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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview:

With a mission to advance interdisciplinary collaboration and public engagement in the humanities, the Center for the Humanities and the Public Sphere (CHPS) shares UF’s commitment to “an exceptional academic environment that reflects the breadth of thought essential for preeminence, achieved by a community of students, faculty, and staff who have diverse experiences and backgrounds.” We are therefore enthusiastic about CLAS’ implementation of the Diversity Liaison Program and Diversity Steering Committee. To support these initiatives, this report highlights a connection between UF’s/CLAS’ commitment to faculty diversity (Goal 1) and the fifth goal of UF’s Strategic Plan, which envisions “a strengthened public engagement of the university’s programs with local, national, and international communities.” According to recent scholarship, tenure and promotion (T&P) policies that support publicly-engaged scholarship help to recruit and retain diverse faculty. To that end, this report looks to UF’s peer institutions (as identified by the AAU) to outline best practices for cultivating public engagement and promoting diversity and inclusion through T&P policies.

What is publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship?

According to the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (2016): “The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of the faculty role in which teaching, research, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member’s expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution.”

Public scholarship looks to communities beyond the academy not only for the purpose of disseminating research findings, but also to generate high-impact research questions, inquiry, and interpretation and to contribute back to communities in meaningful ways that often promote diversity, equity, and justice.

A form of public scholarship, diversity scholarship contributes to but is not the same thing as faculty diversity. Diversity scholarship is scholarship that elucidates the roles of gender, class, race, sexualities, and other axes and their intersections across domains (e.g., literatures and cultures, interpersonal and group interactions, health, politics, organizations). Any and all faculty members (whether or not they are part of underrepresented groups) can do diversity scholarship.

Supporting public and diversity research at the college/departmental level does not mean devaluing other forms of scholarship, nor relinquishing scholarly rigor. Often however, it means revising or elaborating the policies that guide and reward faculty scholarship. Underrepresented faculty tend to be overrepresented among those who do publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship; therefore, it is important that this work be recognized and evaluated equitably. T&P policies, especially, help determine the breadth of scholarship possible within any given department.
How do T&P policies link publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship to faculty diversity?

“We [scholars of color] often enter fields where we can work toward achieving social justice for our communities through teaching and research [...]” (Delgado Bernal and Villalpando, 2002)

1. Recruitment: Supportive T&P policies offer opportunities for faculty to participate in – and help shape – their communities. This might be especially important for faculty who are relocating to places where they are underrepresented.

   ➢ See: Kayes 2006; Ross and Edwards 1998

2. Retention: Supportive T&P policies reward research, teaching, service and outreach activities that underrepresented faculty (e.g., women, racial/ethnic minorities, sexual minorities) tend to shoulder, and encourage all faculty to integrate these activities into coherent research programs.

   ➢ See: Antonio 2002; Fogg 2003; Sanchez, 2005; Strum, Eatman, Saltmarsh, Bush 2011; Wilder and Vásquez-Montilla 2012)

3. Equity, Greater Good, and Future Growth: Supportive T&P policies encourage research, teaching, and service that centralize and address major societal challenges around issues of diversity and equity, which in turn draw and retain underrepresented faculty and students.

   ➢ See: Antonio et. al 2000; Baez 2000; Cress et. al 2010; Garry 2004; Fenelon 2003; Kuh, et. al 2008; Swail 2003

Why now?

T&P policies that incentivize and reward publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship optimize faculty diversity. In doing so, they align Goals 1 and 5 of UF’s strategic plan. Feedback from publicly-engaged faculty and senior-level administrators, including Provost Glover, has indicated that support for public engagement must begin with conversations within departments. CLAS’ Diversity Liaisons and Diversity Steering Committee, as change agents embedded within departments, are ideal catalysts for these conversations. The mission and momentum of CLAS’ diversity initiatives position CLAS units, together with their diversity liaisons, to reassess publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship as it relates to faculty diversity and T&P.

Findings: Eight Tactics for Supporting Diversity and Public Engagement in T&P

Publicly engaged and diversity scholarship can serve a variety of research agendas. Therefore, there are many different ways in which units with various missions, priorities, and methodological orientations can integrate rigorous, publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship into their T&P guidelines (Lidstone, Hacker, Oien 1996). Indeed, drawing on an environmental scan of UF’s AAU peer institutions, we outline eight different tactics to catalyze reflection and discussion within units. These tactics elaborate on five practices identified by O’Meara, Eatman, and Peterson (2015) in Advancing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure: A Roadmap and Call for Reform.

