Greensboro) has long been seen by engagement scholars as a leader of the pack when it comes to updating their institution-, school-, and department-level guidelines with references to community engaged teaching and research (Saltmarsh, 2017; Janke & Shelton, 2011). UNC
Greensboro first revised their institution-level guidelines to include meaningful references to community engaged work and then requested all 54 departments across the institution adopt policies within their department-specific guidelines to articulate the meaning of engagement based on their department’s “individual paradigms, policies, and practices” (Janke & Shelton, 2011, p. 1; Saltmarsh, 2017).

For example, as each school and department has created discipline-specific guidelines in relation to discipline-specific engaged work, UNC Greensboro’s Department of History’s (2011) Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion discuss engagement within their guidelines as following:

The department values community-engaged research and scholarship (CER). CER differs from traditional scholarship in that it reaches audiences beyond academic peers, often emerges from a process of creative collaboration with community partners and tends to culminate in products other than the academic monograph. … CER scholarship depends on the open dissemination of historical knowledge via many different channels of communication: books, articles, classrooms, exhibits, films, historic sites, museums, legal memoranda, testimony and many others. Other products may include oral history recordings, reports, radio productions, grants and research contracts, web-based interpretive projects, and other work that demonstrates the application of historical scholarship to the needs of contemporary communities. (p. 8)

UNC Greensboro’s guidelines and terminology are not commonplace. As such, this study identified the need for definitions along with examples of criteria to assist in evaluating engaged scholarship specifically for review committee members. Without such definitions and examples, review committees may more easily write off engaged scholarship as either insignificant or not different from traditional research. Felix reflected on the many conversations had among committee members, frustrated that without clear language in written guidelines, community engaged research is not accepted and unable to be properly evaluated: “There’s nothing in our P and T guidelines that recognizes or credits community-based participatory research. I have, in my own department, brought it up and it gets passed off.”
The lack of engaged research terminology in promotion and tenure guidelines is one of the primary factors contributing to the lack of agency felt among the majority of the study’s participants, which will be discussed later, in greater detail. It is clear, however, that this study identified that without clear and established language within promotion and tenure guidelines, committees feel forced to either dismiss engaged research entirely, or incorrectly categorize and evaluate it as service.

Engaged Scholarship is Incorrectly Categorized and Evaluated as Service. Across all participants and institutional sites, it was clear that engaged scholarship is almost always seen as a “nice to have,” a supplemental addition to a faculty’s dossier. While faculty are often given a “pat on the back” for engaging community in their research, the scholarly products that come from such engagement are never identified by review committees as scholarly. This study identified that when it comes to evaluating faculty’s engage scholarship it is routinely miscategorized by review committees as service and not valued highly, if at all:

A community-based dissemination doesn’t count. It would be counted as service. If it is not a peer-reviewed publication it is automatically seen as a second-tier product and is not considered scholarship. (Joyce)

Even looking at some of the creative products – art shows, videos … I’ve been part of research projects where that has been a primary output. Where there was a summit at the end, where we pull all the key stakeholders in the community together and had various presentations and arts-based research exhibits that came out of the research. But none of that gets accounted for. But yet, in some ways, those are almost more powerful as far as outputs and contributions to the … research field. When it generates new conversations that could have never been had otherwise. (Andrea)

Even though the scholarship produced from faculty’s engaged research is often some of the most compelling parts of a faculty’s dossier, participants shared that it is rarely accounted for or valued as anything more than an insignificant drop in the service bucket.
To add insult to injury, participants stressed that the metrics used to evaluate faculty’s engagement when placed in the service category are extremely weak and are given very little weight. Such metrics rely almost exclusively on simple lists and counts of events or community members involved. This is in line with O’Meara’s (2005) previous exploration of promotion and tenure documents and faculty handbooks, finding that when evaluating faculty service only the quantity of engagement is considered, not its quality or impact. Further, the sheer involvement of external community partners in a research project, beyond their involvement solely as research subjects, instantly triggers committees to label such work as service and not research. The depth of community partnerships was not shown to be a factor in the categorization or evaluation of faculty work by committees. Regardless of if faculty worked with their community partners to identify research goals or co-present findings in a community space, such involvement with non-academic peers instantly relegates such work as service and diminishes it. This study is significant in that it goes beyond previous research that explores only promotion and tenure guidelines and confirms that in the case of the participants within this study, review committees are both unable and seemingly uninterested in evaluating the engaged research of faculty in ways more appropriate to its unique scholarly and community contributions.

Further, this study is important in that it highlights the tension between what engaged committee review members know should be done when it comes to the evaluation of engaged research but feel powerless to do. Most participants, though they personally did not agree with the mislabeling of engaged scholarship as service, felt powerless to categorize and evaluate it as anything else, due to the current structure of their department and school guidelines, leading to a perceived lack of faculty agency.
**Faculty Agency.** Across the majority of participant interviews a lack of individual or collective faculty agency was apparent. Some participants, though not the majority, were actively trying to use their position and power as tenured faculty members to form committees and/or build momentum within their department, school, or through faculty governance, to edit the promotion and tenure guidelines and/or formalize definitions of community engagement that could be referenced when evaluating faculty work. However, most participants discussed taking far less formalized courses of action (e.g., having individual conversations with other engaged faculty venting their frustrations, mentoring junior faculty to work within the system). It was clear that among the participants interviewed for this study, most did not have much faith in formalized efforts to advance changes to promotion and tenure in their schools or departments. Even from their positioning as tenured faculty, a clear lack of agency was perceived. Rather, participants frequently referenced that senior leadership (e.g., deans, department chairs, provosts) were the ones primarily responsible for enacting large, sustainable change, and the only ones who had the power to do it.

It is curious why most participants, tenured faculty who themselves are engaged scholars, felt as though they have no agency in this area. In reflection, as tenured faculty they do appear to have a significant amount of agency even though they do not necessarily perceive it. As either individual faculty or a collective group or engaged scholars, the overwhelming belief of participants was that they are the *David*, trying to radically alter the R1 *Goliath*. As engaged scholars at large R1s, their individual experience securing tenure was likely difficult, as they had to confine to the unforgiving, rigid structures that they know to be very unfriendly to engaged research. In their difficult quest to secure tenure as engaged scholars, it is understandable that a residual frustration and lack of power is still felt.
Where most participants felt they could make the most change was not at the institutional, school, or even department level, but rather (1) in their individual work as engaged scholars, in their local communities, or (2) by mentoring engaged junior faculty to successfully make their way through the current structures of promotion and tenure. It is uncertain if this sentiment results from a perceived lack of agency after attempts to effect structural change, or rather a submission to the decades-long culture and tradition that exists at their current R1 institutions.

Regardless, all participants spoke proudly about their current work with community, highlighting how they are witness to more direct, tangible, and quicker results due to the practical application of their scholarship. Recognizing the rigid and slow pace that often plagues higher education, it makes sense that faculty would prefer to spend their time affecting change in community, as such benefits are more frequently realized and appreciated. However, as faculty’s time is in high demand and not limitless, there is likely a tension these faculty feel when making the choice to invest their time in their local communities and not primarily within their institutions, advocating for structural reform.

Further, many participants noted that their power and positioning were best utilized by mentoring engaged junior faculty to achieve tenure, since they themselves had done it successfully. Often, this means assisting junior faculty modify their engaged research or present it in a way that was palatable to traditional guidelines and review committees. Such an approach is incredibly damaging to the individual junior faculty, their institutions, and higher education more broadly, as this is how Whiteness and privileged systems operate. When individuals with power and positioning do not work to change the system, but rather assist those fall in line with it, those systems and they individuals they engage, and stuck in a perpetual state of oppression.
Though the participants’ perceived lack of agency can be understood, complacency toward changing their institutions’ structures, systems, and guidelines to is dangerous.

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Must Explicitly Speak to Engaged Scholarship.**

Results from this study emphasize that for review committees to effectively value and reward faculty’s engaged scholarship it must first be recognized within promotion and tenure guidelines as *research*. Without clear language legitimizing community engaged research and its scholarly products as *research*, committees are often powerless to value it as anything but service. However, this identified issue is further compounded when considered in light of Holland’s (2005; 2009) and O’Meara et al.’s (2015) prior research which found the most common approach to revising reward structures and guidelines was to make room for engaged scholarship in the service category, with very little mention of rewarding engagement in alignment with faculty research. Results from this study very clearly state that to ensure faculty members’ engaged scholarship is appropriately categorized and rewarded within promotion and tenure, departments, schools, and their institutions must more broadly define what constitutes scholarly work.

The misclassification and devaluing of faculty’s engaged scholarship within the service category is especially upsetting when considering the campus policies of institutions seeking the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement classification. Saltmarsh et al.’s (2009) review of institutional promotion and tenure guidelines of campuses who applied for the 2006 classification found that faculty involvement in community, regardless of the depth, breadth, or type of involvement, was almost always placed in the service category. Though revision to department-, school-, and institution-level guidelines is necessary, making room for engagement within the service category is not enough. This study adds to the literature highlighting that without clearly defined and accepted terminology to refer to engaged research and its resultant
scholarship through the lens of research, not service, review committees are left unable and often unwilling to consider or evaluate it as anything other than service. Written guidelines legitimizing the products of engaged research as scholarship, to be categorized as research, are critically needed by committee members so they can point to them for legitimacy when evaluating the engaged scholarship of faculty.

