



PROJECT MUSE®

---

## Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship

O'Meara, KerryAnn, 1971-

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 26, Number 1, Fall 2002,  
pp. 57-80 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press  
DOI: 10.1353/rhe.2002.0028



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v026/26.1omeara.html>

*The Review of Higher Education*

Fall 2002, Volume 26, No. 1, pp. 57–80

Copyright © 2002 Association for the Study of Higher Education

All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162-5748)

FOCUS ON FACULTY

# Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship

*KerryAnn O'Meara*

“Archery in the dark” (Rice, 1996, p. 31) has become a widely cited faculty complaint about problems with the tenure and promotion process. A substantial amount of research concurs that promotion and tenure are often elusive, unpredictable, and fraught with “conflicting expectations” and unwritten rules (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000, p. 9). Faculty struggles with promotion and tenure are attributed to ambiguous and often contradictory criteria. Conflicts between institutional rhetoric and the realities of reward structures, and the emphasis on research to the detriment of teaching and service in promotion and tenure decisions have been identified as

---

KERRYANN O'MEARA is an Assistant Professor in Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Her scholarly efforts focus on organizational behavior and change, academic culture, and the service mission of colleges and universities. She thanks Robert Birnbaum, Cathy Burack, Cathy Trower, and two anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier drafts and this paper, which is drawn from a larger study on the process of integrating service as scholarship into academic reward systems: *Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service as Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure* (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2002), part of the Studies in Higher Education Dissertation Series, edited by Philip G. Altbach. Address queries to her at the Department of Educational Policy, Research, and Administration, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA 01003-9308; telephone: (413) 545-0871; e-mail: kerryann@educ.umass.edu.

major sources of stress and dissatisfaction in probationary faculty (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilkie, 1986; Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000; Sorcinelli, 1992; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Women and faculty of color are the most disenchanting with the tenure process. They report lower degrees of satisfaction, fewer opportunities for professional recognition, less favorable perceptions of the academic climate, more instances of subtle discrimination, and higher degrees of stress compared to their White male counterparts (Sax, Astin, Arredondo, & Korn, 1996; Sanderson et al., 1999). A higher proportion of tenure-track women and faculty of color leave the tenure track prior to the tenure decision than their male and White counterparts (Sanderson et al., 1999). Greater dissatisfaction with the reward system has been attributed in part to the higher commitment of women and faculty of color to professional service and teaching, endeavors that are often given less weight than research in tenure reviews (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999).

The main issue addressed in this article is the influence of values and beliefs on the promotion and tenure process. Understanding the values and beliefs that influence promotion and tenure is important because these values and beliefs play a critical role in determining what kinds of faculty work are considered important and meritorious, thus conveying messages about where faculty should invest their time. Values and beliefs shape institutional direction and have consequences on the development of individual faculty careers.

With the best of intentions, colleges and universities have attempted to amend the existing tenure system (Chait, 1998). One of the most popular modifications to traditional tenure follows Ernest Boyer's (1990) suggestion that the definition of scholarship used in promotion policies be changed to include teaching, discovering, integrating, and applying knowledge. In 1994, 62% of chief academic officers in four-year institutions reported that Boyer's (1990) seminal work, *Scholarship Reconsidered* had had a role in discussions of faculty roles and rewards (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). Advocates of assessing teaching as scholarship (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999) and faculty professional service as scholarship (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Lynton, 1995) have suggested that assessing and rewarding multiple forms of scholarship within academic reward systems encourages faculty to emphasize different kinds of work over their career and elevates the status of teaching and service to their rightful place beside research within academic culture.

However, institutions that attempt to expand their definition of scholarship for promotion and tenure take on a huge task. Just because a college changes its written definition of scholarship in promotion policies does not mean that institutional members wake up the next day with a new view of faculty work. Instead, the expanded definition of scholarship must struggle

to survive in an “assumptive world” (Rice, 1996, p. 8) where specialized research published in peer-reviewed journals is central to what it means to be a valued scholar. Faculty and administrators are often “prisoners of their own thinking” (Senge, 1990, p. 27), unable to make promotion decisions based on a new definition of scholarship because they hold values about faculty roles, scholarship, and institutional identity that contradict the values inherent in the new reward structure. Research on change and innovation has shown that modifications to tenure with any hope of success must focus on the cultural realities and inner workings of institutions (ACE, 1999; Bergquist, 1992; Schein, 1992). Institutions that expand their definition of scholarship do so as part of an effort to amend or, in some cases, transform values and beliefs so that their members view faculty roles in new ways.

