Aligning Faculty Reward Systems and Development to Promote Faculty and Student Growth

KerryAnn O'Meara
Larry Braskamp

❖

How can higher education inspire and reinforce greater faculty involvement in the life of the "whole student" given current constraints on and expectations for faculty work? Research from two recent national surveys of chief academic officers on faculty work sheds light on this question by highlighting current faculty employment conditions and expectations. Additional recent research is reviewed to link faculty expectations with student growth. Implications for faculty development that will best serve student needs are explored.

In recent years, a widening gulf between students and faculty has developed is occurring. Faculty spend less time than in the past advising and counseling students and in out-of-class contact (Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000), a significant concern given the important role faculty-student contact plays in student retention and persistence (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Over the last decade faculty productivity and particularly the standards for publication productivity have been moving upward—as institutions of all types try to emulate the research productivity of the most selective research insti-

---

Dr. KerryAnn O'Meara is an assistant professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Larry Braskamp is a professor at Loyola University of Chicago.

tutions (Dey, Milem, & Berger, 1997). While the amount of time faculty spend with students outside of class varies greatly by institutional type, and faculty spend more time preparing for teaching than in the past, faculty in all institutional types are spending more time engaged in research and writing than 20 years ago, activities that may be insufficient to foster good student development (Dey, Milem, & Berger, 1997; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000). The economic downturn that followed September 11, 2001 resulted in many campuses encouraging faculty to become more entrepreneurial with faculty finding themselves now less involved in undergraduate teaching and more involved in grant-making and coordination (Lee & Rhoads, 2003). Likewise with early retirement programs and increased use of part-time and nontenure track faculty, fewer tenured faculty are on campus to participate in shared governance and coordinate academic programs (NERCHE, 2003; Benjamin, 2002). Finally, the majority of graduate programs still do not prepare future faculty for (Austin, 2002, 2003), nor do the majority of reward systems necessarily prioritize, faculty engagement with students (Diamond, 1993, 1999; Huber, 2002).

In sum, each of these trends seems to pull faculty away from direct involvement with students at a time when it is needed more than ever. The majority of students are older, work part-time, arrive with a greater diversity of learning styles and life experiences than ever before, and want to see the relevancey of their studies to real life (Keller, 2001). Since the development of cognitive or academic competencies and personal and interpersonal competencies are intimately connected (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1995), the need to have educational approaches that inspire active learning and partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs has increased (Brady, 1999; Price, 1999; Schroeder, 1999; Schuh, 1999). Faculty need to become involved in and sustain community service learning experiences and field experiences (Schroeder, 1999), and engage in team teaching and residential living-learning communities (Golde & Pribbenow, 2000). Faculty need more than ever to mentor and to advise students, to shape the future of academic programs for them, and to prepare future citizens for the challenges of a complex world (Colby et al, 2003; Parks, 2000). Organizational conditions and environments (of which faculty work-life conditions are a significant part) also have a direct impact on the development of students (Berger, 2000). Thus it is very

important for higher education leaders to create conditions to help both faculty and students grow simultaneously.

How can higher education leaders inspire and reinforce greater faculty involvement in the life of the "whole student" given current conditions and expectations for faculty work? Research from two recent national surveys of chief academic officers (CAOs) on faculty work sheds light on this question by highlighting current faculty employment conditions and expectations.

Conceptual Framework

Expectations for faculty work, such as the relative distribution of time devoted to teaching, research, and service, or the quantity and quality of performance required in each area, vary greatly by institutional type. While expectations for faculty at all institutional types has have grown more imitative of research universities, it has not always been so. The earliest faculty were "teacher-scholars" intimately involved in student learning and growth (Finkelstein, 1983). Not until the expansive growth of higher education that started in the late 1950s and continued through the 1970s, and the tripling of the number of Ph.Ds granted in the 1960s and 1970s, did a new conception of the academic professional emerge (Rice, 1996). This new conception made research the central focus of academic life and emphasized the pursuit of knowledge by discipline. Reputations are established through national organizations rather than through local institutions and reward those who consistently accentuate their specialization. While much has been done in the 1980s and 1990s to challenge this "assumptive world of the academic professional" (Rice, 1996), nonetheless many faculty careers are nonetheless influenced by these priorities.

The movement to encourage multiple forms of scholarship, led by Ernest Boyer (1990) and Gene Rice (1996), was intended to thwart the trend of rising research expectations—at the expense of teaching and service activities—by creating multiple ways faculty work could be "counted" and rewarded. However, Rice and Sorcinelli (2002) observed that the broader conception of scholarship and new ways to document different forms of scholarly work often multiplied the

scholarly responsibilities of early-career faculty. They feel added pressure to document excellence in teaching, research, and service.