*It’s an Old School System that Needs to Change*: Traditional Metrics to Evaluate Faculty Research Do Not Work for Community Engaged Scholarship

The inclusion of community engaged scholarship as research within promotion and tenure guidelines is only half the battle. While written guidelines outlining the appropriate categorization of engaged scholarship are extremely important, this study sheds light on the additional layer of what metrics committees use to evaluate scholarship. Many scholars have illustrated how community engaged research operates in historically non-traditional ways – including community members as co-researchers, producing scholarship outside of peer-review publications, and often favoring local impact over national recognition (Boyer, 1990; Deetz, 2008; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Strand et al., 2003: Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002). However, this study, through the voice of review committee members, has demonstrated that if faculty’s engaged scholarship is ever categorized as research, only a select number of traditional metrics are used in its evaluation. Such metrics (detailed in the following section) are derived from an extremely narrow definition of scholarship and belief of what constitutes something as scholarly.

All participants in this study referenced a similar list of traditional metrics that are used by review committees to evaluate engaged scholarship. Further, after a review of the institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines of campuses in this study, no reference to any metrics specific to community engagement were mentioned. Only once was the dissemination of
engaged scholarship to audiences “outside of the academe” referenced as valuable within the participants’ institution-level guidelines. Though no institutions in this study explicitly referenced non-traditional outputs or metrics upon which to evaluate engaged research, IUPUI’s institution-level guidelines provide a great example of how to acknowledge engaged research (i.e. public scholarship) and the non-traditional products it produces. Within their institution-level guidelines IUPUI notes, in relation to the possible outputs and alternative metrics that could be used to evaluate public scholarship:

Scholarly outcomes may include exhibits, curricular products, community projects and websites. The nature of public scholarship is diverse and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation. Peer review of public scholarship must consider the faculty member’s investment in such activities as building community relationships, engaging in reciprocal learning and project definition, experimenting with collaborative methods, and writing grants to support collaboration with faculty, students, and public stakeholders. … Given the importance of collaboration in this work, external evaluators must have knowledge of the processes involved in public scholarship activities and should have knowledge of the project content, rather than only experience based on the faculty member’s discipline. This may include scholars and experts from outside the academy. (IUPUI, 2017, p. 34)

The narrow definitions of scholarship and even more narrow metrics to evaluate it that were discussed by participants in this study completely disregard not only the scholarly products of community engaged research, but also its research processes. As this study has evidenced, the evaluation of faculty work within promotion and tenure is often based on an extremely limited view of what constitutes scholarship and scholarly products. The only scholarship that counts is that which is geared toward a select audience of other academics. Further, participants shared that at their institutions, the way that scholarship is defined and recognized is exceptionally limited. This study substantiates the notion that faculty do not get tenured for the quality of their work. Rather, they appear to be tenured based on the products that are produced which serve as a proxy for quality. The process of community engaged research which is inherently “messier”,
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more time consuming, and more involved than traditional research is hindered by the rigid definitions of scholarship and scholarly products that most institution, school, and department promotion and tenure guidelines have established. Unfortunately, as this study explicitly illustrates, department- and school-level promotion and tenure committees, even those designated as *engaged*, struggle to value the work and products of their engaged faculty because research processes are entirely left out of the conversation.

**Use of Traditional, Standardized Metrics Leads to the Devaluation of Community Engaged Scholarship.** As it is well established that the scholarly outputs of engaged research differ drastically from those of traditional research (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Saltmarsh et al., 2009), a broader spectrum of what counts as scholarship and who can be considered a peer or acceptable audience of that scholarship is essential. However, as this study illustrates, the need for promotion and tenure committees to judge the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship quickly and efficiently in the most unbiased manner has caused committees to utilize a very specific, standardized set of metrics to evaluate faculty scholarship. The standard metrics currently used by review committees to evaluate scholarship that were identified by participants across all institutions and disciplines, are identified in Table 7:

**Table 7**

*Traditional Metrics Used to Evaluate Faculty Scholarship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Publications</td>
<td>Recognized as the “gold standard” and only acceptable outlet for the dissemination of scholarly work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Amount of funding received at the national level only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>A faculty’s national and/or international reputation among scholars in their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact is measured solely by journal impact factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Letters</td>
<td>References speaking to the quality of one’s work. Only references from academic peers are considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of these traditional metrics to evaluate all forms of faculty scholarship is extremely problematic. Should engaged faculty be able to clear the first hurdle of categorizing their engaged scholarship as research and not service, they are then met with a much higher hurdle to overcome – the evaluation of their engaged scholarship with traditional metrics. As local dissemination in non-traditional outlets for non-academic audiences does not easily fit within the current evaluative structures, faculty’s engaged scholarship is misunderstood and often dismissed by promotion and tenure committees. This study supports previous research by Sobrero and Jayaratne (2014) which found that department heads are unlikely to promote or tenure faculty who pursue non-traditional avenues of scholarship and dissemination because they found it difficult to understand and evaluate. This study goes beyond and adds to current research by pinpointing the specific metrics and evaluative processes that cause the inappropriate evaluation of engaged research. As such, this study demonstrates that because engaged scholarship cannot be appropriately understood or evaluated by traditional metrics, it is often not considered research and either, (1) not believed to be relevant to decisions for promotion and tenure, (2) labeled as “nice to have” and not factored into decisions of merit, or (3) recategorized as service and heavily devalued.

Due to the fact that the successful measures used to evaluate traditional research are too narrow in their focus to judge quality engaged scholarship, it is engaged faculty who are pushed to change their focus, methods, and products, rather than promotion and tenure committees adopting additional measures of evaluation. It is extremely difficult for engaged faculty to morph their engaged scholarship in ways that are consistent with the tenants of community engaged research and are aligned with the traditional metrics used by committees to evaluate scholarship. Evaluating engaged scholarship with traditional metrics is essentially like trying to
fit a square peg into a round hole. Thus, applying traditional measures to evaluate engaged scholarship often deters faculty from pursuing engaged scholarship entirely or pushes them to carry out their work in a way that hinders the collaboration, insights, and needs of community—fundamental components of engaged research.

**Not Valuing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Discourages Junior Faculty from Pursuing an Engaged Research Agenda.** Due to the limiting nature of traditional metrics used to evaluate faculty scholarship, this study found that junior faculty who have an interest in community engaged research are usually advised to:

- Forgo an engaged research agenda until they have secured tenure;
- Pursue a non-tenure track appointment; and/or
- Produce double the scholarly products— one set to adhere to the traditional metrics used for evaluation and another for their community partners and local audiences.

The suggestion to pause an engaged research agenda in order to secure tenure was discussed by most participants as the primary advice junior faculty are given in their initial year with their school and/or department. Most participants revealed that they know many engaged faculty within their schools and departments who are counseled to forgo an engaged research agenda because of the time it takes to secure funding and publish in certain journals. Junior faculty are advised to do a large amount of quick research in order to have higher publication counts. This study is in line with previous scholarship suggesting that engaged research is viewed by school and department heads as an insufficient way to achieve promotion and tenure (O’Meara, 2003). Further, this helps to explain why mid- and late-career faculty are more likely than early-career faculty to carry out community engaged research, as the pressures to produce traditional scholarship fade once tenure is achieved (Braxton et al., 2002; Karpiak, 1996).
On the other hand, in an effort to appease junior faculty wanting to pursue an engaged research agenda without having to wait until securing tenure, participants shared that many are advised to forgo a tenure-track position altogether:

We do third year reviews and those are really hard sometimes because [engaged faculty] are like, ‘I'm working so hard!’ and I know, but I have to tell them … ‘You're in a research university. You've got to get grants and publish. And if you don't want to do that, then a research university is not for you, or you shouldn't be on tenure track because there's other ways.’ We have clinical tracks, we have lecturers. They don't have to do research. So, we just try to get people to the right place. (Julie)

Though such advice might be given with good intentions, relegating engaged faculty to non-tenure track status inherently devalues their work and very explicitly identifies the priorities of their department, school, and institution. Further, research suggests that contingent faculty, who are limited to a narrow list of specific work requirements with few resources, time, and autonomy have few opportunities to pursue community engaged research because of the additional workload and lack of resources they must balance (Austin, 2015; Kezar, 2005).

The above options presented to engaged faculty are very discouraging, as their commitment to community engagement is deeply personal, guided by their belief that as scholars and educators they have a responsibility to apply their knowledge and expertise to their local communities. Further, as faculty of color and women are found to be more likely than their counterparts to pursue an engaged research agenda (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara et al., 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2010) this is clearly an issue of racial and gender equity. The experiences of participants in this study highlight previous research of Ellison and Eatman (2008) which found that faculty of color believed pursuing an engaged scholarly agenda was seen as an extremely risky option for them in their early careers. Additional research by O’Meara (2002) and Sax et al. (1996) emphasized that both women and faculty of color were identified as those most “disenchanted” with the
structures of promotion and tenure and had less favorable perceptions of academia than their white male counterparts. This study clearly illustrates that what is counted “counts”; and, in this case, it is not the work of engaged faculty.

As evidenced in this study, the current structures of promotion and tenure at the participants’ institutions, categorize engaged scholarship as service and utilize a rigid set of metrics that cannot appropriately evaluate the scholarly products of engaged research. This discourages faculty to pursue a research agenda that contributes to their local communities and addresses community-identified needs in reciprocal, mutually beneficial ways. The perspectives and firsthand accounts of review committee members who evaluate the work of their engaged peers provided much needed insight into the evaluative processes of engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure and add depth and nuance to a growing base of literature.

