Reframing Incentives and Rewards for Community Service-Learning and Academic Outreach

KerryAnn O'Meara

Abstract

This article reviews theory, research, and models applicable to faculty motivation and faculty careers as well as a model of organizational behavior as a contribution toward understanding how to create systems that encourage and reward faculty service. The article discusses what these sources can tell us about effective strategies individual faculty can adopt to increase the likelihood that their service-learning and academic outreach will be acknowledged and rewarded, and strategies that institutional systems can implement to reward faculty service and academic outreach. Finally, the article explores how utilization of strategies may differ by institutional type.

Introduction

There are many ways to think about supporting faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach. For example, much has been written on documenting and assessing service-learning and outreach as forms of scholarship *(Lynton 1995; Driscoll and Lynton 1999; O'Meara 2000, 2002b; Ward 2003)*. Indeed, campuses that formally change reward systems to acknowledge a broader definition of scholarship have been found to enjoy greater faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach and greater faculty satisfaction *(O'Meara forthcoming)*. Scholars have also noted that women and faculty of color are often disproportionately involved in service-learning and outreach activities *(Aquirre 2000; Ward 2003; Antonio, Astin, and Cress 2000)*. Targeting these groups for support may therefore be one way to advance both these activities and these individuals. Likewise, research indicates that discipline influences faculty involvement in the scholarship of application/outreach *(Braxton, Luckey, and Holland 2002; Zlotkowski 2001)*. This knowledge might be used to devise different strategies for recruiting and retaining faculty involvement from basic and applied, and high and low consensus disciplines *(Braxton, Luckey, and Holland 2002)*. While tenure status has not been found to exert a significant influence on faculty involvement

in outreach *(Braxton, Luckey, and Holland 2002)*, the increase in non-tenure track appointments *(Baldwin and Chronister 2001)* and special circumstances of this type of employment suggest a range of support strategies that might be employed to reward faculty in this ever-increasing category.

Over the last five years much has been written on graduate socialization and how graduate students are still not socialized to assume more than traditional research roles *(Austin 2002; Richlin 1993; Burgan 1998)*. The higher education community is ripe for a nationwide project like the Preparing Future Faculty program directed by Jerry Gaff *(Ferren, Gaff, and Clayton-Pedersen 2002)* that focuses specifically on training and socializing graduate students for involvement in service-learning and outreach. This kind of program might make a dent in an even more complex problem that needs addressing. That is, we might support faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach by increasing the acquisition and espousal of values that support these involvements *(O'Meara 2002a; Braxton, Luckey, and Holland 2002)*.

> *"[W]e might support faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach by increasing the acquisition and espousal of values that support these involvements."*

All of this is to say that the issue of supporting faculty, whether as teachers, researchers, or as I will refer to it, as "service scholars," is complex. It is complex because it involves supporting faculty as persons as well as professionals, while deciding how to best situate such persons and their work within the organizational structure, politics, and culture that they find themselves in. While each of the factors mentioned above is important for this article, I have chosen three different frames with which to examine the issue of rewarding service. These three frames were chosen because they are critical to understanding both the individual and organizational levels of this issue, because they have rarely been applied to service-learning and outreach, and because they have the potential to suggest useful strategies to support faculty service-learning and outreach both individually and organizationally. Thus this article reviews theory, research, and models applicable to faculty motivation and faculty careers, as well as a model of organizational behavior, as a contribution toward

understanding how to create systems that encourage and reward faculty service. A final section explores how utilization of these strategies may differ by institutional type. Three research questions guided this review of the literature:

- What do research, policy, and practice tell us about the most effective strategies for individual faculty to have their service-learning and academic outreach acknowledged and rewarded?
- What do research, policy, and practice tell us about the most effective strategies for institutional systems to reward faculty service-learning and academic outreach?
- How does institutional type influence the use of strategies discussed above?

The strategies described in this article might be used by individual service scholars, department chairs, deans, and provosts to: help faculty survive and thrive within organizations that will probably continue to offer greater rewards for activities other than service-learning and academic outreach; facilitate faculty engagement in better and higher quality service-learning and outreach; and contribute to faculty development, well-being, and satisfaction overall, given the faculty member's needs and motivations, career stage, and personal interests.