This study explored how values and beliefs held by faculty and administrators influenced the promotion and tenure process at four institutions that expanded their definition of scholarship in promotion policies. While expanding the definition of scholarship in promotion and tenure has implications for the assessment of teaching, integrative work, and research, this study focused on how values and beliefs influenced the promotion process in relationship to the assessment of service as scholarship.

### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study was guided by Schein's (1992) theory of organizational culture and Kuh and Whitt's (1988) application of cultural theory to higher education settings. Schein (1992) divided culture into a conceptual hierarchy comprised of three levels: artifacts, values and beliefs, and basic assumptions.

Artifacts are the visible products, activities, and processes that form a culture (Schein, 1992) and include reward structures, rituals, ceremonies, and insider language and terminology (ACE, 1999). Underlying assumptions are rarely questioned, taken-for-granted beliefs that reside at the inner core of organizational culture and the deepest level of institutional consciousness. This study focused on the middle layer of Schein's three levels of culture—values and beliefs.

Values are

widely held beliefs or sentiments about the importance of certain goals, activities, relations, and feelings. Values can be (a) conscious and explicitly articulated, serving a normative or moral function guiding member behavior, (b) unconsciously expressed as themes (e.g. the tradition of collegial governance) and/or (c) symbolic interpretations of reality that give meaning to social actions and establish standards for social behavior. (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. 23)

Values are often context bound and directly related to a college's history and wellbeing. They sometimes "surface as exhortations about what is right or wrong, what is encouraged or discouraged, and what ought to be" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. 25). Espoused values are a subset of this second layer of culture. They are aspirations, or how an institution wishes to be. There are often discrepancies between the espoused values of individuals and institutions and how they actually behave. In order for a change effort to become permanent, there must be congruence between artifacts, values, and espoused values (ACE, 1999; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Schein, 1992).

Values become "theories in use" (Argyris & Schon, 1974, qtd. in Schein, 1992, p. 22). Only when values and their effect on practice are revealed can change agents begin to transform values and modify practice. The literature on effecting successful change (ACE, 1999; Bolman & Deal, 1991; Birnbaum, 1988; Senge, 1990) and on institutional culture (Birnbaum, 1988; Bergquist, 1992; Bolman & Deal, 1994; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1992) is voluminous. However little research has explored the values held by faculty and administrators that influence faculty evaluation and, more specifically, the values that advance or prevent a campus from embracing a broader view of scholarship in promotion decisions.

While a broader view of scholarship was written into institution-wide evaluation policies in each of the four cases studied, I narrowed the scope of this study to values and beliefs impacting evaluation in colleges/units of education. I selected colleges of education for two reasons. First, education faculty report engaging in the greatest amount of external service of faculty in any discipline (Kirshstein, 1997). Antonio, Astin, and Cress (2000) found that faculty trained in education, along with social work and health education (considered other or service-oriented disciplines), were the most committed personally and professionally to community service. Because education faculty are routinely called upon to engage in outreach to K-12 schools and community colleges (Campoy, 1996; Viechnicki, Yanity, & Olinski, 1997), policies on how service is valued and rewarded in promotion and tenure impacts them most heavily. Second, each discipline has its own distinctive epistemology, methods, and social relations among members (Becher, 1989; Biglan, 1973). In a study of the institutionalization of Boyer's four domains of scholarship, Braxton et al. (2000) found significant differences in the amount of activity and the valuing of the scholarship of application in four academic disciplines. Isolating colleges of education reveals the values within this service-oriented discipline. The study may be replicated later in the humanities and/or sciences.

## METHODOLOGY

This study investigated the values and beliefs that influence the assessment of service as scholarship in promotion and tenure review. Its intent was to identify themes and patterns of values concerning institutional identity, the nature of scholarship, and faculty careers that influenced the promotion and tenure process. I use "promotion and tenure process" as an intentionally broad term, encompassing decisions made by promotion and tenure (personnel) committees and external factors such as voiced opinions and behavior of senior faculty, department chairs, deans, and candidates who influenced promotion decisions. I adopted a revelatory multiple case-study method to build explanations (Yin, 1994). An institution, to be eligible for this study, had to have (a) revised its promotion policies to include an expanded definition of scholarship consistent with Boyer's (1990) framework, (b) been identified by the American Association for Higher Education's Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards and New England Resource Center for Higher Education as having made significant strides to assess service as scholarship, and (c) be accessible for research.