This study illustrates that for campuses seeking to institutionalize engagement and be designated as an engaged institution by the Carnegie Foundation, the inability for faculty to be recognized and rewarded for engaged work is a matter of significant importance that must be addressed. As every participant in this study shared, all of whom currently work within a Carnegie designated engaged campus, their schools, departments, and ultimately institutions fall short when it comes to valuing the engaged research of faculty.

“It’s Catch as Catch Can”: Institution-Wide Supports to Assist with the Evaluation of Community Engaged Research Do Not Exist

Holland’s (1997; 2005; 2009; 2016) extensive work on the institutionalization of community engagement found that the primary barriers identified by faculty blocking them from conducting engaged research are concern about the amount of time it takes, resources needed to conduct engaged research, and fear that it will not be appropriately valued within promotion and
tenure. This study adds to Holland’s scholarship, identifying more concretely the major factors preventing the appropriate evaluation of engaged scholarship by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees to be (1) the lack of clearly articulated definitions of community engaged research and/or scholarship, (2) the absence of engaged research terminology within promotion and tenure guidelines, (3) the miscategorization of engaged scholarship as service, and (4) the rigidity of traditional metrics used to evaluate engaged scholarship. Additionally, this study illustrated that further exacerbating this issue is the complete absence of any department, school, or institutional supports to assist promotion and tenure committees define, understand, and evaluate faculty’s engaged scholarship.

While participants spoke about many department, school, and institutional supports that exist for engaged faculty on their campuses, all identified resources were geared toward individual faculty to assist them in carrying out quality engagement in their teaching and research. There were no known supports to help promotion and tenure committees evaluate the engaged work of their peers. Most supports identified were faculty mentoring programs and newly created centers or offices dedicated to faculty development and partnership management. Participants noted that such supports were frequently created out of a need to further the institutionalization of engagement, which often was brought to light through the process of applying for the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement classification. Though new centers, offices, and units dedicated to deepening partnerships and ensuring quality engagement are much needed, such supports do little to move the needle when it comes to appropriately recognizing and rewarding engagement in promotion and tenure. For community engagement to be institutionalized, it must move beyond siloed programs, centers, and offices.
While the creation of organizational units within an institution is no small feat and highlights a certain level of commitment by the campus, engagement must be infused into existing structures and procedures (e.g., promotion and tenure) to fully take root. For example, in 2020 the University of Minnesota’s Office for Public Engagement and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs created a campus-wide Review Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship to assist with the review of engaged candidates’ promotion dossiers. The committee is comprised of engaged University of Minnesota tenured faculty who have distinguished records of engaged scholarship, teaching, and/or outreach. Committee members review engaged candidates’ dossiers and provide a letter evaluating the quality and impact of a candidate’s engaged scholarship. The letter is presented as evidence to the department- and/or school-level review committee to assist with the candidate’s evaluation. The purpose of the review committee is:

1. To develop engaged scholars’ ability to present an engaged dossier;
2. To educate review committees about the standards for high quality engaged scholarship; and
3. To provide internal reviews of the scholarship of engaged junior faculty seeking promotion and tenure (University of Minnesota, 2021).

The University of Minnesota’s Review Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship, while incredibly helpful to review committees unfamiliar with community engagement, is not the norm. Unfortunately, as this study found, R1 institutions often lack institutional supports to assist with the evaluation of engaged scholarship by promotion and tenure committee. In line with the previous scholarship of Ellison and Eatman (2008) and Holland (2005), research universities are the institution-type most likely to struggle with institutionalizing engagement and
developing the infrastructure and policies to support it due to the heavy pressure put on their faculty to produce traditional research. This study confirms that such institutionalization and supports often do not touch the evaluation of engaged research, even at institutions classified as engaged by the Carnegie Foundation.

Widely acknowledged as the premier indicator that a campus has successfully institutionalized engagement, the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification for community engagement encourages institutions to create systems and procedures to better understand, improve, and reward engagement on their campuses (Public Purpose Institute, 2021). However, as this study illustrates, institutions that have received the classification continue to struggle with rewarding their engaged faculty. Though the Carnegie designation touts an institution as having institutionalized engagement, or taking significant steps to do so, this study demonstrates that from the perspective valuing engaged research and scholarship in promotion and tenure, the Carnegie classification is not always a good indicator that a campus has institutionalized engagement within all levels and structures of their institution. The Carnegie classification alone does not signify that a campus has truly accomplished change throughout all levels of the institution or within all various structures, policies, and/or procedures.

**Institutions and their Leaders are “Talking out of Two Sides of their Mouth”**

External designations and rankings are one way institutions and their leaders illustrate that they are engaged with community in meaningful ways. As participants in this study shared, their department, school, and institutional leaders are not shy to speak publicly and favorably of their engaged faculty. Though institutional leadership may speak about and publicly recognize the engaged work of their faculty through internal awards, news articles, Tweets, etc., the lack of concrete recognition and reward through the structures of promotion and tenure can easily lead to
a misalignment between what leaders say they value and what is actually valued. Through the voice of faculty, this study highlights the deep frustration felt by engaged faculty and promotion and tenure committees who feel that their leaders want to reap the benefits of their faculty’s engagement, but do not want to ensure they are properly rewarded. This can ultimately lead to a fragmented image of the institution and its schools and departments, as its faculty receive “scattered” messages about who the institution ultimately is (Janke et al., 2015).

Previous research (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Holland, 2005) has shown that in order for a mission and culture of engagement to be institutionalized throughout a campus, acceptance and support must be evident among upper-level institutional leaders (e.g., presidents and provosts), as well as leaders within the middle ground of institutions (e.g., department chairs, senior faculty, center/program directors). Support for community engagement cannot only reside within one level of an institution. Though there exists the need for institutional leaders to prioritize, both publicly and internally, a culture of engagement, such support cannot only exist at the upper levels with the hopes of trickling down. Further, it cannot solely exist within the public-facing image of the institution and be expected to somehow infuse itself magically into internal policies and procedures.

Prior research has also shown that engaged faculty often feel they receive messages that their institution broadly supports community engagement and engaged scholarship, but they do not necessarily feel supported at the school or department levels, as unit-level leaders and the traditional structures of promotion and tenure encourage an exclusive focus on traditional, non-engaged scholarship (Calleson et al., 2005; Foster, 2010; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014). This study builds on past research and solidifies that if a campus is to value and prioritize community engagement (as is evidenced by seeking the Carnegie classification and public praise by
leadership), structural and cultural change must occur within all levels of an institution. Otherwise, faculty will continue to be pushed to forgo an engaged research agenda because of the lack of structures, guidelines, and metrics to appropriately understand, evaluate, and reward engaged scholarship, at all levels within the institution. This study shines a new light on how the lack of structural and cultural support negatively impacts the ability for review committees to appropriately evaluate faculty’s engaged work.

All participants in this study felt similarly that if their leaders are actually committed to institutionalizing engagement and building a culture that accepts and rewards engaged research, pats on the back are not enough. Change to promotion and tenure guidelines, evaluative metrics, and a more inclusive definition of scholarship is required:

There needs to be more recognition. . . . I don’t mean pay or, ‘you’re doing a good job, here’s a pat on the back’ recognition, but taking it into consideration in P and T. (Felix)

Now, it’s going to be communicated from [leadership] … that engagement is good, that it’s a good thing. I mean, who could argue that’s not a good thing? … It has to be communicated. And the best way to communicate it and show value is put it into promotion and tenure criteria … That is what it takes to get somebody’s attention at a place like this. (Philip)

Institutions that have successfully adopted and maintained a culture of community engagement have leaders that speak consistently about engagement, embed it in institutional planning, create infrastructure to support and strengthen it, and embrace faculty who pursue engaged research (Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Votruba, 2005). However, all participants within this study did not feel as though their R1 universities, who had just been designated as engaged, had effectively institutionalized engagement within promotion and tenure. This study is important in that it highlights the perceived divergence between what is rewarded in promotion and tenure and what is publicly praised by institutions and their schools and departments. Faculty and review committee members confirm that community engaged research and its
products are quickly, loudly, and publicly applauded by institutional and department leaders for making an impact, but the unspoken message that this work does not count within promotion and tenure looms large over their heads. As illustrated by this study, while public recognition and classifications might open the door to entice an institution and their leaders to be engaged, it is not the final step. Change to the foundational structures of how faculty work is rewarded is essential. This study demonstrates that such change must include (1) recognition of engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure guidelines, (2) broadening the definition of what counts as scholarship, and (3) updated metrics to properly evaluate engaged scholarship because current metrics are too rigid to appropriately categorize or assess it.

The Events of 2020 Have Both Positively and Negatively Affected Community Engaged Research

The data within this study was collected from June to October 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic and nation-wide protests for racial justice in response to the murder of George Floyd and countless other people of color who have died at the hands of a systematically unjust system. Coupled with the nation-wide protests was the immediate reorientation of public life due to COVID-19, further exacerbating the health, economic, and social inequities faced by communities of color. Participants reflected on all of this, from their unique perspectives as engaged faculty within large R1 universities.