Research on faculty motivation, behavior, and satisfaction also helps us understand how institutional reward systems and individual preference interact to determine the commitments faculty make to different activities. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) found that the dynamic interaction between self-knowledge and social knowledge determines faculty behavior. Faculty make decisions about how to use discretionary time based on their self-knowledge (self-judged competence; preferred effort to give to a role) and their social knowledge (perceived institutional expectation of effort given to a role) (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Research on faculty well-being (Walker, 2002, 2003) suggests faculty are more productive and successful if they are experts at the work they do most often, have sufficient control of their work and social support for it, and receive feedback on the quality of their work on a regular basis. Faculty job satisfaction is associated with achievement and recognition. Chances for advancement play a major role, as do relationships with students (Hagedorn, 2000). Faculty are most successful and satisfied at institutions where there is a strong fit between their personal values and the values of the college (Maehr & Braskamp, 1986).

In summary, eliciting greater faculty engagement with students means affecting expectations for faculty work and the structures and conditions of their careers. Before leaders in colleges and universities can initiate needed change in these areas, they can benefit by knowing what these expectations are and which structures and programs are likely to have the greatest success in encouraging greater engagement between faculty and students. And they need to know what types of faculty choose to work at a specific college (i.e., fit or congruence between the personal values of the faculty member and the college) so that they might attract faculty willing to invest in the activities the college values most. Thus the research question that guided both research studies reported in this article was: What is expected of faculty today? Given multiple sets of data, we also were able to study a related question: Is type of institution (public and church affiliated) related to expectations for faculty?

Methodology

This article reports quantitative data from two national surveys of CAOs completed in the last 3 years, as well as data from focus groups and individual interviews completed with CAOs during the same time. CAOs play a critical role in setting standards for faculty work, evaluating faculty performance, and promoting growth and morale among members of the faculty (Diamond, 1993). Because of their pivotal role in recruiting and retaining faculty, and because of their ability to describe what has happened and is happening in faculty roles and rewards across their campuses, CAOs were the ideal participants for both of these studies of faculty work and reward systems. Since church-related institutions (private institutions with a strong religious affiliation) are known to have a strong commitment to holistic student development, it was advantageous to compare a national sample of 4-year institution CAO responses to CAO responses from 4-year church-related colleges to examine differences and similarities.

The American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE's) National Survey of Chief Academic Officers on Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship was conducted in 2001–2002. O'Meara designed and implemented the survey while acting as a research associate for the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, directed by Gene Rice. An invitation to complete this Web-based survey was emailed to 1,452 CAOs of nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities (identified by the 2000 Carnegie classification system) during late fall 2001. A follow-up written copy of the survey was sent to those who did not complete the Web version. Exactly half of the CAOs completed the survey (2/3 on the Web and 1/3 the paper copy). The findings reported from this survey are based on the responses of these 729 CAOs (50% of 4-year nonprofit college and university CAOs in the United States). When compared to the Carnegie classification system (2000) and broken down by institutional type, the AAHE national survey responses are representative of the national profile of institutions. (See Table 1.) In order to enrich the findings and explore some of the more unexpected findings qualitatively, four focus groups (with approximately 10 CAOs in each group) were held with CAOs in New England 4-year colleges and universities in December 2002 and January 2003. These focus groups were tape-recorded and transcribed and provide clarification and extension of the survey findings.

Table 1
2000 Carnegie Classification of Study CAO Survey Institutions
4-Year Nonprofit institutions (2001–2002)

	N	%		N	%
Doctoral/Research	259	18%	Doctoral/Research	136	18.7%
Masters	603	41%	Masters	310	42.5%
Baccalaureate	590	41%	Baccalaureate	281	38.5%
			Undetermined	2	.3%
	N = 1452	100%		N = 729	100%

Braskamp's National Survey of Chief Academic Officers at Church-Related Colleges was initially emailed to 488 CAOs of church-related colleges and universities during spring 2003. The colleges are affiliated with long-standing church denominations in America (e.g., Lutheran, Catholic, Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist). A follow-up written copy was sent to those who did not return the email version. Over one-half (255) of the CAOs completed the survey. Of the nearly 100 CAOs who indicated on the survey they would participate in a telephone interview or a campus visit, Author 2 interviewed over 30 CAOs by phone or in person and visited seven campuses during summer 2003. Interview data expanded upon and offered evidence for several of the survey findings. (See Braskamp, 2003 for more details.)