For the purposes of this article, I refer to two kinds of external faculty service—service-learning and outreach. Throughout this discussion, I use the term "outreach" interchangeably with the terms "faculty professional service" and "engagement" and define outreach as: "work based on the faculty member's professional expertise that contributes to the mission of the institution" *(Elman and Smock 1985, 43)*. Service-learning is defined as a form of experiential education that engages students in organized service activity, is connected to specific learning outcomes, meets specific community needs, and provides structured time for reflection (adapted from *Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002, 6*).

Faculty and Service: What We Know

There is a rich and expansive literature on faculty behavior, motivation, and careers that can be utilized to develop individual and institutional strategies to reward faculty service. Two specific factors that influence faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach—intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and faculty career stage—and strategies resulting from these factors are reviewed in

the next section. The following section addresses the institution as a system.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: In a comprehensive review of the literature on faculty and factors affecting faculty work, Austin and Gamson *(1983)* noted the differences between extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for faculty. Extrinsic factors focus on the environment and conditions under which work is done and include: reward systems, workload, working conditions, opportunity structures, and policies *(18)*. Extrinsic rewards for faculty involvement in service-learning and academic outreach might include incentive grants or release time, promotion and tenure criteria that explicitly suggest assessment of service-learning and academic outreach as forms of scholarship, outreach awards, opportunities to publish articles from service-learning experiences, and the chance to serve on national boards of service organizations.

> *"[A]lthough extrinsic rewards like salary are linked to faculty dissatisfaction, intrinsic factors may be more important in promoting faculty satisfaction."*

Intrinsic factors, on the other hand, pertain to the nature of faculty work itself, including: how the work is done and how it affects the faculty member, the variety of activities involved in the work, the degree to which someone performs the activity from beginning to end, the autonomy the person has in doing the work, the responsibility involved, and the amount of feedback the person receives concerning performance *(Austin and Gamson 1983, 18)*. Research indicates that although extrinsic rewards like salary are linked to faculty dissatisfaction, intrinsic factors may be more important in promoting faculty satisfaction *(McKeachie 1982; Austin and Gamson 1983)*. In fact, faculty motivation for involvement in outreach *(O'Meara 2002a, b)* and service-learning *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)* has been found to be largely intrinsic, with studies showing that many faculty pursue these service activities regardless of external rewards. The intrinsic dimensions of faculty work found to contribute most to satisfaction are autonomy and freedom, intellectual exchange, and the opportunity to work with and impact students *(Wilson, Woods, and Gaff 1974)*.

Research suggests that a primary reason faculty choose to use service-learning is their belief that it increases student understanding of course material, and enhances student personal development *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002; Hammond 1994; Bringle, Hatcher, and Games 1997)*. This motivation for engaging in service-learning is consistent with research that indicates faculty have an intrinsic desire to see their teaching impact students. However, a study of motivation for teaching found that the difficulty in measuring success in teaching "serves to block satisfactions of faculty and force them to turn to other pursuits which seem to be more rewarding" *(Bess 1977, 243)*. In a similar vein, many who have studied outreach and published their findings in this journal have pointed to the diffi-

> *"[F]aculty motivation for involvement in outreach and service-learning has been found to be largely intrinsic . . . many faculty pursue these service activities regardless of external rewards."*

culty in measuring the myriad number of outcomes that result from participatory action research and community-university partnerships. Likewise, research has found that faculty are deterred from integrating service-learning into their courses by lack of evidence that it will improve intended course outcomes *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)*. Thus, a key strategy for facilitating faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach is to help faculty continuously assess the impact of their service on multiple constituencies (students, community members, themselves) and on multiple kinds of outcomes (student learning, community capacity, university-community partnerships, etc.). In this way faculty members' intrinsic need to know what they are accomplishing might be met.

John Wergin *(1994)* reminds us that meaningful intellectual engagement is also a primary motivator for faculty members, followed closely by a yearning to be a member of a community in which one can have an impact and gain recognition. Research has found that mentoring and advice from other faculty in or outside their departments encourages faculty to use service-learning *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)*. Stimulating greater interaction between faculty and "sharing of success stories" *(Abes, Jackson,*

and Jones 2002, 14) through more meetings, conferences, or learning communities has thus been proven to increase and improve faculty involvement in outreach and service-learning *(Gelmon et al. 1998; UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project 1999)*.