As all universities were required to shift their teaching, research, and engagement online quickly and dramatically, participants within this study noted the shift to virtual spaces was much more difficult for themselves and their engaged peers than it was for faculty who have more traditional research agendas. Even prior to the pandemic a large percentage of engaged faculty’s time is spent initiating, growing, and cultivating relationships with community partners.
With the immediate shift to virtual engagement and research, participants shared that faculty working with community partners were required to either spend even more time virtually engaging with partners or put a pause on their engaged research, which often meant ending any current partnerships with the hopes of rekindling relationships post-pandemic. Meanwhile, their traditional counterparts whose research does not involve community were able to utilize the time to write and publish, not having to worry about maintaining community-based partnerships. As faculty rarely get evaluated on or rewarded for the amount of time and energy put into establishing meaningful relationships with community partners and rather, primarily on the quantity of peer-reviewed publications they produce, the need for engaged faculty to dedicate a majority of their time maintaining relationships with community in the virtual space felt like, “yet another nail in the coffin” (Kathleen).

Though the immediate shift to virtual research, teaching, and engagement was more difficult for faculty who embed community outreach and engagement into their work, such hurdles were not the primary focus of participants when reflecting on the impact of the pandemic in 2020. The issues of racial justice and equity highlighted and intensified by COVID-19 had pushed large numbers of faculty at the participants’ universities, engaged and non-engaged, to more seriously consider how their institutions could respond in meaningful ways and leverage community engagement as a strategy to address such issues. Participants noted how it felt like their colleagues and campus leadership were beginning to see a serious opportunity for their institutions to engage with community in significant ways and to effect real change, based on community-identified needs and priorities. Louis articulated it best:

Here we are, deep in a change process related to the George Floyd murder and so many others, and Black Lives Matter. . . . And that’s finally made an impression in an important way in the university. There are signs here, as in many places around the country, of course, that people are listening in a different kind of way. . . . I think there’s
a real opportunity for change at the institutional level and understanding what community engagement means, driven by a lot of forces that relate to the light going off about systemic racism and the role that we play in in our community.

Like Louis, many other study participants felt that now is a prime opportunity for their institutions, leaders, and faculty to reorient the ways their communities’ needs and expertise are prioritized. We cannot go back to “normal”. However, it is important to note that while this time is rich with opportunity for change, it is not necessary, or even recommended, to start from scratch. Rather, it is imperative that the recognition of community engagement and the faculty whose work is intimately embedded in it, must be integrated into the existing institutional processes. The best way to ensure community voice and expertise is properly legitimized and respected is to engrain it into the traditional structures of the institution so it is not anecdotal or something to be viewed as ‘less than’. IUPUI is an excellent example of how one institution has recently built into their faculty reward structures a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. In Spring 2021 the IUPUI Faculty council approved the addition of an integrative diversity, equity, and inclusion case to the IUPUI promotion and tenure guidelines. The first in the country, IUPUI is allowing promotion based on a faculty member’s commitment to advance diversity equity, and inclusion across teaching, research, and service (IUPUI, 2021).

Across each of the institutions in this study much work has gone into slowly chipping away at the traditional institutional reward structures to highlight and center community. Now is the time to build upon that work. The energy and momentum felt by participants must now be leveraged to further integrate community engagement into the traditional structures of the university and make it the norm.

Due to its unique timing, this study offers a rare glimpse into faculty engaged research during the time of pandemic. Important are the views expressed by participants about how they,
themselves, their peers, and their institutional leaders reevaluate and reorient the way their institutions approach and engage with community in a post-pandemic world. There is a firmly articulated need to not return to normal. Higher education and their leaders cannot fall back into the traditional ways of defining and evaluating the work of faculty. Though engaged faculty have long identified with and advocated for the public purpose of higher education, and appropriately rewarding faculty who pursue it, this study provides unique insights into the excitement and cautious optimism of those longing to move the needle on changes to promotion and tenure. Fueled by the resounding community-identified needs and priorities, engaged faculty and review committee members are hopeful that their institutions and leaders will work more intentionally to integrate plans, ideas, and pathways to leverage engagement with community as a primary strategy through which their institutions, and faculty, can achieve success and ultimately be “better humans” (Debra).

Conclusions

Large, overarching conclusions drawn from this study are presented here to help summarize the essential barriers preventing faculty’s community engaged scholarship from being appropriately evaluated within promotion and tenure. This study built upon previous research (Alperin et al., 2018; Diamond, 2005; O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh et al., 2005; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014) exploring the institutionalization of community engagement through promotion and tenure. Recognizing the need for an examination of the ways promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s engaged scholarship at institutions classified as “community engaged” by the Carnegie Foundation, this study adds to the growing body of research by offering findings that both complement and expand previous scholarship.
The barriers faced by school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees preventing them from appropriately defining, categorizing, and evaluating faculty’s community engaged scholarship are primarily due to a number of school, department, and institutional factors, illustrated in Table 8.

**Table 8**

*Barriers Preventing the Appropriate Evaluation of Faculty’s Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure at the School- and Department-Levels*

- No articulated definition of community engaged research or scholarship within school- or department-level promotion and tenure guidelines
- Absence of “community engaged research” or similar terminology within school and department guidelines
- Narrow conception of research and scholarship that excludes community engaged scholarship and incorrectly categorizes it as *service*
- Reliance on traditional metrics to judge the quality of engaged scholarship
- Inability to evaluate quality research *processes* and reliance on bean counting to judge quality of research
- Lack of supports to assist committees understand and evaluate engaged scholarship (e.g., guidelines, definition sheets)
- Institutional, school, and departmental culture that publicly praises community engagement but does not internally support engaged faculty (e.g., recognition, funding)

All identified barriers were consistent across participant disciplines, institution-type, location, and length of time their institution has been classified as “community engaged” by the Carnegie Foundation (e.g., 2020 reclassification or 2020 initial classification). Though all identified barriers were acknowledged by each individual participant, review committees’ reliance on traditional metrics to judge the quality of engaged scholarship was cited as the issue
of most concern. While the reliance on traditional metrics is affected by (e.g., absence of engaged terminology in guidelines) and magnifies other (e.g., narrow conception of scholarship, inability to evaluate research processes) barriers, it was identified by participants as the greatest obstacle around which committees cannot maneuver.

The five most commonly cited metrics used to evaluate faculty scholarship all come with unique challenges when committees attempt to judge engaged research and scholarship through the lens of each traditional metric. Table 9, below, identifies the most cited metrics to assess faculty’s research, the unique challenges they pose when attempting to specifically use them to evaluate faculty’s engaged scholarship, and the frequency that those metrics appear in the promotion and tenure guidelines for the campuses in this study.
Table 9  

*Traditional Metrics Used to Evaluate Faculty Scholarship and Challenges When Applied to the Evaluation of Community Engaged Scholarship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Metric</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Presence of Traditional Metrics in Reviewed Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Publications</td>
<td>Recognized as the “gold standard” and only acceptable outlet for the dissemination of scholarly work. Is not inclusive of community-based dissemination outlets or other scholarship (e.g., community presentations, laws/public policy, delivery of products or services).</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Only national funding is recognized and valued. Local/regional funding is not acknowledged as legitimate or valuable.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>A faculty’s reputation and accomplishments with local partners is not considered or valued. Only the national/international reputation and reach of a faculty member is considered.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact is measured solely by journal impact factors. Community engagement journals typically have lower impact factors. Local/regional or community-based impact is not acknowledged.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Letters</td>
<td>Only opinions of other academics hold weight. Community members are not seen as peers and deemed unable to appropriately speak to the work of faculty.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While posing significant challenges to review committees and their departments, schools, and institutions, the identified barriers also offer opportunities for change and growth.

Accordingly, the six overarching conclusions identified within this study, noted below, have practical implications for institutions, their leaders, and the field of higher education:

1. Schools, departments, and their promotion and tenure review committees do not have an agreed upon definition of community engaged research and/or community engaged scholarship upon which to refer, hindering their ability to effectively evaluate it.
2. The current school- and department-level promotion and tenure guidelines are too rigid and are not inclusive of non-traditional forms of research and/or scholarship. Committees are thus unable to appropriately categorize engaged scholarship as research or evaluate it as such.

3. The current metrics used to evaluate traditional scholarship are not appropriate to evaluate engaged research and scholarship. Committees are reliant on a strict set of criteria to evaluate faculty scholarship and the unique processes and products of community engaged research are unable to be effectively assessed.

4. Institution-specific supports to assist promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s engaged research scholarship do not exist. Current external resources to assist committees define, understand, and evaluate engaged scholarship are not utilized by school and department review committees.

5. The public rhetoric of institutional leaders praising community engagement does not align with the way faculty are rewarded through the traditional structures of promotion and tenure. For many faculty, it feels as though their leaders want to reap the benefits of their engaged work, but do not want to ensure they are properly rewarded.

6. Though the events of 2020 were challenging for institutions and their faculty, especially those who engage community partners in their teaching and research, there currently exists an excellent opportunity to reorient institutions to better align with the public purpose of higher education.