I sought to identify institutions with differing structures and cultures because values might vary by institutional type, and I wanted to understand the values and beliefs influencing faculty evaluation across four different types of institutions. I used the Carnegie (1976) classification system to distinguish among university types. I chose one institution in four categories (research, doctoral, master, and baccalaureate) and assigned a pseudonym to each: MidWest State University (MWSU), Patrick State University (PSU), Erin College, and St. Timothy (St. Tims).

I interviewed 12 to 15 individuals from each institution using semi-structured, open-ended question protocols. The interview protocol included questions on values and beliefs about the evolution and implementation of the new promotion policy for the purposes of defining, assessing, and rewarding service as scholarship. Academic administrators and deans of the colleges/units of education acted as primary informants and assisted me in selecting participants. I also used snowball sampling to ensure that the interview pool included faculty of each rank, both sexes, and a range of viewpoints on the assessment of service as scholarship for promotion and tenure.

Participants included education faculty who were currently on the personnel committee and/or had been within the last two years, education faculty who were and were not involved in service scholarship (tenured and untenured), and the dean, department chairs, provost, and other administrators involved in policy decisions affecting this issue. At PSU I interviewed the entire personnel committee; at the other three institutions, I interviewed 75% of the personnel committee. I taped and transcribed the interviews. I also reviewed promotion and tenure guidelines, applicant portfolios and

materials, institutional reports and memoranda, meeting minutes, and descriptions of service projects. I received these documents through primary informants, at meetings with campus archivists, and from searches of electronic databases.

From the collected data, I drafted four case reports that included all of the relevant information (Yin, 1994). Out of each larger case report, I crafted a case study. I then used two three-step data-analysis processes: pattern coding, memoing, and proposition writing—first within each case and then across the four cases—to identify values that influenced the assessment of service as scholarship (Miles & Huberman, 1994). More specifically, I began data analysis by reading and rereading transcripts, noting the participants' roles, and then coding them according to categories that emerged from the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Coding reduced the data, allowed codes to be displayed, and facilitated drawing conclusions from patterns. I searched for, recorded, and analyzed divergent data that contradicted emerging patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

### THE FOUR CASES

Organizational culture is a complex concept influenced by history and continually created and recreated by institutional mission, traditions, and experiences (Love, 1997). The values and beliefs that faculty and administrators held about faculty roles and rewards were as much embedded in how they interpreted their personal and institutional histories as they were the result of recent events and daily activities. For this reason, I briefly describe each of the four institutions and also common themes that cut across the four cases.

#### *Patrick State University (PSU)*

PSU is a public metropolitan university located in a large northwestern city. No clear boundaries separate the campus from the city, and the faculty have always identified strongly with PSU's urban service mission. PSU is a young institution, living in the shadow of the state's flagship land-grant campus that receives greater visibility and enjoys more generous funding from the legislature. Since its founding, PSU has operated in a perpetual budget crisis. These realities have forced PSU to be entrepreneurial, to respond rapidly to change, and to innovate to meet the changing needs of its students, faculty, and city. Like other comprehensive universities, PSU has evolved from a single-purpose to a multi-purpose institution, from serving full-time to part-time students, from undergraduate to graduate focus.

#### *MidWest State University (MWSU)*

Located in a big city, MWSU is a large, research-oriented land-grant university in the Midwest. Faculty have a reduced course load to encourage

them to engage in significant scholarly research. *U.S. News and World Report* ranks at least one program in each colleges as among the top graduate programs in the United States. Like PSU, MWSU's sensitivity about being second to its state's flagship campus is a big part of the university culture.

### *Erin College*

Erin College is a medium-sized liberal arts/professional college in a major city in New England, founded to train women teachers. The undergraduate school remains single sex, while the graduate school is now coeducational. Erin College's name is synonymous in its region with the highest quality of teaching. Erin is a progressive place with a social action agenda. Faculty maintain a heavy workload of four courses each semester and have extensive advising and committee responsibilities. The culture of Erin College is student-centered, collaborative, interdisciplinary, service oriented, and committed to faculty and student interactions.

### *St. Timothy (St. Tims)*

St. Tims is a small, Catholic, liberal arts college in the Midwest. Students are 18 to 22 years old, and the college is mostly residential. St. Tims is 100 years old and known for excellence in teaching. The college was founded by an order of priests whose governing principle was hospitality; they "created an atmosphere that was congenial, that wasn't educationally edgy," according to one administrator. St. Tims's governing principle of hospitality nurtured a tradition of community, collegiality, and democratic decision-making. Teaching loads of three courses a semester, intensive committee work, and research mean that faculty are very busy. Budget cuts have been common yearly events and have had a significant impact on faculty and division chairs.