1. Affirm the university’s relationship to public engagement and diversity scholarship

2. Articulate the department’s / field’s relationship to public engagement and diversity

3. Define public and diversity engagement, and their relationship to scholarship and service
4. **Specify the career stage and extent** at which public and diversity engagement are optimal

5. **Invite community-based experts** to evaluate scholarly outputs in conjunction with academic experts

6. **Identify inclusive scholarly principles** that your unit may reward, even/especially if they are reflected in outputs other than solo-authored publications

7. Outline inclusive **protocols for documenting** engaged, diversity, and collaborative scholarship

8. Outline inclusive **protocols for assessing** engaged, diversity, and collaborative scholarship

In offering these eight tactics, this report also includes: a) examples of T&P policy language from peer institutions; b) examples of rigorous, high-impact public and diversity scholarship projects; and c) evidence that public and diversity scholarship can be integrated into T&P guidelines for units with a wide range of missions, priorities, and methodological orientations.
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Findings

In *Advancing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure: A Roadmap and Call for Reform*, O’Meara, Eatman, and Peterson identify five steps for supporting public engagement, including diversity scholarship, through T&P reform. These are: establishing definition and priority; establishing criteria for evaluation; establishing documentation and evidence; facilitating inclusive peer review; and establishing the value of local impact. Our findings confirm and elaborate on these practices.

UF’s peer institutions (See Appendix A) have adopted the following tactics to reward and support public engagement in their T&P guidelines:

I. **Affirm the university’s relationship to public engagement and diversity scholarship.**
   In the overview of T&P policies, cite aspects of the university’s mission and/or history that prioritize public and diversity engagement. Without dictating policy or practice, this gesture a) reminds readers that public and diversity engagement is relevant to T&P, and b) provides language (or further resources) that faculty can use to align their engagement with the university’s mission.

   - From the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Office of the Provost: [http://provost.illinois.edu/communication/09/2013/Communication_9.pdf](http://provost.illinois.edu/communication/09/2013/Communication_9.pdf)
     
     *The three primary missions of the University are teaching, research, and service and public engagement. In any promotion review, consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally.*

   - From the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Faculty Division of Biological Sciences: [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/outreach/WisconsinIdea.asp](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/outreach/WisconsinIdea.asp)
     
     *Efforts to promote a diverse population of researchers, teachers and students and to encourage the participation of groups underrepresented in the candidate’s field are valued in the consideration for tenure.*

     
     [...] See: *Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship*

II. **Articulate the department’s / field’s relationship to public engagement and diversity.**
   Stating the orientation to public and diversity engagement within a department offers an opportunity for deliberative discussion, while acknowledging values and challenges specific to the relevant discipline(s). It also equips the department with a framework for explaining what kind of public and diversity engagement is (and is not) relevant to the field.
The Department of American Studies seeks to be objective, fair, and honest in matters of hiring and promotion. It **reaffirms at this time its goal of quality combined with diversity.**

Engagement with communities beyond the University is a **core value** in our Department, which, after all, takes as its subject the full breadth of the American experience in all its myriad contexts. We recognize that public involvement can prompt conversations with and among communities who might not otherwise engage with such vehicles as scholarly publications; as such, engagement becomes a way of accessibly integrating scholarship and public life.

[Responsibilities of department, chairperson, and dean] include the interests of the unit and the University to promote racial, ethnic and gender diversity among the faculty. But regardless of how the department weighs the relevant factors in any particular case, no candidate may be granted tenure who does not meet the requirements for overall excellence.

*Failure to meet any of the diversity factors may not be used as a negative element in the evaluation of any candidate.*

**III. Define public and diversity engagement, and their relationship to scholarship and service.**

A frequent misconception of public and diversity scholarship is that they are interchangeable with service. Typically, however, colleges / units that support public and diversity scholarship carefully distinguish such scholarship from service (which usually plays a lesser role in T&P) and volunteer work (which is usually irrelevant to T&P). Other institutions may not explicitly champion public scholarship, but do distinguish professional and university service from public service, encouraging faculty to work with communities beyond the academy.

---

1 Cornell University is not one of UF’s peer institutions according to the AAU. It has been included in this survey as another land-grant university with a significant Extension program.
Public engagement is the application for the public good of the knowledge and expertise of a faculty or staff member to issues of societal importance. Typically, this activity is done in collaboration with others both within and outside of the university. The activity may enrich research and teaching as well as lead to new directions within the university. Public engagement falls under the service mission of the university.