**Recommendations**

As more institutions, campus leaders, faculty, and staff work to establish a culture of engagement throughout their universities, adjustments to promotion and tenure cannot be
overlooked. Though it may appear that the study’s participants have painted a fairly bleak picture of life as a faculty member, specifically as an engaged faculty member, they all were incredibly proud of their work with community and many spoke with optimism about the future of their scholarship and community engagement. Though they identified many large obstacles standing in the way of their institutions valuing community engaged research in promotion and tenure, they ultimately have chosen to continue on the path of an engaged scholar because they know their work is making a positive difference outside the walls of their institutions. As engaged faculty continue to work with community on an individual level, there are many things institutions and those within them (leaders, staff, and faculty members) can do to help ensure engaged faculty are appropriately valued and rewarded for their engagement. In this section comments about the future of valuing the engaged work of faculty in promotion and tenure are followed by specific suggestions for institutions of higher education, school and department leaders, review committees, community engagement professionals, and future research.

**Recommendations for Institutions of Higher Education**

Community engagement, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation, cannot be fully institutionalized if a campus lacks clearly defined pathways to reward, promote, and tenure faculty who conduct engaged research. Previous research suggests that the Carnegie Foundation’s community engagement classification has “enhanced both the prominence and promise of community engagement in higher education” (Driscoll, 2008, p. 41) and contends that there is “clear evidence of institutional change as a result of applying for the classification” (Noel & Earwicker, 2015, p. 55). However, findings from this dissertation suggest that for the R1 institutions included in this study, who have recently received the initial classification, or have just been reclassified, the label of an “engaged” campus is still uncertain when it comes to
rewarding engaged faculty through the traditional structures of promotion and tenure. This points to a dangerous gap between the public recognition of engaged work by classifications such as Carnegie’s and the policies and structures that are actually leveraged in practice.

When considering the changes recommended to institutions and their leadership in light of this study’s findings, certain question come to mind: _Why work to change promotion and tenure? Why not dismantle it and reconstruct new structures to reward faculty? Why legitimize community engagement in an institutional tradition that is clearly problematic in a lot of respects?_ Though these larger questions should not be ignored and ultimately push institutions to combat potential levels of imbalance within their current structures of promotion and tenure, change takes time and is far more palatable in smaller, more manageable amounts. In today’s environment, momentum is building to steadily chip away at the rigid layers of promotion and tenure and push to expand what “counts” as valued and meaningful faculty work, including engagement and research with community partners. Eventually, with enough force, the dam will break.

When considering how to best chip away at and open up the current structures of promotion and tenure, this study provides four clear recommendations for interested institutions and their leadership to consider in order to value the engaged research of faculty more appropriately, as illustrated in Figure 1, below. Though classifications, rankings, and public image might open the door and entice an institution to commit to establishing a culture of engagement (Step 1), this is not the final step. Further, the creation of offices, centers, institutes, and/or committees to lead the work, often in silos, is but a step (Step 2) in the process. To appropriately evaluate and reward faculty for their engaged research and the scholarship it produces, change to department-, school-, and institution-level guidelines is required to expand
the definition of scholarship and what “counts” as scholarly work (Step 3). Lastly, and most importantly, the establishment of referenceable metrics upon which review committees may properly evaluate the work of their engaged peers is fundamental if real change is to be made (Step 4). Otherwise, the inclusion of community engaged research and/or scholarship in promotion and tenure guidelines is useless if review committees continue to evaluate it with traditional metrics.

**Figure 1**

*Recommended Steps for Institutions Working to Appropriately Recognize and Reward Community Engaged Research and Scholarship within Promotion and Tenure*

---

**Step 1:** Desire to institutionalize community engagement and appropriately reward faculty within promotion and tenure (spurred by recent events, vocal faculty/staff, desire to realign mission, seeking Carnegie classification, etc.).

**Step 2:** Creation or realignment of additional supports (e.g., centers, offices, committees) to assist with revision of guidelines and evaluative metrics.

**Step 3:** Change to institution-level guidelines – defining community engagement within all levels (department, school, and institution), opening up definition of *research* and what “counts” as scholarship.

**Step 4:** Creation of metrics that schools and departments can reference and utilize to properly evaluate the quality of engaged scholarship.

---

*Note:* Though the order of steps is suggested to build on each other, they likely will be done concurrently and inform each other.

**Valuing the Engaged Research of Faculty is an Issue of Equity.** The suggested recommendations above are only made more urgent and necessary when considering this need through the lens of faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion. Research has shown that large
percentages of baby boomer faculty are beginning to retire and are being replaced by more diverse groups of faculty who are more likely to pursue an engaged scholarly agenda, believing that they have a responsibility to apply their knowledge toward advancing community-identified needs and issues, even when it often runs counter to the institutional norms (Holland; 1997; O’Meara et al., 2011; Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016). These incoming faculty are increasingly more female and racially and ethnically diverse (Finkelstein, 2010; Finkelstein et al., 2016).

Further, studies have shown that faculty of color are more likely than their White counterparts, and females are more likely than males, to pursue an engaged research agenda, provide services for local communities, and leverage their scholarship to promote community-based change and equity (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O’Meara, 2002; O’Meara et al., 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2010).

When considering the current structures of promotion and tenure and the type of faculty work that is valued, and that which is not, failing to recognize and reward the engaged work of faculty has clear implications for faculty of color, women, and other marginalized groups who are often more engaged than their White male peers. If institutions of higher education do not explicitly reward and value the engagement of its faculty in local/regional communities who are working to address community-identified issues, often through a social justice lens, then institutions are inherently pushing forward an agenda of systemic inequality. As detailed by participants in this study, in order to achieve promotion and tenure, engaged faculty are often required to forgo an engaged research agenda, pursue a non-tenure track appointment, or produce two lines of scholarship. The way scholarship is currently valued within promotion and tenure is disproportionately affecting faculty of color, women, and other marginalized groups. In today’s climate, higher education is at a point of reckoning. With the upheaval caused by the COVID-19
pandemic and nation-wide protests for racial justice, institutions are poised to reorient and reimagine the ways they leverage and reward the engaged work of their faculty.

**Recommendations for School and Department Leaders and Review Committees**

Though change at the institution-level to build structures and supports, broaden the definition of scholarship, and create guidelines and referenceable metrics upon which to evaluate engaged scholarship are much needed, change must simultaneously occur at the school- and department-levels to be sustained. As this study suggests, there is a great need for schools, departments, and their leaders to cultivate a culture that values engagement within their units, both in word and in practice. Though such a culture cannot be created overnight, it is absolutely essential and must occur in addition to any changes made at the institutional level. Academic disciplines and department cultures are known to heavily influence the type of scholarship faculty conduct (Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2009). Even with structures, policies, and procedures in place, as O’Meara (2002) identified, “unconscious values and beliefs held by faculty facilitating the reward system can prevent newer forms of scholarly work from being accepted and rewarded” (p. 76-77). In conjunction with changes to structures and policies, a culture accepting the engaged work of faculty must be created.

**Define and Categorize Community Engaged Research as “Big R” Research.** The creation of a culture and the establishment of policies, procedures, and guidelines to support and fuel the developing culture go hand in hand. One cannot be done without the other. When it comes to actions that can be taken by school and department leaders, this study suggests that the first step must be the expansion of what “counts” or what is defined as scholarship. Before appropriate metrics can be created to evaluate engaged scholarship, community engaged research must be identified and defined as “big R” research, and not service, within the formal school and
department promotion and tenure guidelines. Further, the products of community engaged research, *community engaged scholarship*, must be understood as scholarly and acceptable research outputs within the guidelines. As evidenced in this study, without clearly defining engaged research and its scholarship as research in school- and department-level guidelines, review committees are ultimately required to define, categorize, and thus evaluate it as *service*. Only when it is properly defined, understood, and categorized as research, can engaged research and the scholarship it produces be appropriately evaluated by review committees.

Within the current structures of promotion and tenure, the placement of engaged work within promotion and tenure guidelines and categories is one of debate among scholars. There is not a consensus around where to place engaged work, in its own separate “community engagement” category or integrated throughout the established categories of teaching, research, and service. Some scholars believe it is essential that engaged scholarship be explicitly recognized within the research category and viewed as parallel to traditional research (Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Weerts & Sandman, 2008). However, others believe that it is best to avoid the rigid divisions of teaching, research, and service and rather integrate all forms of engaged intellectual work into its own space (e.g., a fourth “engagement” category) that recognizes the public purpose of academic work (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006).

As this dissertation illustrates, within the current structures of promotion and tenure at the R1 institutions included in this study, the category of research reigns supreme. For faculty on the tenure-track, anything other than research is second tier and is devalued in comparison to that which is understood as research. Thus, the creation of a fourth “engagement” category would run the risk of becoming, for tenure-track faculty, second tier. When recognized as something *other* than research, such work will continue to be devalued, or be reserved as a way only for
non-tenure track faculty to provide evidence of scholarship. Thus, community engaged research
and the non-traditional scholarship it produces must be recognized and included within the
current category of research. Without such recognition it will continue to be devalued in a fourth
space. It cannot and should not be siloed into its own category and othered. At its core,
community engagement is a strategy for faculty to accomplish their teaching, research, and
service. Creating a fourth category and distinguishing it as something other than teaching,
research, and service ultimately negates this thinking.