## THEMES

### *A Tradition of Service*

Since their founding, each of the four institutions in this study has had a strong, identifiable service mission. By virtue of its land-grant mission, MWSU's faculty has a long tradition of engaging in research-grounded technical assistance and community-based extension programs in agriculture, nursing, medicine, business, and education throughout the state. PSU was founded with an explicit mandate to serve its city and metropolitan area. All of its academic programs, and especially its professional schools, had established partnerships with city and nonprofit organizations. Since its early years of training women teachers, Erin College and its faculty has had a strong social justice orientation, stressing the philosophical values of serving the community and the educational benefits of service for its students. While St. Tims's service mission was not as strong as that of the other three,



faculty and administrators have always viewed service as a critical extension of the college's vision of community and teaching mission. As a result, many faculty were involved in teaching-related service projects.

### *Academic Recruitment and Evaluation*

Another similarity among the four cases was the institutional history and context within which these institutions decided to modify their promotion and tenure policies and expand their definitions of scholarship. Since their founding, each of the four campuses has had a history of valuing teaching and service as equal to, if not more important than, research in faculty evaluation. While the precise time of departure from this tradition differed, by the early 1980s each of the campuses had begun to shift into what Rice (1996) called the "assumptive world of the academic professional" (p. 8) and which Gamson and Finnegan (1996) described as "the culture of research" (p. 172).

To different degrees, each of the four institutions wanted to increase its national standing within the academic labor market. The ability to attract graduate students and external funding and to compete with peers for national rankings rested on faculty productivity in research. As market forces brought more faculty with Ph.Ds and research backgrounds to these campuses, the campuses became more focused on traditional forms of research. By the 1990s, "scholarship" had become synonymous in these four different institutions with traditional research. Increasingly, success in tenure and/or promotion and increases in salary became closely tied with publication productivity. Promotion and tenure standards at each of these institutions began to emphasize national over local accomplishments and to value published and peer-reviewed writing over other forms of faculty work.

This shift resulted in four institutions characterized by paradox. Throughout this period of increasing research emphasis, many faculty were recruited because they believed their institutions were committed to, and rewarded, faculty service. As a result, to different degrees, each of the four institutions experienced significant difficulty in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a disconnect formed between faculty who emphasized teaching and service and reward systems that favored research. In addition, the institutional rhetoric and mission of each of the institutions remained the same; in each case, the rhetoric suggested that the institution prized and rewarded faculty teaching and service to the community. During the early to mid-1990s at each institution, some faculty who engaged primarily in teaching and service were denied promotion and tenure. Some faculty and administrators at each institution expressed dissatisfaction with inconsistencies between rhetoric and rewards.

### *External Catalysts to Reform*

External forces frequently force institutions to redirect institutional goals and priorities and undertake change (Birnbaum, 1988). In the case of these four schools, external forces influenced their administrations' decision to attempt to amend the reward system. For example, PSU experienced a significant budget crisis that triggered a reexamination of the core curriculum and subsequent revision to include greater service-learning. Greater faculty involvement in service-learning triggered more faculty outreach, which encouraged faculty to push for greater alignment between their workloads and rewards. MWSU received a large grant to become a national model for how a major research-oriented land-grant university could weave service into the fabric of academic life, prompting the development of more outreach and reexamination of rewards for outreach. In the first case, a perceived crisis sparked action, in the second, a perceived opportunity.

All four institutions were involved in and influenced by the national movement toward redefining scholarship and faculty rewards that involved hundreds of campuses. Also, the national teacher education movement, which pushed for greater involvement by education faculty in professional development school partnerships, was a major reason that education faculty began to see a need for more flexibility in faculty roles and rewards.

### *Internal Catalysts for Reform*

The two most significant internal catalysts for reform were leadership and faculty dissatisfaction. For example, on PSU's campus, a new president who pushed for PSU to become an exemplar "urban grant university" played a major role in the decision to revise the reward system. In addition, on each of the four campuses, when faculty were denied promotion and tenure (at least in part) because they emphasized teaching or service over research, they were in disciplines with fewer publication opportunities, or were artists with nontraditional venues for dissemination of their creative work. Many faculty complained to their deans and provosts that the reward system needed to be altered. All of these issues converged in the late 1980s and early 1990s, influencing the institutions' decisions to amend faculty evaluation policies.