Finally, autonomy is considered a major value and benefit of an academic career. In the 1998–99 HERI survey data, faculty rated "autonomy and independence" very satisfactory or satisfactory 86.8 percent of the time, the highest of fourteen work and career satisfaction factors *(Sax et al. 1999)*. Rosovsky *(1990)* fondly described the satisfaction he and other faculty experienced in autonomy: "A critical virtue of academic life . . . is the absence of a boss. [As] a professor I recognized no master save peer pressure. No profession guarantees its practitioners such independence as university research and teaching" *(163–64)*. A critical component of autonomy in teaching is feeling competent to effectively complete one's job. Faculty will be deterred from involvement in service-learning and outreach if they do not feel that they have the requisite skills and knowledge to do it well *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002, 11)*. Training by more experienced faculty, from directors of service-learning, or even within disciplinary conferences on the use of outreach methods and service-learning pedagogy would assist faculty in maintaining both a feeling of autonomy and competency. Table 1 provides a quick summary of the ways known intrinsic and extrinsic motivators can be translated into strategies that individuals and institutions can use to support faculty service. Institutions should do their best to provide strategies that respond to both extrinsic and intrinsic faculty needs and motivations for engaging in outreach and service-learning.

Career Stage: Another critical factor influencing faculty work and behavior is career stage. There are many differences between professors at successive ages and career stages *(Baldwin 1990; Knefelkamp 1990; Schuster 1990)*. Scholars have applied human development and organizational literature to understand faculty career stages and found that faculty have different needs throughout the seasons of their careers *(Baldwin 1979, 1990)*. For example, interest in various faculty roles seems to vary among professors with different levels of experience. Some research has found that mid-career and late-career faculty display a decreased interest in research but an increased enthusiasm for teaching and increased interest in institutional service *(Baldwin 1990; Karpiak 1996; Fulton and Trow 1974; Ladd and Lipset 1975)*. Likewise, Austin and Gamson *(1983)* pointed out that "the third component of faculty work,

**Table 1. Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivators
for Faculty Engagement**

Extrinsic Motivators	Strategies to Support Faculty Engagement
Reward Systems	Changes to promotion and tenure policies to acknowledge teaching and service as potential forms of scholarship
Workload	Release time, stipends, etc.
Working Conditions	Assistance from offices of community service to alleviate some of the logistical and administrative concerns of the work
Intrinsic Motivators Autonomy and Freedom	Training and education to ensure faculty feel confident in leading these activities
Intellectual Exchange	Opportunity to join a group of colleagues in brown-bag lunches or other forums where service-learning pedagogy or outreach projects are discussed and mutual support and mentoring between faculty occur.
Impact on Students	Assistance in gathering evidence of the impact of service-learning on student learning outcomes and personal development.

This table utilizes research from Austin and Gamson *(1983)* and applies it to the issue of providing incentives and supports for faculty outreach and service-learning.

***

service, appears to increase over the years. Faculty members appear to get more involved in service activities as they become more comfortable with their teaching responsibilities and less pressured by demands for scholarship" *(22)*. Braxton, Luckey, and Holland *(2002)* found that while professional age negatively influences publication productivity in discovery and application, it wields little or no influence on faculty production of unpublished scholarly outcomes directed toward application such as

Table 2. Relationship Between Career Stage and Faculty Involvement in Service-Learning and Outreach

Career Stage	Needs	Personal Development	Involvement in SL Academic Outreach
Novice Professor	Time of intense pressure and considerable growth. Major concerns are: competence & developing effective teaching skills, developing proficiency in research methods, gaining knowledge of institutions, resources and support services, policies, mores, and expectations and learning how to balance teaching, research, service, work/family. *(Baldwin 1990; Boice 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin 1992).*	Work assignments should acknowledge that new roles mean more time. Reduction of load is important if one is innovating. A supportive department chair is key. Mentoring relationships with mid-career and senior colleagues sustain faculty during this period.	Difficult time for faculty to be involved in work considered new or radical to an institution; helpful if it can be with a group of more senior colleagues. Load/support are key issues. External rewards for service more important now than in other stages.
Early Academic Career	Task-oriented phase with concrete goals. Achievement and confirmation through publications, grants, awards, tenure, etc. Courses redesigned and teaching strategies refined *(Baldwin 1990; Boice 1992; Sorcinelli and Austin 1992).*	Support for teaching and research endeavors is important. Sabbatical leaves for non-tenured, junior faculty helpful. Early socialization to the importance of teaching and service important.	Important time to: link and integrate teaching, research, and service roles; publish from service work; document outcomes of service; bring in grants and gain publicity.
Mid Career	Time to enjoy maximum professional influence, satisfaction w/accomplishments. But faculty can also experience a plateau with lack of concrete goals and direction; experience monotonous sameness; fear challenge and growth have ended. Period of reassessment, examination of goals *(Baldwin 1990; Knefelkamp 1990; Bowen and Schuster 1986).*	Guide assessment to identify goals that can reenergize subsequent phases of the professional career.	Great time to begin mentoring other faculty in service-learning; become more involved with community research, apply for longer-term grants, attend service-learning and outreach conferences.
Late Career	Leaving a legacy is key. Experience of satisfaction with career/accomplishments. May also feel out of touch with discipline & younger faculty; feeling marginal or left out of their departments *(Knefelkamp, 1990)*, threatened by new institutional emphasis on research, relegated to subordinate status, resentful toward an ungrateful administration, and suspicious of better-trained junior colleagues *(Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Baldwin, 1990).*	Challenging teaching assignments. Institutional roles that capitalize on faculty skills, including leading task forces and leading teaching strategy workshops. Meaningful work.	Ideal time to lead institutional change efforts related to service; mentor, write, connect service-learning to the discipline.