[...] To be recognized as public engagement, activities should:
  o Contribute to the public welfare or the common good.
  o Call upon the faculty member’s academic, professional, or creative expertise.
  o Directly address or respond to societal problems, issues, interests or concerns.

• From UC Berkeley, Academic Senate:
  http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/acfr/advancement-and-promotion-junior-faculty-uc-berkeley
  
  Publications, awards and honors, teaching, administrative activities, professional activities, University service, and public service are all an important part of the tenure review process.

• From Cornell University, Academic Human Resources:
  https://hr.cornell.edu/policies/academic/app_tenure.pdf

  [...] The responsibilities of a faculty member include teaching, research and other scholarly achievement, public service, advising students, and contributing to the department, the college and the University. Not all faculty members are assigned all these responsibilities [...]

• From Penn State University, Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs:
  http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_%20guidelines.pdf

  Service and Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession

IV. Specify the career stage and extent at which public and diversity engagement are optimal.

There are several ways to support public and diversity scholarship among those faculty whom it interests, without devaluing other forms. Units can tailor their approach to public and diversity engagement by identifying the stage(s) at which it might be more or less appropriate. For some units and fields, public and diversity scholarship (and other forms of engagement) may be central at all career stages, and this should be recognized and rewarded. For other units and fields, the centrality of public and diversity engagement may vary across career stages.

• From the University of North Carolina, Department of Women’s and Gender Studies:
The field of Women's and Gender Studies is engaged, by definition, with community outreach in many venues. We feel that these activities should be encouraged among the tenured faculty because they help promote the role and function of the University beyond its walls, but in addition to, not instead of, normal teaching commitments in the Department or service commitments to the Department and University.

[...] Engagement is not required for promotion to associate professor with tenure or for promotion to full professor; faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds.

- From the University of North Carolina, Department of American Studies:  

  Engagement may play a more prominent role at different phases of a faculty member’s career, and it should be supported at any phase if it is consistent with our Department’s practices and priorities. However, faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds.

V. Invite community-based experts to evaluate scholarly outputs in conjunction with academic experts.

Many forms of publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship can be evaluated using typical standards such as publication outlet, citation counts, etc. With other forms of publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship for which these standards are not appropriate, a strong way to support publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship is to include evaluations from non-academic partners. This not only institutionalizes town-gown collaborations; it also allows peer reviewers and T&P committees to more fully understand the impacts of a scholar’s research program.

- From University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Departmental Evaluation of Public Engagement Activities:  

  This evaluation should be based on peer observation, standardized evaluation metrics completed by client groups (as appropriate, evaluative interviews with clients, focus groups of clients convened for the purpose of evaluation, and up to three letters of evaluation from qualified academic and non-academic authorities (see the Faculty Handbook for further discussion of possible evaluation procedures and methods).

- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Department of American Studies:  

  In our Department, the criteria for evaluating the quality of the engaged scholarship include evaluation by experts in the field; qualitative feedback from users / participants; and external competitive funding. When it is possible to evaluate both quality and
impact, engaged scholarship may be considered as part of a faculty member’s scholarly achievement.

VI. Identify scholarly principles that your unit may value/reward, even (or especially) if they are reflected in outputs different from solo-authored publications.

Scholars who generate non-traditional products can refer to this language in determining if/how it might be relevant to college/departmental objectives and disciplinary commitments.

- From the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Faculty Division of Biological Sciences: http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/outreach/WisconsinIdea.asp

  Efforts to promote the inclusion of diverse populations at the University of Wisconsin-Madison or in the candidate’s field are valued in the consideration for tenure.

- From University of Michigan, Office of the Provost, in an Outline for Dean’s/Director/s Letter: https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html

  Provide a 2-3 sentence assessment on what impact the candidate's research or scholarly work has had either within his/her own field or more broadly.

  o It is important that non-traditional forms of scholarly production are given as much scrutiny as the more traditional/disciplinary work. It is important to ensure that individuals receive full credit for their contributions to interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly projects.