**Construct Appropriate Metrics to Evaluate Community Engaged Scholarship as a
Product of Research.** Recognizing community engaged research and its scholarly products as
valid forms of research is only half the battle. When community engaged research is categorized
as research, review committees are required to evaluate it as such and they only have one, very
limited, set of metrics upon which to assess it. This study illustrates how incredibly difficult it is
for review committees to evaluate engaged scholarship using the current metrics that have been
constructed to assess traditional scholarship. Earlier, Table 9 outlined the traditional metrics
used by committees to evaluate all forms of scholarship and the challenges that come when
attempting to evaluate engaged scholarship through the same lens. In order to appropriately
evaluate community engaged scholarship, it must be judged against a set of metrics constructed
to assess its unique contributions and rigor. In Table 10 alterations to the current metrics are
proposed to evaluate community engaged scholarship better and more appropriately.
Table 10

Current, Traditional Metrics Used to Evaluate Faculty Scholarship and Proposed Adjustments to More Appropriately Evaluate Community Engaged Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Metric</th>
<th>Proposed Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peer-Reviewed Publications          | Expand the notion of what “counts” as evidence of scholarship. In addition to peer-reviewed publications, equally weight other forms of scholarship and involvement of other, community-based audiences. Examples of additional outputs to evidence faculty scholarship:  
  • Community programs/reports  
  • Laws/public policy  
  • Delivery of products and/or services  
  • Community presentations  
  • Creative products (e.g., art shows, videos) |
| Funding                             | Recognize local/regional funding received by faculty as evidence of the need for their work with local/regional communities. Consider outputs and outcomes of locally funded research on par with products of nationally funded projects.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Reputation                          | Acknowledge the reputation of faculty on a local/regional level, as evidenced by voices of community members and/or partner organizations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Impact                              | Expand impact beyond journal impact factors. For engaged faculty, also consider:  
  • Depth of relationship faculty has established with community  
  • Impact of faculty’s scholarship (e.g., policy, programs) on community, through community voice  
  • Number of community members or organizations impacted |
| External Letters                    | If faculty conducts engaged research, their academic peer reviewers should also conduct and/or be knowledgeable about engaged research. Community partners with whom engaged faculty work should be considered as equally legitimate reviewers who can speak to the community-based work of their faculty partners. More reliance on partner voice is essential.                                                                                           |

The creation of new or adaptation of current metrics to assess faculty’s community engaged research is absolutely essential in order for school- and department-level review committees to appropriately evaluate and reward it within promotion and tenure.

**Value the Voice of Community Partners.** Though all proposed adjustments to the metrics above are necessary to evaluate engaged scholarship more effectively, the inclusion of
community partner voice is critical. Many times, those most appropriate to review and speak to faculty’s community engagement and its impact are outside of the academy (e.g., K-12 schools, government, nonprofit organizations). Often, as evidenced in this study, the voice of community partners within promotion and tenure is heavily devalued, if not entirely absent from the conversation. A fundamental component of engaged research is developing and sustaining partnerships that are mutually beneficial, reciprocal, and grounded in equal community/faculty voice. The absence of community partners as respected and valued peer reviewers is counter to engaged research. Schools and departments, and their review committees, must broaden the notion of who is considered a peer and whose voice “counts”. If institutions, schools and departments are to truly value the engaged work of faculty they must equally value the voice of their community partners, especially as those partners work jointly with faculty to plan, carry out, and disseminate the research and scholarly products. Higher education cannot remain insular and value only the voice of other academics.

**Recommendations for Community Engagement Professionals**

To ensure that faculty are not deterred from pursuing engaged research there is significant need for institutions to better train and equip schools, departments, and promotion and tenure committees to appropriately evaluate faculty’s engaged scholarship. Considering the recommended changes for institutions, schools, and departments detailed above, this study has identified two primary recommendations for community engagement professionals to assist with this work, recognizing their unique skillset and positioning within their institutions:

- Assist school and department leaders and promotion and tenure review committees vet and legitimate community partners as respected external reviewers of faculty’s engaged research.
• Provide tools, or help guide the creation of tools, rubrics, etc. to assist review committees properly define, understand, and evaluate faculty’s engaged research.

Within many R1 universities Community Engagement Professionals (CEPs) are often positioned within campus-wide centers, offices, or institutes, providing them with a unique perspective and leverage to assist the institutionalization of engagement more broadly. Within this study, four of the five CEPs who assisted with participant recruitment worked within a cross-campus unit dedicated to community engagement and/or service learning. As such, many CEPs have the ability to “speak” the various discipline-specific languages of engagement, (e.g., public service, public scholarship, community-based health) and they can help departments and schools create definitions, guidelines, metrics, and tools to address the ways faculty engagement manifests more specifically in their disciplines (Weiss & Norris, 2019).

Further, CEPs have a robust understanding of the institutions’ many community partner organizations, how to generate and sustain strong partnerships, and can provide helpful guidance to schools, departments, and review committees when considering how to best legitimize and value the voice of community. CEPs can work with school and department leaders to either create a pool of vetted and accepted community reviewers who can appropriately speak to faculty’s engaged research or assist review committees in their evaluation of community partner letters and assessment of partnership strength. It is important for CEPs to work with schools and departments to identify and help legitimize community members as valued experts who are able to evaluate the impact and strength of faculty’s engaged research and scholarship.

Secondly, CEPs can further assist schools, departments, and review committees by providing them with tools or procedures to assist the proper evaluation of engaged research and scholarship. Within this study, many participants noted the initial need for their committees to
be provided a guide defining and explaining the primary components of community engaged research and why it is a valid approach to research and scholarship:

I think first it needs to be explained. . . . It’s almost like a cover sheet should come with their packet that says this individual participates in [engaged scholarship] . . . you know, this is what it is. This is how it should be evaluated and considered. This should be considered as research and scholarly activity. . . . You know, we usually get a cover sheet with a letter from the department head that says, ‘this person did this, and this is, you know, I recommend this or that.’ You just get the department head cover sheet. It would also be nice to have sort of a department head cover sheet [saying] this person has this component to their job and this is what it means. At least as its new, and as people are getting used to what it means. Sort of like a definition sheet almost that explains what it is and why it’s important. (Kathleen)

CEPs can work with committees and their schools and departments to create new resources, supports, and procedures to assist with defining, understanding, and evaluating community engaged research that are unique to their specific campus needs. As detailed earlier in this chapter, the University of Minnesota’s Review Committee on Community-Engaged Scholarship is a prime example of how CEPs have worked with tenured engaged faculty to assist with the evaluation of an engaged dossier.

Similar to the current work of the University of Minnesota, it is important to note that other, similar resources already exist, many of which are available to the public. As illustrated in this study, review committees are unaware of these resources and do not reference or leverage them when evaluating the engaged work of their peers:

- Purdue University’s The Guide – A public document for committees outlining the characteristics of quality engaged scholarship, defining and framing the value of it, and suggested rubrics to assist with its evaluation (Abel & Williams, 2019).

- CES4Health – A free, online resource to assist with peer-review, publishing, and the dissemination of health-related engaged scholarship for non-traditional products.
committees within the health fields can leverage CES4Health to identify quality engaged scholarship, vetted by engaged peers across the county (CES4Health, 2021).

- IUPUI Public Scholarship Faculty Learning Community’s Strategies for Developing and Documenting Products of Public Scholarship in Research and Creative Activity – A resource for review committees, school and department leaders, and engaged faculty that defines engaged scholarship, suggests criteria for its evaluation, and ways for engaged faculty to best document it within their dossiers (Wood et al., 2018).

Whether they leverage existing resources or create new ones, CEPs are well positioned on their campuses to assist schools, departments, and review committees better understand and identify appropriate ways to evaluate faculty’s engaged scholarship.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research related to the evaluation of engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure would continue to enhance and push forward the conversations about how to meaningfully institutionalize and leverage community engagement as a strategy for higher education’s overall success. The need for identifying and clarifying additional metrics to effectively evaluate community engaged research and its engaged scholarship is evidenced in this study. More specifically, research exploring the diverse ways to illustrate and assess the processes (e.g., generating and sustaining meaningful partnerships, ensuring trust with community partners, identifying shared research goals) and impact of engaged research is warranted. Within the institutions in this study, the processes of engaged research were shown not to factor into evaluative decisions by promotion and tenure review committees because there is no mention of them in school- and/or department-level guidelines or metrics upon which to assess them.

Research investigating alternative ways to document and assess the intangible processes of
community engaged research would shed light on how to bring engaged research processes most effectively into the conversation of faculty reward.

The findings from this study also support calls for future research to address and clarify ways to document and evaluate the impact of faculty’s community engaged research more successfully. Though the proposed adjustments to current evaluative metrics and resources to assist review committees with the process of evaluation outlined in prior sections provide a foundation upon which to initiate change, questions remain specifically around the issue of defining, documenting, measuring, and evaluating impact. It is clear that understanding impact must move beyond journal impact factors. However, engaged faculty and promotion and tenure committees continue to wrestle with questions that future research could explore, such as:

- **How does an engaged faculty member document the impact of an engagement project or program?**
- **What constitutes “appropriate” or “valuable” scholarly impact within engagement activities?**
- **How do faculty members tell the story of impact in ways that will be recognized by promotion and tenure committees?**
- **How can the depth and strength of community partnerships, and their impact be measured?**
- **How can community voice be appropriately leveraged to assist with illustrating impact?**

Further, there is a need for additional exploration into how the expert voice of community partners can be best leveraged within the evaluative aspect of promotion and tenure. As participants in this study noted, faculty are able to bring in community partner voice through the use of external letters, but they shared that letters by peers outside of the academy hold far less
weight than those of other academics. This study has highlighted the need for improvements to the way community partners are currently leveraged as experts and external reviewers. Further research investigating the most advantageous ways to bring in and value the voice of community partners (e.g., through individual external letters, via an institutional or external resource of vetted partners who can serve as reviewers) would be an effective extension to this study’s findings.