This table applies on Baldwin *(1990)* research on faculty career stages and several other sources to the issue of supporting faculty involvement in service-learning and academic outreach.

seminars conducted by faculty for local organizations or studies conducted by faculty to help solve community problems for local or regional groups.

The evolution of a faculty member's career has some interesting implications for the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for faculty engaged in service-learning and academic outreach, because at different stages a faculty member may be motivated by different factors, emphasizing extrinsic rewards such as tenure and awards earlier, and more intrinsic rewards in mid and late career after gaining tenure is no longer an issue. Table 2 provides a synthesis of faculty career research and theories, followed by what this literature suggests for

> *"The evolution of a faculty member's career has some interesting implications for the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for faculty engaged in service-learning and academic outreach."*

faculty professional development and faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach. A director of faculty professional development might use this information to structure a faculty engagement grant program so that junior faculty are given stipends to either learn about service-learning and outreach from more senior scholars or to conduct assessment and disseminate findings from the project. Likewise, mid-career and senior faculty might be encouraged to use the grants to develop longer-term projects with community agencies or to mentor more junior colleagues engaging in these activities within their departments and colleges.

Changing Institutional Reward Systems to Vale Faculty Service: What We Know.

While there are many excellent models and theories of organizational behavior, Bolman and Deal's *Reframing Organizations (1997)* is perhaps one of the most comprehensive. This synthesis of multiple models of organizational behavior helps us to understand how institutional systems work and how different aspects of faculty work and the faculty career fit into colleges and universities as organizational systems. Bolman and Deal use four frames, to consider organizational problems and strategies for solving them. If we consider our problem to be how college and university systems might better support faculty service-learning and outreach,

Table 3. Reframing Incentives and Rewards for Community Service-Learning and Academic Outreach

Framing Questions		Incentives/ Rewards
	The Structural frame is concerned with how well structures fit with goals, technology & environment. * How well is the service-learning/outreach integrated with other aspects of the faculty role? * How well does the service-learning experience match the learning objectives of the course?	* Opportunities to write and publish articles on the experience. * Documenting service-learning as a form of teaching scholarship, academic outreach as the scholarship of application, or community action research as the scholarship of discovery for promotion and tenure * Connecting service-learning with advising * Reduced course load for first semester * Assessment that demonstrates increased learning outcomes for particular courses when service-learning is utilized
	The Human Resource frame is concerned with whether people's needs are being met. * Do faculty have sufficient education and training to be successful with service-learning? * Do faculty find the work meaningful and satisfying? * Do they have sufficient autonomy and opportunity to make the experience effective?	* Support services * Investing in faculty training & enrichment around service-learning * Mentoring between faculty * Assess learning outcomes and reflect back to faculty what the experience accomplished * Allow for creativity and flexibility as service-learning is integrated with courses
	The Political frame is concerned with how individuals negotiate to obtain scarce resources. * Is it clear that the institution has a commitment to faculty involvement in service-learning? * Has the service-learning been marketed and publicized, especially success stories? * Are there resources to support faculty involvement? * How can networks and coalitions of faculty be formed to support each other and move the agenda forward? * How can involvement in service-learning and outreach enhance, as opposed to detract from, the pursuit of tenure/ promotion, merit pay?	* Mission statements, speeches by academic leaders to faculty * Articles in campus publications (e.g. student newspapers, alumni magazines) * Department chair/deans publicly commending service-learning in meetings * Stipends, course-release time, GA support, space, copying, professional development funds * University committees and task forces * Letters to department chairs, personnel committees for promotion and tenure commending faculty
	The Symbolic frame is concerned with organizational values and how people make meaning of experiences. * How is service-learning part of the institution's saga or identity? * How does the service-learning/outreach connect with the faculty member's own personal mission? * Are there symbols, rituals, ceremonies, or opportunities for humor, celebration, & play that draw people to the efforts and make them feel that they are connected to something of significance?	* Connecting service to institutional heroes, stories, founding * Understanding and connecting faculty values and activity values * Creating discourse communities around service-learning, brown-bag lunches * Providing opportunities for service-learning to allow students and faculty to get to know each other better * Award ceremonies, annual celebrations * Open activity to faculty's family members This table applies Bolman and Deal's (1997) four frames for understanding organizational behavior to the issue of creating incentives and rewards for academic outreach and service-learning.