- From Indiana University Bloomington, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs: http://vpfaa.indiana.edu/docs/promotion_tenure_reappointment/pt-revised-review-guidelines.pdf

  Interdisciplinarity. With the growth of interdisciplinary research and with the emergence of exciting new fields, not all research/creative activity will fit comfortably into traditional “disciplinary” expectations or understandings. Candidates for tenure and promotion are encouraged to pursue innovation wherever it seems promising, even at the edges of disciplinary boundaries or in between them. Reviewers at all levels should be open to the possibility that work ‘on the edges’ or straddling thro fields may eventually transform research agendas in fundamental ways not always recognized by the home unit. A candidate’s interdisciplinarity may require that home units adapt their expectations / criteria and procedures. For example, practices for assembling review committees and soliciting external referees may need to be altered in ordered to insure that all aspects of research/creative activity get assessed by properly knowledgeable subjects.
New Scholarly Communications. The world of scholarly and scientific publishing is undergoing revolutionary change. New forms of digital scholarly communication (e-journals, moderated websites, blogs) continue to emerge and grow. New journals emerge in interdisciplinary fields. Reviewers at all levels should consider that the best new research / creative activity may not necessarily appear in the traditional disciplinary top journals or in books published by the historically most prestigious publishing houses. Peer reviewed publications are given greater weight than those that are not. Candidates assume responsibility for providing evidence of the value of their publication outlets.

Impact on Diverse Communities. In assessing the impact of research/creative activity, reviewers should consider the variety of communities – inside the academy and beyond – which may be transformed in significant ways by a candidate’s work. The emergence of “public scholarship” expands the range of audiences to whom a scholar/artist may direct their research/creative activity, and sometimes the best of this work does not appear in narrowly-defined professional outlets. Candidates should describe how their research/creative activity targeted for non-academic audiences intersects with work targeted to a scholarly community. Public scholarship will not supplant expectations for publications targeted to peer professional communities, but it may supplement that work. Evidence for “public scholarship” includes panel / commission and other technical reports, policy white papers, and strategic plans for community/civic groups.

Collaborative Work. Candidates are expected to establish independent lines of research/creative activity. For that reason, it is vital to establish the autonomous role played by the candidate in collaborative publications and grant proposals. The candidate must describe his/her role in the research statement. The chair/dean must solicit letters from collaborators and co-authors, attesting to the autonomous contributions of the candidate.


Digital technologies are reshaping every profession. Digital technologies shape not only how we communicate new knowledge, but also how we perceive and develop knowledge in the first place. Since digital technologies influence every aspect of professional life, including research, teaching, and service, the Department of American Studies should, therefore, regularly evaluate this changing landscape. Candidates for promotion or tenure should help articulate the nature and reception of their digital work.

Interdisciplinary work provides opportunities for creating knowledge in new and unanticipated ways, often representing cutting-edge scholarship and teaching. Since many challenges and problems require skills and perspectives from multiple academic and professional disciplines, evidence of innovative inter- and cross-disciplinary research, teaching, and service should therefore be valued in a candidate’s promotion and tenure dossier.
VII. Outline inclusive protocols for documenting engaged, diversity, and collaborative scholarship.
Publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship sometimes leads to non-traditional processes and outputs. Therefore, some institutions outline protocols for documenting non-traditional work, ensuring that peer reviewers and T&P committees will have tangible evidence to evaluate.

- From the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign:

  *If you do a lot of collaborative research, talk with your department head about how to arrange your activities and collaborations so that you will assemble a record from which appropriate independent assessments of your achievements can be made at promotion time. This does not mean that you should not engage in collaborative research, but that you must make these arrangements with care when you are early in your professional career.*

- From the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Office of the Provost, for evaluating public engagement:

  *Provide evidence of quality and impact; describe dissemination of the public service work through publications and adoption by others; if appropriate, illustrate how the public service activities are integrated with research and teaching.*

- From the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Faculty Division of Biological Sciences:
  http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/outreach/WisconsinIdea.asp

  *Documenting achievements in increasing and encouraging diversity in clinical, classroom, and mentored teaching is encouraged.*

VIII. Outline inclusive protocols and standards for assessing engaged, diversity, and collaborative scholarship.
Many forms of publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship can be evaluated using typical standards such as publication outlet, citation counts, etc. With other forms of publicly-engaged and diversity scholarship for which these standards are not appropriate, additional protocols and standards both ensure that public and diversity scholarship will be rigorous and assessable by peer reviewers and T&P committees.

- From Indiana University Bloomington, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

  *Defining Quality. Evaluations of research can never be reduced to a simple metric: judgments about the quality of work, and its influence, impact, utility and creativity*
cannot be fully captured by the count of publications and citations or by a journal impact factor. Faculty members and administrators must fully engage the candidate’s work, and reach their own judgments about its worth. Greater weight will be given to peer-reviewed publications / creative activities. Tenure and promotion decisions are not only about “quantity” (e.g., number of grants or publications), although successful candidates will typically show a sustained or accelerating rate of output during the period under review.