Findings

Table 2 compares all CAOs' responses to the question of whether different areas of faculty performance count more, the same, or less than 10 years ago. One-half of all CAOs reported that research is counting more today than 10 years ago on their campus. Moreover, about a third of CAOs reported expectations for teaching and engagement/professorial service had increased, and about one in five of CAOs also reported increased emphasis on service to the institution and discipline. Thus if the "good news" is that activities that involve the greatest faculty-student interaction are counting more, the "bad

news" is that expectations for these activities are not increasing at the same rate of research expectations, and that faculty seem to be increasingly required to excel in everything they do simultaneously. Findings from the AAHE study suggest that research expectations have continued to increase despite the fact that more and more campuses formally recognize multiple forms of scholarship in their promotion and tenure systems.

Table 2
AAHE's National Survey of Chief Academic Officers: What Counts for Faculty Evaluation

Responses to question, "For purposes of faculty evaluation, do the following faculty activities count more or less today than they did 10 years ago?"

Question	Count more than 10 years ago (%)	Count about the same as 10 years ago (%)	Count less than 10 years ago (%)	Not Applicable (%)	Did Not Respond (%)	Total (%)
Publication Productivity						
All Institution CAOs	51	40	3	2	4	100
Teaching						
All CAOs	35	59	2	.3	4	100
Engagement/Professional Service						
All CAOs	31	59	4	2	4	100
Service to the Institution/Citizenship						
All CAOs	19	67	8	2	4	100
Service to the Profession/Discipline						
All CAOs	19	69	6	2	4	100

*Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not equal 100%

The criteria used to assess faculty scholarship may also influence faculty involvement with students, by sending messages to faculty about what kinds of work and impact the institution expects. For example, traditional criteria used to assess faculty scholarship include whether scholarly products are published, and the impact of the scholarship on the disciplines. A broader set of criteria, often considered critical to the positive and effective evaluation of activities most likely to involve faculty-student interaction (i.e., teaching and service scholarship), include the impact of the scholarship on the state or local community, the institution, the students, the mission of the institution, and the academic unit. In the AAHE study, CAOs at institutions where reforms were made to encourage multiple forms of scholarship noted the traditional criteria used to evaluate faculty work as major influences on promotion and tenure decisions, but also identified the broader set of criteria as equal to or greater influences on evaluation of scholarship. These findings suggest that making formal changes in reward systems to encourage multiple forms of scholarship influence the kind of work that is considered scholarship (e.g., teaching, research, integrative work and outreach), who is valued (e.g., teaching and service scholars as well as researchers), and how scholarship is evaluated (e.g., impact on students, mission) (O'Meara, forthcoming). Given that activities involving increased faculty-student interaction (such as faculty advising/mentoring, involvement in living-learning communities, and diversity efforts) are more likely to show an impact on the institution and students than the discipline, including these criteria in evaluation are essential to encouraging faculty for their work in these areas.

Table 3 outlines Braskamp's (2003) findings regarding CAOs expectations of faculty at church-related institutions. While research is clearly essential, these types of institutions place a high priority on excellence in teaching. Likewise, CAOs of church-related institutions were actually more concerned that faculty exhibit *scholarly qualities* (such as acting as effective role models, mentors, and advisors, and demonstrating qualities of character and integrity) than demonstrate research productivity per se. Likewise, CAOs place high importance on faculty attending to students' personal and moral development and supporting the mission of the institution.

Table 3
National Survey of Chief Academic Officers at Church-Related Colleges
(Braskamp 2003)

CAOs noted it was of considerable and/or extreme importance that faculty:	(%)
Demonstrate excellence in teaching	98
Demonstrate excellence in research and creative activities	58
Act as effective role models in the college or university community	61
Are an effective mentor, counselor, and advisor to students	84
Assist students to foster their personal, ethical, and moral development	65
Assist students in their search for personal meaning and purpose	52
Demonstrate qualities of character, such as integrity, perseverance and courage	70
Actively support the mission and identity of the college	84

In summary, we know from these two national surveys and a review of other recent research (Huber, 2002) that faculty are increasingly expected to excel as teachers *and* researchers. Within land grant institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and other institutions with focused service missions, engagement is also expected (Ward, 2003). As efforts have been made to assess multiple forms of scholarship, greater documentation of teaching and engagement have been required (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Huber, 2002). However, on campuses where advising, mentoring, and citizenship are highly valued and are considered major components of faculty workload, there remains a gap between what is *formally* and *informally* expected of faculty. While most campuses are accustomed to expecting and assessing *scholarly products*, few campuses know how to expect and assess *"being" scholarly* (i.e., the process or attributes expected). Being schol-

arly is more than conducting research and writing about it. It reflects who faculty are as mentors and colleagues and how they approach their work and relate to others. Thus a "culture of evidence" now advocated by most accrediting associations is a good framework for thinking about and implementing a variety of assessment strategies (qualitative as well as quantitative measures) that build portrayals of the contributions of faculty and staff both individually and collectively. An aim is to construct compelling stories of faculty and staff making a difference in the lives of students.