This table applies Bolman and Deal's *(1997)* four frames for understanding organizational behavior to the issues of creating incentives and rewards for academic outreach and service-learning.

each of the frames approaches the answer from a different vantage point. Table 3 outlines each of these frames and how they might be applied by academic leaders to help support faculty service.

The structural frame, which draws from sociology and management science, assumes that problems and performance gaps arise when an institution's structure does not fit the situation and when goals, roles, and responsibilities are vaguely defined *(Bolman and Deal 1997)*. Looking at the issue of rewarding external faculty service from this vantage point, deans and department chairs might ask themselves the following questions: Do our faculty have the necessary tools to make these experiences and themselves successful? Some of the necessary tools might be release time or workload reduction; some of the technology needed might mean training and development. Likewise, the service experience and the scholarly question or goal should be closely aligned. This frame reminds us that it is in the best interest of the faculty member, community, and institution if service-learning and academic outreach are not stand-alone activities, but rather integrated with other aspects of the faculty role, such as research or teaching scholarship, even advising. Faculty will engage in better service-

> *"[I]t is in the best interest of the faculty member, community, and institution if service-learning and academic outreach are not stand-alone activities, but rather integrated with other aspects of the faculty role . . ."*

learning or outreach if they treat it as a scholarly activity and assess its impact in ways that can be documented for tenure and promotion. Likewise, we know from research that faculty experience the time, logistics, and technical aspects of coordinating community partnerships and student involvement as overwhelming their other roles *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)*. A strong community service office can alleviate some of these faculty concerns over time and logistics *(Bringle and Hatcher 2000; Driscoll 1998; Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)*. Offering course-release time or some other form of workload reduction during a faculty member's earlier attempts at such projects makes it more likely that faculty will be able to negotiate this role in relationship to their other roles.

The human resource frame, which draws from psychology, views organizations as families and looks to people, motivations, and group dynamics as the major influences on how the organization works *(Bolman and Deal 1997)*. From this vantage point, actors in leadership roles within institutions might ask: Do the faculty involved in these projects have sufficient training and education to be successful? Are faculty needs for feeling safe and competent in implementing service activities being met? Do they find the work meaningful and satisfying? Strategies from this vantage point ensure that faculty have sufficient education, training, and enrichment to be competent and confident in their work. Faculty engaged in service-learning or outreach need to have confidence in what they are doing and why they are doing it so that they

> *"Faculty engaged in service-learning or outreach need to have confidence in what they are doing and why . . . so that they can communicate the goals and objectives to students or colleagues . . ."*

can communicate the goals and objectives to students or colleagues who do not understand, or to community members who want to extend the projects in ways that do not advance the original agreed-upon goals. Mentoring and support from other faculty are also important. Beginning service-learning and academic outreach projects for the first time may feel like jumping off a cliff. However, with training, mentoring, and support, faculty might find the experience less like jumping off a cliff and more like running down a small hill with someone to catch you at the end. Furthermore, research tells us that being recruited by students, other faculty, or even community members can encourage faculty involvement in service-learning and outreach *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002; Gelmon et al. 1998; UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project 1999)*.