Excellence in Service / Engagement. Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion on the basis of Excellence in Service / Engagement must provide evidence for national / international visibility and stature resulting from service activities (even abundant local committee work is insufficient). The key is to demonstrate that the candidate’s efforts have been sustained and transformative, for a professional association, government agency, or non-academic community.

- From University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign:

  Assessing the quality of public service is easier when the link to research is most direct. The stronger portfolios with a service segment will demonstrate a strong integration of research and service.

- From University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, American Studies Department:

  […] We see scholarship as the advancement of knowledge and understanding; it consists substantially of original research or interpretation that is part of a coherent project. Scholarship, in turn, seeks public audience, so that it might become a part of a reflective conversations in the discipline, the academy and the public at large. One way to spark such conversation is through publication. We hold other forms, however, to be equally appropriate for meeting our disciplinary goals. These might include such projects a s museum exhibitions (including those that are digital), educational curricula for public school use, research-based media projects (websites, databases, films, podcasts, digital formats, etc) These might also include reports to public bodies, such as state, local, tribal, and national government, museums, heritage preservation groups, and non-profit entities engaged in humanistic and artistic performance, interpretation and public engagement. All of these projects must be solidly and explicitly grounded in research and must be able to be evaluated for quality, according to accepted best practices.

  The Department of American Studies recognizes that the form that scholarship takes is secondary to its quality; as such, we see publication as but one of many possible
vehicles for the dissemination of knowledge. Each of these vehicles, in turn, shall be treated as equivalent to publication, and judged on the strength of its quality.

Engaged scholarship refers to research on projects that include collaborative interactions with partners outside of the University. In order to satisfy the criterion for engaged scholarship, the faculty member’s work must meet rigorous standards. In our Department, the criteria for evaluating the quality of the engaged scholarship include evaluation by experts in the field; qualitative feedback from users/participants; and external competitive funding. When it is possible to evaluate both quality and impact, engaged scholarship may be considered as part of a faculty member’s scholarly achievement.

The Department of American Studies recognizes faculty who conduct or publish their research digitally for their innovation and for moving beyond traditional formats. The standard for excellence is the same for digital and non-digital work and may include influence on a scholarly field, evaluation by experts in the field, qualitative measures of use and impact, and feedback from users. The overall quality and contribution of the work must be measured against the University’s long-standing high standards, which should be independent of the mode or medium of publication.

The research of faculty engaged in innovative interdisciplinary research shall be given formal consideration and due credit, although the overall quality and contribution of the interdisciplinary work should be measured through appropriated means against the University’s well-established high standards [...]

• From the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Faculty Division of Biological Sciences: https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/BSci/BSci_Tenure-guidelines.pdf

Outreach Performance:

The case for excellence in outreach must be based on clear evidence that the candidate, in his or her area of expertise, has engaged in independent scholarly endeavors that demonstrate conclusively: (1) leadership, organizational and communicative skills that are truly outstanding; (2) productivity and innovation that are meritorious and (3) program impact that is highly effective.
Appendices

A. List of UF’s AAU Peer Institutions:

Indiana University, Bloomington
Ohio State University, Main Campus
Pennsylvania State University, Main Campus
Texas A&M University
University of California, Berkeley
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Texas, Austin
University of Wisconsin, Madison

http://www.ir.ufl.edu/aau_peers.htm

B. Samples of Faculty Projects:

Scholars in Anthropology, Health, History, and Recreation collaborate with indigenous community members to explore the Canadian North through photohistory:
http://arj.sagepub.com/content/11/1/92.full.pdf+html

A team of Classicists use digital tools to track the way elements of ancient Greece and Rome inform expressions of Chicago’s distinctive identity as an American global metropolis:
http://classicizingchicago.northwestern.edu/

An English scholar and and Adult Education scholar assess radical humanities programs in three Canadian provinces:

A historian explores physical and narrative legacies of the New Deal in Michigan:

A mathematician consults on a Brooklyn-based African dance project:
https://jpwolfson.wordpress.com/mathematics-and-dance/

Philosophers and computer programmers collaborate to edit, annotate and digitize seminal texts of John Locke:
http://www.digitallockeproject.nl/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=locke;sid=bbe98021cb4dd1869bc9d8c95092ea35;tpl=home.tpl

C. Bibliography:

Acord, Sophia et a. “Facilitated Peer Review Committee,”
DRAFT: July 11, 2016


*Nb. This source includes an extensive annotated bibliography on T&P


Jordan, C (Editor), “Community-Engaged Scholarship Review, Promotion & Tenure Package,”
(Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2007),