Implications

Based on the findings from these two research studies we suggest that campuses might consider the following six policies, organizational structures, and programs to support faculty and greater faculty-student engagement.

- **Change promotion and tenure and contract renewal definitions and criteria to include a broadened definition of scholarship.** CAOs and chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) should work together to change the reward system—both have access to resources whether they be financial, human resource, political or symbolic, and both can put these resources behind the faculty activities they consider most crucial to student growth. Findings from AAHE's national study of CAOs showed that campuses that initiated formal reforms to encourage multiple forms of scholarship were significantly more likely than their counterparts to: (a) report an increase over the last decade in faculty involvement in the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of teaching and learning, the scholarship of integration, and service-learning; (b) report an increase over the last decade in overall faculty satisfaction with roles and rewards; (c) report a higher percentage of tenure and promotion cases that emphasized their work in teaching and engagement scholarship; and (d) report an increase in congruence between faculty priorities and institutional mission over the last decade (O'Meara, forthcoming).

  These are important findings from the perspective of increasing faculty-student interaction. First, campuses that change their

reward systems to acknowledge engagement in multiple forms of scholarship are more likely to have faculty involved in the types of programs that link student affairs and academic affairs in intentional partnerships to improve student learning and development. Faculty involvement in service-learning, learning communities, diversity education reforms, and first-year experience programs, for example, are often considered teaching and engagement scholarship. Second, since encouraging multiple forms of scholarship positively impacts faculty satisfaction, faculty can be in a better place to engage in those types of partnerships by virtue of not feeling overworked and under-rewarded. Finally, the fact that CAOs who made efforts to encourage multiple forms of scholarship reported an increase between faculty priorities and institutional mission suggests that the teaching and learning and perhaps student development goals of campus missions are likely to have achieved more attention and legitimacy within faculty priorities. This facilitates a stronger climate for student affairs/academic affairs partnerships to increase student learning and development goals.

- **Create flexible workload programs.** Forty-one percent of the CAOs who made formal efforts to expand the definition of scholarship in the AAHE study reported that their institution had used the expanded definition of scholarship to develop flexible workload programs (in the spirit of Boyer's [1990] "creativity contracts"). These flexible workload programs are "an arrangement by which faculty members define professional goals for a 3- to 5-year period, possibly shifting from one principal scholarly focus to another," (Boyer, 1990, p. 48). Kansas State University has created such "individualized assignments" and found positive outcomes in both faculty satisfaction and institutional effectiveness as a result (Clegg & Esping, forthcoming). By providing a structure whereby faculty involvement in teaching diversity seminars or becoming involved in learning communities are not "extra" components of faculty work, but an agreed upon contribution for which effort they will be rewarded, faculty have the time and freedom they need to participate; and students benefit as a result.

- **Reward mentoring, advising, and citizenship more.**
  Developing students takes time (Willimon, 1997). Faculty need to
  be recognized, developed, and nurtured if they are to be effective
  persons in developing all of the dimensions of students. The
  church-related institutions in Braskamp's study held the greatest
  expectations for faculty involvement in student formation and
  development, and most were rewarding this involvement even if
  they did not have clear guidelines and practices in place.
  Campuses that want to reward mentoring/advising can initiate
  student-nominated Advisor of the Year awards; include advising
  loads and mentoring accomplishments in merit pay decisions; and
  recognize faculty who make significant contributions to shared
  governance and campus programs through release time; and
  support services such as G.A. time, copying, and secretarial
  support. Simply, the gesture of offering these types of recognition
  make an important symbolic statement that the institution values
  this type of faculty time and investment.

- **Develop faculty and midlevel administrator capacity as
  continual learners.** Neumann and Terosky's (2003) research on
  midcareer faculty suggests the importance of nurturing faculty
  capacity as learners throughout their academic careers. We see the
  need for faculty professional development programs and student
  affairs professional development programs that allow both faculty
  and student affairs administrators to reflect on how they promote
  student development and ways that they might become more
  skilled in promoting student growth.