The political frame, which draws from political science, views organizations as jungles where interest groups compete for scarce resources, the most important of which is power *(Bolman and Deal 1997)*. From this vantage point, institutional leaders might ask themselves: Has this institution made it clear to faculty that it values these commitments? Are there networks or coalitions that support faculty in this work and support its value as scholarship and/or its importance to the mission of the institution? What

real resources have been put behind these initiatives: space, salaries, tenure decisions? Strategies from this vantage point focus on ensuring that faculty are credited for their service accomplishments. Methods can include department chairs or deans publicly commending faculty in meetings, publicizing and marketing the work through success stories in alumni magazines, or adding formal letters of support to faculty personnel files. Research suggests that a significant deterrent for faculty involvement in service-learning and academic outreach is lack of recognition in the faculty reward structure *(Morton and Troppe 1996; Ward 1998; O'Meara 2002a, b)*. The institution can provide "cultural armour" *(O'Meara 2002b)* for faculty involved in service activities by making sure the mission, promotion and tenure policies, and other formal institutional documents recognize this work as legitimate forms of scholarly activity. In addition, "administrators and professors accord full academic value only to the work they can confidently judge" *(Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997, 5)*. Therefore, applying the findings of Ernest Lynton *(1995)*, Driscoll and Lynton *(1999)*, and Sandmann and colleagues *(2000)* on documenting the scholarship in outreach is very important to ensure that faculty get credit for this work as legitimate scholarly activity. Also, when possible, giving faculty key resources to support their work, such as stipends, course-release time, graduate assistant support, space, copying, or professional development funds goes a long way toward showing real institutional commitment to these activities.

The symbolic frame, which draws from social and cultural anthropology, views organizations as having values, sagas, myths, and rituals that form organizational identity and motivate members *(Bolman and Deal 1997)*. From this vantage point, directors of community service-learning and those who facilitate and assist faculty with outreach might ask: Are there ways we can attach symbols, ceremonies, humor, and/or play to the work that faculty are doing so they feel they are doing something significant? Strategies in this area focus on what Weick *(1995)* calls sensemaking, or having people come together and connect their own values and the values of the organization with an activity. Annual rituals that celebrate service accomplishments, telling stories that connect the service to the mission of the institution or its founder, and the creation of discourse communities where faculty can share the trials and tribulations of the experience with others—these are all important strategies that can address intrinsic needs

of faculty to feel that their work is making the difference they desire, and the symbolic needs of the organization to celebrate what it values.

The Influence of Institutional Type on Strategies to Support Service

An important consideration in crafting strategies to support service-learning and outreach is institutional type, a factor that may affect faculty motivation, the progression of career stages, and organizational capacity for providing various incentives and programs. Research on how encouraging multiple forms of scholarship varies by institutional type *(O'Meara forthcoming)* and on the faculty service role in different institutional types *(Ward 2003)* sheds light on how strategies might be paired with specific institutional needs.

The Carnegie classification system *(Carnegie 2000)* and its categorization of institutions as baccalaureate, masters, doctoral/comprehensive, and research provides one way to distinguish between institutions. Within each of these institutional types there are different challenges for service-learning and outreach and thus different needs for support. Teaching load (as much as five courses per semester) and heavy advising and committee loads tend to be the most significant barrier to baccalaureate faculty engagement in any form of scholarship or professional development, including service-learning and outreach. Reduced course loads, incentive grants, and time for training thus become critical structural supports for these faculty at all career stages. Master's institutions have been among the most involved of four-year institutions in their local communities. Research shows that the impact of faculty scholarship on the local community and/or state is more likely to be taken into account in promotion and tenure decisions at these institutions than any other institutional type *(O'Meara*

"Because of rising expectations in teaching, outreach, and research . . . , faculty at doctoral/comprehensive universities are most likely to struggle with involvement in service-learning and outreach."

forthcoming). Yet these institutions often suffer from mission drift as they try to emulate more prestigious universities. Workload, rewards, and mission become misaligned. While these faculty also tend to have significant teaching loads, they are perhaps most in need of leadership that continually clarifies the service mission of their institution and relates that service mission on a day-to-day basis to faculty workload and rewards. Because of rising expectations in teaching, outreach, and research over the last decade *(O'Meara forthcoming)*, faculty at doctoral/ comprehensive universities are most likely to struggle with involvement in service-learning and outreach. Under the pressure of expectations to excel in all areas of their work simultaneously, they experience frustration as they add one more role to an overloaded plate *(Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin 2000)*. Creativity contracts *(Boyer 1990)* or other arrangements enabling faculty to emphasize outreach in their workload for a period agreed upon with their department can be an important strategy for doctoral/comprehensive faculty engaged in this work. Finally, research university faculty engaged in service-learning and outreach are most likely to be discouraged by cultures that do not recognize the scholarship in or importance of their work. These faculty need help in integrating their service-learning and outreach with their research, improving the image of service on their campus, and bringing national attention to their work through awards or through peer-reviewed grant processes. Research university faculty need to form coalitions with other faculty engaged in service-learning and outreach to try to amend promotion and tenure processes to reward this work and to create greater organizational understanding of why this work is scholarly and important. For more discussion of how institutional type influences faculty service roles, see Ward *(2003)* and O'Meara *(forthcoming)*.