As this study sought to examine how school- and department-level promotion and tenure committees evaluate the engaged research of faculty and the supports they use to assist them in the evaluation process at R1 institutions that recently received the engaged Carnegie classification, future research reexamining the progress of such institutions is warranted. Follow up studies five to ten years (based on Carnegie reclassification cycles) would bring to light how classification processes such as Carnegie push institutions to change practice and policy to become a more engaged institution. Future research could help identify if change was driven by applying for and receiving the Carnegie community engagement classification, and if so, what type of change. Is change more organizationally focused, creating new offices, centers, and institutes centering, and often siloing, community engagement? What type of changes to policy, if any, are made? What type of changes to practice? How do changes affect or translate to the appropriate recognition of community engaged research and scholarship within promotion and tenure? Investigation into these questions offers substantial opportunity for continued research exploring how the Carnegie community engagement classification is generating change on university campuses.

Additionally, further research exploring the participants’ own experiences seeking promotion and tenure as engaged scholars would give increased depth and nuance to their current
perspective and how they choose to operate as a review committee member. Does the manner by which they achieved tenure (highlighting their engaged scholarship vs. modifying it to fit traditional research metrics) impact the way in which they review or advise their junior colleagues? Does it affect their beliefs about how change to the evaluation of engaged scholarship should be addressed? As data about the individual participants’ experiences seeking promotion and tenure (e.g., if they included engaged scholarship within their dossiers, was it central to their case, how it was framed) fell outside the scope of this study, additional research exploring their trajectory through the structures of promotion and tenure might help explain the lack of individual faculty agency that was felt by many of the participants who were interviewed.

Some limitations of this study could also be addressed through future research, specifically examination of this issue at other institution types, with or without the Carnegie community engagement classification, as well as with a more diverse participant group. As this study intentionally chose to explore the issue of engaged scholarship evaluation at R1 universities, the inclusion of other institution-types would provide additional insight into how other institutions that are not as research-focused (e.g., R2, R3, Master’s colleges and universities) approach engaged scholarship within promotion and tenure. Do they face the same challenges as R1 institutions? Are the constraints around definitions, guidelines, and metrics similar or different? Have institutions that do not hold the Carnegie’s community engagement classification made significant strides recognizing the engaged scholarship of faculty and have just not sought formal recognition through Carnegie?

Finally, further research including the perspectives of faculty of color would greatly enhance the current study’s findings and lead to additional insights into the nuance of how issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are impacted by and fueled through the current limitations of
promotion and tenure. As this study did not explicitly seek to include participants of color and was limited by the availability and willingness of engaged faculty to participate, a more nuanced approach to such research specifically exploring the intersection of faculty reward and diversity, equity, and inclusion would lead to important revisions to policy and practice. Larger scale research, including different institution and participant types would continue to provide insights into the institutionalization of community engagement, specifically within the structures of promotion and tenure.

Final Comments

The participants in this study and their unique and varied experiences as engaged faculty and review committee members were a window into the innerworkings of faculty reward structures at Carnegie classified R1 institutions. Insights shared by participants during this study greatly enhanced my appreciation and respect for engaged faculty and their commitments to engaging community in their research when doing so is at great risk to their professional advancement. Each participant shared their personal frustrations with how their school, department, and/or institution values the work of engaged faculty. Andrea articulated it well:

Even as we’re having this conversation, it’s frustrating. Really, when you think … what is it that we should be expecting of our faculty? Should we really be expecting them to toe the line on two different sides and only get credit for one? Because otherwise, what’s the incentive, other than a responsibility and a commitment to the community … What’s the driving urge to want to put as much time and effort into outputs that go back to the community when you can’t even really account for it?

Evident in their collective voice was the desire to value and reward faculty based on the quality of their engagement, partnerships, and local impact, but exasperation that current structures and policies prevented them from rewarding faculty for anything other than traditional research outputs. Further, I was disappointed to hear how participants spoke about the disconnect between what their institutions publicly praise and what is actually valued in practice. Such
discoveries have led me to doubt the authenticity of higher education’s professed role as an engaged and public serving institution.

I understand higher education’s dedicated focus on conducting traditional research and rewarding the faculty who do it. It enhances an institution’s national and international image and brings in large amounts of funding that is especially relevant in today’s tumultuous times. However, failing to value the local impact of faculty’s engaged work and the voice, commitments, and expertise of community partners undermines the very principles of our institutions and higher education more broadly. As this study revealed, within American higher education there can exist a “savage ambition” to highlight and reward the traditional research profiles of institutions and their faculty in order to claim national and international prestige (Saltmarsh & Wooding, 2016, p. 79). Though higher education has slowly evolved over time, the current emphasis on traditional research helps to discount the engaged work of faculty and prioritize the voice of the academy over those of our communities. This is fundamentally at odds with the public purpose of higher education and is concerning if it continues unaddressed.

Talking with each and every participant in this study has only further illustrated to me that R1 institutions must seriously reconsider how to better reward engaged faculty and value the expertise, experience, and voice of our community partners. Institutions, and higher education as a whole, must reflect on how we think about our communities, how we value their expertise, and what it means for institutions to truly commit to actualizing the public purpose of our colleges and universities. If institutions of higher education are truly committed to pushing forward an agenda of equitable change in our local neighborhoods and cities, they must seriously consider how they will recognize and reward their engaged faculty. Conversations must be had about what institutions truly value and include considerations of whether the current structures of
promotion and tenure are hindering progress toward actualizing the public purpose of higher education. As this study illustrates, promotion and tenure cannot and should not be one-size-fits-all.

Further, as more and more institutions commit to advancing an engaged agenda and are recognized for doing so through designations like Carnegie, we must ask ourselves what actually constitutes an institution as engaged. As higher education and the academic labor market continue to evolve and respond to the increasing needs of our communities, faculty are faced with the choice of where to employ their time and expertise. There is no doubt that faculty will continue to meaningfully engage with their local communities. The question, rather, is a matter of how quickly, if at all, institutions will recognize the need to align their public commitment to community engagement with the appropriate internal systems, structures, and policies to recognize and reward their faculty who are doing it. The COVID-19 pandemic, despite the incredible strain it put upon our institutions and communities, has provided a unique perspective and call to reevaluate the public purpose of higher education. There is a real opportunity for change as our country, institutions, faculty, and communities continue to reckon with what it means to commit ourselves to furthering the public good. I believe higher education is up for the challenge.
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Appendix A

Community Engagement Professionals Recruitment Email

Greetings [NAME],

To complete my dissertation for the Indiana University Higher Education PhD program, I am conducting a study to explore how promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s community engaged research. The study is intended to develop a better understanding of what goes into making evaluative decisions, tools used for evaluation, and how evaluative decisions are made regarding faculty’s engaged research. This information will be used to inform current discussions of the institutionalization of engagement in higher education.

I need your help. I am looking to conduct 60-minute Zoom interviews with faculty that meet the following criteria:

- Are a tenured faculty member and are currently serving on their school and/or department-level promotion and tenure committee OR have served on their school and/or department-level promotion and tenure committee within the past 12 months
- Have a primary appointment in either:
  - Social Science field
  - STEM field (e.g., Science, Technology, Engineering, Math)
- Have some familiarity with community engaged research as an approach to inquiry

Would you or one of your colleagues be willing to send a message to faculty at [INSTITUTION] who you know are either knowledgeable about or conduct community engaged research to gauge their interest in participating? Or provide a list of engaged faculty whom I may contact or other colleagues who could point me in the best direction? I will provide copy for the email that will include a link for faculty to note their interest.

Once you have provided names and emails for each possible participant, I will contact the faculty members individually to provide a Study Information Sheet, identify availability, distribute the pre-interview questionnaire, and schedule an interview.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [EMAIL].
Thank you for your recommendations and continued leadership in community engagement!

Sincerely,
Lauren Wendling, Doctoral Candidate
Indiana University
Appendix B

Email from Community Engagement Professionals to Engaged Faculty

Greetings [NAME],

You are invited to participate in a study exploring how promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s community engaged research. The study will explore what goes into making evaluative decisions, tools used for evaluation, and how evaluative decisions are made regarding faculty’s engaged research.

Faculty who meet the following criteria are invited to participate in one 60-minute Zoom interview:

- Are a tenure or tenure-track (non-clinical) faculty member
- Are currently serving on a school and/or department-level promotion and tenure committee OR have previously served on a school and/or department-level promotion and tenure committee
- Have some familiarity with community engaged research as an approach to inquiry

If you are interested in participating, please complete this short Qualtrics survey [LINK TO SURVEY].

For additional information please contact Lauren Wendling [EMAIL].

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROFESSIONAL NAME]
Appendix C

Participant Questionnaire

You are here because you have agreed to participate in a study regarding the evaluation of faculty’s engaged research within promotion and tenure. This study seeks to (1) better understand what goes into making evaluative decisions, (2) if and how committees utilize tools for evaluation, and (3) how evaluative decisions are made regarding faculty’s engaged research. Insights gained from this study will inform current discussions concerning the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education and will be useful for various higher education professionals (e.g., engaged faculty, academic departments, deans).

Following is a brief questionnaire inquiring about your perceptions of and experiences with community engaged research at your institution. Completing this questionnaire will help frame the conversation during our upcoming focus group.