  In order to prevent faculty burnout, institutions can provide
  structures for continual feedback and reflection on faculty work.
  Just like as students are in need of formation, so are faculty as
  professionals in need of development and growth, recognizing the
  personhood of faculty. That is, faculty need to think of developing
  themselves holistically just like as they desire their students to do.
  Students consider faculty as to be important role models and
  mentors in their lives (Chickering, 2003). Faculty need to think of
  their contributions in terms of who they are as well as what they
  produce.

  Currently several initiatives to foster faculty development exist.
  The Center for Teaching at the University of Massachusetts

Amherst is a leader in providing such opportunities (see www.umass.edu/cft/index.htm). There are yearlong faculty learning communities for both early-career faculty and late-career faculty to meet and reflect on teaching and learning issues, and groups that meet to support the integration of diversity and technology into the curriculum. Faculty learning communities specifically focused on promoting student development in out-of-class activities could offer a unique opportunity for partnership with student affairs as well as needed faculty professional development. More informal arrangements exist on smaller church- related colleges (e.g., Pacific Lutheran University, Whitworth College, and Union University), but the level of commitment and support of holistic faculty and staff development is apparent.

In addition, faculty and student affairs administrators can work together on research on student cognitive and personal growth and development in ways that meet traditional expectations for faculty research and reinforce Student Affairs involvement in student learning.

- **Move towards mission alignment, not mission drift.** Faculty work in a social environment in which others play significant roles. Faculty look to their department chairs, deans, provosts, and presidents for "messages" about what they value and how this will play out in the reward system. In the AAHE study, 57% of CAOs at campuses that had reformed faculty roles and rewards to acknowledge a broader definition of scholarship noted leadership by the provost, 73% of CAOs the institution's commitment to teaching, 44% of CAOs engagement/professional service, and 49% of CAOs the need to align reward system with mission to meet institutional goals, as major influences (40% or above) on the institution's decision to formally change policy to encourage multiple forms of scholarship. Thus campus leadership must be vigilant about keeping the reward system and mission in line and not allowing rewards to follow prestige-associated outcomes rather than faculty contributions that have direct impacts on students.

- **Establish partnerships between junior and senior faculty and between academic and student affairs**. Even in highly

collaborative, community-oriented institutions, such as those studied by Author Two, there can be a tendency to reward the "independent productive achiever" rather than the faculty member who collaborates with others. For example, faculty who team-teach often do not receive sufficient credit within their teaching load, and the time it takes to successfully mentor undergraduates for graduate school or careers is not counted in any substantial way. Yet the more that faculty collaborate with student affairs professionals on various projects (e.g., study abroad), and work with each other to strengthen and integrate the curriculum with cocurricular activities, the more effective the environment for both faculty, staff, and student development. Over the last decade faculty-student affairs partnerships in the areas of living-learning communities, study abroad programs, and service-learning and undergraduate research programs have shown enormous promise in linking cognitive and personal learning and development for students. Thus, VPs for academic affairs and student affairs who can find ways to support collaborative activity go a long way to supporting positive faculty and student outcomes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We advocate a collaborative relationship among faculty, student affairs, campus ministry, and others to create an environment that fosters the whole student. CSAOs and CAOs can work together on strategies that facilitate collaboration.

First, there is a needed negotiation between student affairs and faculty. Both groups need to learn more about each other, their work expectations, and goals. Just as faculty can learn from student affairs professionals about current research in student development theory; department chairs and faculty need to explain to student affairs professionals what faculty do, their constraints and challenges, and external influences such as discipline standards, career stage, and employment conditions.

We need to recognize the differing cultures and values these two groups bring to campus culture and to the development of the "whole

student." As one CAO mentioned in an interview, faculty tend to overemphasize the "challenge" side of student growth, while student affairs professionals are more apt to stress "support." The importance of balancing challenge and support was first introduced by Sanford (1962, 1966) and has since been recognized as a foundation of good student development. The challenge is of course finding a balance that creates a dynamic creative tension.

Second, the importance of "fit" applies to faculty, staff, and students. Although students are not long-term citizens, the retention rate at many colleges is clearly below a reasonable standard. The cost of recruitment and the pain of students leaving without fulfilled expectations is often too great a loss for a college. The same is true for faculty and staff. Several similar strategies can be considered. One is to be very clear about the mission and identity of the college. In the church-related colleges many CAOs interviewed mentioned the importance of being very explicit about faculty expectations at the time of hiring. Many now ask faculty to offer a statement of their personal goals and how they can help advance the mission and identity of the college in their application.