Conclusion

Just as an individual faculty member's involvement in service-learning or outreach will be influenced by career stage, discipline, gender, race, socialization, and values, the relative weight given to service-learning and outreach organizationally will of course differ by institutional type and culture, discipline, and type of appointment. Given that faculty enjoy a significant degree of autonomy (even though this varies by institutional type), they are likely to engage in those activities that they find most appealing *(Finkelstein 1984; Blackburn et al. 1991)*. Hopefully the research

reviewed in this article provides some useful explanation of reasons faculty do and do not become or stay involved in service-learning and outreach, and how organizations may influence those decisions.

A unifying theme in my teaching, research, and service is how structures and systems within colleges and universities support or impede faculty careers and the ability of faculty to develop as well-rounded scholars, through which they can contribute to the development of others.

Scholars have long recognized that a main purpose of higher education is the discovery and encouragement of talent *(Jacobi, Astin, and Ayala 1987; Bowen 1977)*. Colleges and universities best accomplish the mission of discovering and encouraging talent by recognizing that some of their faculty have special talents and capacities in the areas of service-learning and academic outreach. Since service is a key aspect of every institutional mission, and since not all faculty have talents in the areas of service-learning and academic outreach, it is in the best interests of department chairs, deans, provosts, and others in every type of institution to develop strategies to support faculty talent in these areas. When they do so, their faculty can return the favor by discovering and nurturing student and community talent locally, regionally, and throughout the world.

Martha Sinetar *(1998)* stresses in The Mentor's Spirit *(1998)* that as counselors, mentors and facilitators, we must all become "artists of encouragement" *(25)*. She refers to the importance in everyday life of the personal note of commendation, the smile of approval and expression of congratulations, and the words of encouragement we can give to each other during down times in one's career. These small gestures profoundly enhance culture. They can go a long way toward reenergizing both the individual and the institution.

If individual service scholars can find this kind of encouragement in their universities and likewise grant it to others, every university and community can become a better place.

References

Abes, E., G. Jackson, and S. Jones. 2002. Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 9*(1): 5–17.

Antonio, A., H. Astin, and C. Cress. 2000. Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education 23*(4): 373–97.

Aquirre, A. 2000. Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 27, no. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, A., and Z. Gamson. 1983. Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, no. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

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

Baldwin, R. 1979. The faculty career process—Continuity and change: A study of college professors at five stages of the academic career. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan.

Baldwin, R. 1990. Faculty career stages and implications for professional development. In *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal*, edited by J. Schuster, D. Wheeler, and Associates, 20–40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, R., and J. Chronister. 2001. *Teaching without tenure: Practices and policies for a new era*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bess, J. 1977. The motivation to teach. *Journal of Higher Education May/June*: 243–58.

Blackburn, R., J. Bieber, J. Lawrence, and L. Trautvetter. 1991. Faculty at work: Focus on research, scholarship, and service. *Research in Higher Education 32*(4): 385–413.

Boice, R. 1992. *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. and T. Deal. 1997. *Reframing organizations*. 2d ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H. 1977. Goals: The intended outcomes of higher education. In *Foundations of American Higher Education*, edited by J. L. Bess and D. S. Webster, 2d ed. 1991, 23–37. Needham Heights, Mass.: Simon and Schuster.

Bowen, H. M. and J. Schuster. 1986. Faculty tasks and talents. In *Foundations of American Higher Education*, edited by J. L. Bess and D. S. Webster, 2d ed. 1991, 167–79. Needham Heights, Mass.: Simon and Schuster.

Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J., W. Luckey, and P. Holland. 2002. *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bringle, R., and J. Hatcher. 2000. Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education 71*(3): 273–90.

Bringle, R., J. Hatcher, and R. Games. 1997. Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach 2*(1): 43–51.

Burgan, M. 1998. Academic citizenship: A fading vision. *Liberal Education 84*(4): 16–21.

Carnegie Foundation. 2000. Carnegie classification of institution of higher education 2000 edition. <www.carnegiefoundation.org/classification>.