Completing this questionnaire should take no longer than 5 minutes. Thank you in advance for your time.

Please provide your name (first and last) and institution: __________________________

Please note that your name will never be attributed to your responses. Your name is being requested now for the purposes of tracking who has completed this part of the study. No identifying information will be included on any data records or final reports. The data records focus group recordings, transcripts, and final reports are stored in a secure, password protected file and server.

How many years have you been at [institution]? __________

What is your gender identity?
- Man
- Woman
- Another gender identity, please specify: ___________
- I prefer not to respond

What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Select all that apply.)
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latina/o
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Another race or ethnicity
- I prefer not to respond
In which academic department(s) at [institution] do you hold appointments? ________

Please indicate if you are currently:
  Tenured
  Tenure-track
  Other: ________

Within this study, community engaged research refers to the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community that embodies the characteristics of community engagement (e.g., mutual exchange of knowledge, reciprocal partnerships) and scholarship (e.g., demonstration of knowledge within an academic field or discipline). Community engaged research is the exchange of mutually beneficial and societally relevant knowledge that is created with, communicated to, and validated by members both within community and the academe.

It is understood that community engaged research is not a term recognized or used across all academic disciplines. Does your academic discipline use other term(s) to refer to scholarship and/or creative activity done in/with community (e.g., applied scholarship, public scholarship)?
  Yes | No

If so, please list the additional term(s) used: _______________

Indicate how often you carry out community engaged research, as defined above, in your scholarly role at [institution]:
  Never
  Rarely
  Sometimes
  Often
  Always

Indicate your level of familiarity with your institution-level promotion and tenure guidelines as they relate to recognizing community engaged research:
  Not at all familiar
  Slightly familiar
  Somewhat familiar
  Moderately familiar
  Extremely familiar

Indicate your level of familiarity with your school/department-level promotion and tenure guidelines as they relate to recognizing community engaged research:
  Not at all familiar
  Slightly familiar
  Somewhat familiar
  Moderately familiar
  Extremely familiar

Indicate your experience evaluating faculty’s community engaged research when
serving on your school/department-level promotion and tenure committee:
  Very high level of experience
  High level of experience
  Moderate level of experience
  Low level of experience
  Very low level of experience

Indicate the extent to which you think the existing promotion and tenure system in your school/department appropriately rewards community engaged research:
  Does not reward community engaged research
  -
  Neutral
  -
  Appropriately rewards community engaged research

Indicate the extent to which you think the existing promotion and tenure system at the institutional level appropriately rewards community engaged research:
  Does not reward community engaged research
  -
  Neutral
  -
  Appropriately rewards community engaged research

My institution is committed to utilizing its knowledge and resources in partnership with those of the public and private sectors to address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good:
  Strongly agree
  Agree
  Neither agree nor disagree
  Disagree
  Strongly disagree
Appendix D

Interview Protocol

BRIEF OVERVIEW & WELCOME
Thank you for your participation, [NAME]!
For my dissertation in Indiana University’s Higher Education PhD program, I am conducting a study to explore how promotion and tenure committees evaluate faculty’s community engaged research. The study is intended to explore what goes into making evaluative decisions, tools used for evaluation, and how evaluative decisions are made regarding faculty’s engaged research. This information will be used to inform current discussions of the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education.

You were selected as a participant because of your experience serving on a school- or department-level promotion and tenure committee. Thank you for your participation!

Please remember that throughout the entirety of this study and dissemination of findings you will never be personally identifiable. The recording and transcript produced from this interview, as well as all final reports, will be stored in a secure, password protected file and server.

PHASE 1: BUILDING UNDERSTANDING
- Remind participant the definition of CER within this study, acknowledging other discipline-based terms are often used.
  Within this study, community engaged research refers to the research and/or creative activities of faculty in partnership with community that embodies the characteristics of community engagement (e.g., mutual exchange of knowledge, reciprocal partnerships) and scholarship (e.g., demonstration of knowledge within an academic field or discipline). Community engaged research is the exchange of mutually beneficial and societally relevant knowledge that is created with, communicated to, and validated by members both within community and the academy.

QUESTIONS 1.1 + 1.2:
- Does this definition align with your understanding of CER?
- Does this definition align with your school’s/department’s understanding of CER?

QUESTION 2:
- In your pre-interview responses, you noted there [were/weren’t] other terms are used to describe what is identified above as community engaged research. [If they use other terms] – Could you please expand on those terms and how they are used in your school and/or department?

QUESTION 3:
- Do you feel there to be challenges with the lack of agreement or understanding of how to label or define this type of work when it comes to evaluating it in P+T?

QUESTION 4:
• Have you ever experienced any challenges evaluating the engaged research of your colleagues in promotion and tenure?
  o If so, what challenges have you encountered?

PHASE 2: EVALUATING CER - PROCESSES & PRODUCTS

➢ Explain that today the bulk of our discussion will be digging into the evaluation of the processes and products of CER within promotion and tenure.
➢ Share visual of Traditional vs. Community Engaged Research table (Appendix E) for participant to reference.

QUESTION 5:
• How does the use of non-traditional research processes (research goals, study design, etc.) affect the way CER is evaluated in promotion and tenure within your department/school?

QUESTIONS 6+:
• How does the primacy of non-traditional scholarly products (types of products, method of dissemination, audience, etc.) affect the way CER is evaluated in promotion and tenure within your department/school?

SUB-QUESTIONS REGARDING PRODUCTS:
  o What types of outputs (e.g., journal articles, creative products, community supports) are valued within your discipline/department school when evaluating the CER of faculty for promotion and tenure?
  o Who counts as an acceptable audience for the dissemination of research within your discipline/department/school (e.g., esteemed journals/publications, groups,)?
  o When considering the impact of products produced by research within your discipline/department/school, what metrics are used to measure the impact of CER and/or traditional scholarship?

QUESTION 7+:
• When evaluating CER what guidelines, resources, and/or tools do you (or would you) look to for guidance?

SUB-QUESTIONS REGARDING EVALUATION SUPPORTS:
  o What do your school/department-level promotion and tenure guidelines say about CER?
  o What institutional or departmental/school supports exist at [institution] to assist the evaluation and understanding of CER (e.g., centers, offices, faculty committees, definitions)?
    ▪ What institutional supports exist to assist with the evaluation of traditional scholarship?
  o What outside resources, if any, are used to assist in the evaluation and understanding of CER within your school/department (e.g., Purdue’s Guide, NIH, CCPH)?
    ▪ What outside resources, if any, are used to assist with the evaluation of traditional scholarship?
PHASE 3: LOOKING FORWARD

- In the pre-interview questionnaire, you noted that you believe:
  - [INSTITUTION] is/isn’t committed to utilizing its knowledge and resources in partnership with those of the public and private sectors to address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good.
  - And that the existing promotion and tenure system at both your school/department level [does/neutral/does not] reward community engaged research. And that the institutional level [does/neutral/does not] reward community engaged research.
- Considering what we have discussed today (barriers and supports for evaluating and rewarding CER):

QUESTION 8+:
- What suggestions for changes to institutional and/or department/school policies do you have to improve how [INSTITUTION] and/or your department rewards its faculty who do community engaged research?
- What suggestions for changes to institutional and/or department/school practices do you have to improve how [INSTITUTION] and/or your department rewards its faculty who do community engaged research?
- If [INSTITUTION] and your school/department wants to attract, retain, and/or promote community engaged research amongst its faculty, do you have any additional recommendations? If so, what recommendations can you offer?

QUESTION 9+:
- How has the new reliance on virtual connections due to COVID affected how faculty view community engaged research, if at all?
- How has the new reliance on virtual connections due to COVID affected how faculty are evaluated in promotion and tenure, if at all?

WRAP-UP & CLOSING:
Thank you for participating in this interview! The insights, expertise, and experiences you shared will inform current discussions of the institutionalization of community engagement in higher education and how to better reward and recognize faculty who do community engaged research.
- I am still in the phase of data collection, which includes snowball sampling. To that end, can you recommend another faculty member to share their experiences and participate in this study? They must:
  - Have experience serving on a school- and/or department-level promotion and tenure committee
  - Understand community engagement

Thank you again for your time today!
## Appendix E

Traditional vs. Community Engaged Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Research</th>
<th>Community Engaged Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Goals</strong></td>
<td>Identified by the researcher; Goals based on researcher interest, <em>perceived</em> community needs, and funding opportunities</td>
<td>Identified by both the researcher and community members/organizations jointly to address locally relevant issues and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design</strong></td>
<td>Based on scientific rigor and feasibility; Interventions designed based on literature and theory</td>
<td>Researchers work with community to develop study design making sure it is culturally acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Participants selected based on researcher needs; Recruitment based on best guesses of how to reach community members</td>
<td>Researchers consult with community members to identify best recruitment strategies; Community members assist with identifying participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis and Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Researcher owns the data and conducts analysis and interpretation in isolation</td>
<td>Researcher shares data and results of analysis with community members for comments and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly Products Produced from Research</strong></td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference presentations</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference presentations; Community presentations; Creative products (art shows, videos, etc.); Laws/public policy; Community programs/reports; Delivery of products and/or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination of Results</strong></td>
<td>Published primarily in peer-reviewed academic journals</td>
<td>Disseminated in community venues and peer-reviewed academic journals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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