Finally, development of the whole person applies to students, professional staff, and faculty. As faculty become more active and engaged role models to students, they need to view themselves as persons and not detached experts. Since formation takes time, the reward structures need to take into account these added responsibilities of the faculty and staff. Assessment and reward structures should reflect and reinforce—in short, be aligned with—the mission, character, and identity of the institution.

References

Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94–122.

Austin, A. E. (2003). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(2), 119–144.

Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review: Contingent Faculty and Student Learning, 5*(1), 33–45.

Berger, J. B. (2000, Winter). Organizational behavior at colleges and student outcomes: A new perspective on college impact. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(2), 177–198.

Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

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

Brady, S. M. (1999). Students at the center of education. *Liberal Education, 85*(1), 14–21.

Braskamp, L. (2003). *Fostering student development through faculty development: A National survey of chief academic officers at church-related colleges.* Chicago, IL: Loyola University Chicago.

Chickering, A. W. (2003, January/February). Reclaiming our soul: Democracy and higher education. *Change, 35*(1), 39–44.

Clegg, V. L., & Esping, G. R. (forthcoming). Optimism with our eyes wide open: Reconsidering scholarship at Kansas State University. In K. O'Meara & E. R. Rice (Eds.), *Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship: Experienced voices.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dey, E. L., Milem, J. F., & Berger, J. B. (1997). Changing patterns of publication productivity: Accumulative advantage or institutional isomorphism? *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 308–323.

Diamond, R. M (1993). Instituting change in faculty reward systems. In *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000.* In R. M. Diamond and B. E. Adam (Eds), *New Directions for Higher Education* (no 81, pp. 13–22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diamond, R. M. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, DC American Association for Higher Education.

Finkelstein, M. (1983). From tutor to specialized scholar: Academic professionalization in eighteenth and nineteenth century

America. *History of Higher Education Annual, 3.*

Golde, C. M., & Pribbenow, D. A. (2000). Understanding faculty involvement in residential learning communities. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 27–40.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000, spring). What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff? *New Directions for Institutional Research* (no. 105). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huber, M. T. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. *New Directions for Institutional Research* (no. 114, pp. 73–81).

Keller, G. (2001, spring). The new demographics of higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 24*(3), 219–235.

Lee, J. J., & Rhoads, J. A. (2003). *Faculty entrepreneurialism and the challenge to undergraduate education.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Maehr, M. L., & Braskamp, L. A. (1986*). The motivation factor: A theory of personal investment.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000, July/August). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(4). The Ohio State University Press.

NERCHE. (2003). New faculty: A catalyst for change. *NERCHE Brief: New Faculty.* Retrieved May 15, 2003, from http://www.nerche. org.

Neumann, & Terosky. (2003). *Toward images of reciprocity in faculty service: Insights from a study of the early post-tenure career.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

O'Meara, K. A. (forthcoming). *Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference?* Unpublished manuscript.

Parks, S. D. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. R., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How colleges affect students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. R., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995, fall). The impact of college on students: Myths, rational myths and some other things that may not be true. *NACADA Journal, 15*(2). Edward-Lynne Jones & Associates.

Price, J. (1999). Merging with academic affairs: A promotion or demotion for student affairs? *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 75–83.

Rice, R. E. (1996). Making a place for the new American scholar. *New Pathways Inquiry* (no. 1). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R., & Sorcinelli, M. (2002). Can the tenure process be improved? In Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure* (pp. 101–124). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sanford, N. (1962). *The American college.* New York: Wiley.

Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society: Social change and individual development.* New York: Atherton Press.

Schroeder, C. C. (1999). Partnerships: an imperative for enhancing student learning and institutional effectiveness. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 5–18.

Schuh, J. H. (1999). Guiding principles for evaluating student and academic affairs partnerships. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 85–92.

Walker, C. J. (2002). Faculty well-being review: An alternative to post-tenure review? In C. M. Licata & J. C. Morreale (Eds.), *Post-tenure faculty review and renewal* (pp. 229–241). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Walker. (2003). *Characteristics of colleges that engender high well-being in their faculty.* Retrieved July 23, 2003, from http://web.sbu.edu/vitality/faculty_vitality/institutional_well-being.html.

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29*(5). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willimon, W. (1997). Religious faith and the development of character on campus. *The Educational Record, 78*(3–4), 73–79.