Driscoll, A. 1998. Comprehensive design of community service: New undertakings, options, and vitality in student learning at Portland State University. In *Sucessful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education*, edited by E. Zlotkowski, 150–68. Boston: Anker.

Driscoll, A., and E. Lynton. eds. 1999. *Making outreach visible: A workbook on documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Elman, S. E. and S. M. Smock. 1985. *Professional service and faculty rewards: Toward an integrated structure*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Ferren, A., J. G. Gaff, and A. Clayton-Pedersen. 2002. Will reforms survive? Strategies for sustaining preparing future faculty programs. *Liberal Education 88*(3): 14–21.

Finkelstein, M. 1984. *The American academic profession*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Fulton, O., and M. Trow. 1974. Research activity in American higher education. *Sociology of Education 47*: 29–73.

Gelmon, S., B. Holland, A. Shinnamon, and B. Morris. 1998. Community-based education and service: The HPSISN experience. *Journal of Interprofessional Care 12*(3): 257–72.

Glassick, C., M. Huber, and G. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hammond, C. 1994. Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 1*(1): 21–28.

Jacobi, Maryann, A. W. Austin, and Frank Ayala, Jr. 1987. College student outcomer assessment: A talent development perspective. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 7, Washington, D.C. Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Karpiak, I. E. 1996. Ghosts in a wilderness: Problems and priorities of faculty at mid-career and mid-life. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education 26*(3): 49–78.

Knefelkamp, L. 1990. Seasons of academic life: Honoring our collective autobiography. *Liberal Education 76*: 4–11.

Ladd, E. and S. Lipset. 1975. *The divided academy: Professors and politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lynton, E. 1995. *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

McKeachie, W. K. 1982. Enhancing productivity in postsecondary education. *Journal of Higher Education 53*(4): 460-64.

Morton, K. and M. Troppe. 1996. From margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics 15*: 21–32.

O'Meara, K. A. 2000. Service-learning, scholarship, and the reward system. In *Service-Learning in Health Education*, edited by J. S. Greenberg, 138–49. Reston, Va.: American Association for Health Education.

O'Meara, K. A. 2002a. Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education summer*: 57–80.

O'Meara, K. A. 2002b. *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York: RoutledgeFarmer.

O'Meara, K. A. Forthcoming. Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship: Accounting for institutional type and mission. In *Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship: Experienced voices*, edited by K. A. O'Meara and E. Rice. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, E., M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin. 2000. *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New pathways working paper series. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Richlin, L. ed. 1993 Preparing faculty for the new conception of scholarship. *New directions for teaching and learning*, no. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosovsky, H. 1990. *The university: An owner's manual*. New York: Norton.

Sandmann, L., P. Foster-Fishman, J. Floyd, W. Rauhe, and C. Rosaen. 2000. Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change 9*(2): 45–52.

Sax, L., A. Astin, W. Korn, and S. Gilmartin. 1999. *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998–99 faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Schuster, J. ed. 1990. *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sinetar, M. 1998. *The mentor's spirit: Life lessons on leadership and the art of encouragement*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sorcinelli, M. D., A. E. Austin. 1992. Developing new and junior faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 50. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project. 1999. 1999 service-learning needs assessment. <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/slc/slcp.html> (15 July 2003).

Ward, K. 1998. Addressing academic culture: Service-learning, organizations and faculty work. In *Academic service-learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection*, edited by R. Rhoads and J. Howard, 73–80. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, K. 2003 Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report vol. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weick, K. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Wergin, J. 1994. *The collaborative department: How five campuses are inching toward cultures of collective responsibility*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Wilson, R., L. Woods, and J. Gaff. 1974. Social-psychological accessibility and faculty-student interaction beyond the classroom. *Sociology of Education 47*(1): 74–92.

Zlotkowski, E. 2001. Mapping new terrain: Service-learning across the disciplines. *Change 33*(1): 25–33.

Acknowledgments

About the Author

KerryAnn O'Meara is an assistant professor of higher education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Dr. O'Meara's research focuses on how colleges and universities and specifically academic reward systems and academic cultures support or impede human talent/potential and the ability of faculty to excel in teaching, research, and service. Her recent research on the impact of the movement to encourage multiple forms of scholarship in four-year colleges and universities will be published in a book (co-edited with Gene Rice) titled *Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Experienced Voices*, which will be published fall 2003 by the American Association for Higher Education.