### *Expanding the Definition of Scholarship*

Each of the four campuses took different roads but arrived at the same destination: a new expanded definition of scholarship. PSU and St. Tims took the most conventional route. They held college-wide committee deliberations, circulated drafts, and received faculty senate approval of a new definition of scholarship for promotion and tenure, which the local units then implemented. MWSU had two college-wide committees that developed criteria to assess service as scholarship; the provost requested, but did

not mandate, that the individual colleges use these criteria to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. Erin's road to change was the least conventional. Over a ten-year period prior to 1997, the provost served in a variety of administrative positions and roles that gave him the opportunity to "sneak in various forms of clarification" and to "nudge the official promotion policies toward an expanded definition of scholarship." While not officially approved by any faculty governing body, the new definition of scholarship was written into promotion policies and used in faculty evaluation.

### VALUES AND BELIEFS

This section describes the values and beliefs that influenced the promotion process during the 1997–1998 academic year when an expanded definition of scholarship had been in place at MWSU, PSU, and Erin College less than two years and, at St. Tims, five years. Personnel committees reported using criteria to assess service as scholarship that were laid out in policy documents. These criteria included: professional/academic expertise, peer review, evidence of impact, dissemination, originality and innovation, and connection to teaching and research. While there is much to say about the apparent gap between stated criteria and actual practice, as well as the ways in which assessing service as scholarship brings existing measures of scholarship into question, this article does not address criteria unless they intersect with values and beliefs.

Love's (1997) study of campus culture describes paradoxes as aspects of a college's culture that are seemingly contradictory but which, in reality, express a truth. In each of the four cases, some actors held values and beliefs about their institution, scholarship, and faculty careers that supported the traditional definition of scholarship *and* Boyer's expanded definition of scholarship in promotion decisions. These perspectives resulted in colleges/units of education that simultaneously embraced and rejected the view that service should be assessed and rewarded as scholarship. Although the same people often held these contradictory perspectives, I describe first the values and beliefs that supported the expanded definition of scholarship, then describe the values and beliefs supporting the more traditional research paradigm, thus thwarting the intent of the modified promotion policies. Table 1 compares the values/beliefs encouraging and discouraging the assessment and rewarding of service as scholarship.

### VALUES/BELIEFS SUPPORTING THE ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE AS SCHOLARSHIP

*"Service is who we are."* Each of the four colleges had strong, preexisting service missions. Consequently, when the idea of multiple forms of schol-

**TABLE 1**  
**VALUES AND BELIEFS RELATED TO SERVICE AS SCHOLARSHIP**

<i>Values/Beliefs Topic</i>	<i>Values Supporting SS</i>	<i>Values Against SS</i>
Institutional Identity/Direction	<p>“Service is who we are.”</p> <p>“We don’t want our institution to be like other institutions.”</p>	<p>“Climbing the academic ladder is who we are.”</p> <p>“We want our institution to be like other institutions.”</p>
The Nature of Scholarship	<p>“Scholarship can be teaching, integration, discovery, and application.”</p> <p>“Scholarly work can be completed in collaboration with practitioners.”</p> <p>“The best scholarship has the most impact on students, communities, and policy issues.”</p> <p>“Writing is scholarly because of what it is and what it does.”</p> <p>“SS requires as much professional knowledge as other forms of scholarship.”</p>	<p>“Scholarship is empirical research disseminated to the academic community.”</p> <p>“Scholarly work is completed apart from practitioners.”</p> <p>“The best scholarship brings the most prestige to our positions.”</p> <p>“Writing is scholarly because of where it is.”</p> <p>“Traditional research requires more professional knowledge than SS.”</p>
“Faculty Careers/Self-Interest”	<p>The new standards reward all faculty for what they do best, which is in our self-interest.”</p> <p>“Doesn’t affect me. I don’t care.”</p>	<p>“New faculty should have the same standards I did or the system will not be fair.”</p> <p>“I care, if standards are perceived to be lower, my department and position will be diminished.”</p>

arship was introduced to the college community, faculty and administrators at each institution, and especially at the colleges of education, already considered external service to be “part of who we are as a college/university.” When asked about the adoption of the new way of thinking about service as scholarship, the dean of Erin’s College of Education replied, “This is a comfortable place for that idea to be introduced. We are an application place here.” Likewise, personnel committee members acknowledged that MWSU had always praised service as “an important piece of what people do” and stated that “service is taken very seriously here.”

Faculty at each of the four institutions were regularly involved in service that Boyer would characterize as scholarship and viewed it as a critical part of their faculty roles. Faculty were most involved in professional service at PSU, then Erin, then MWSU, and then St. Tims. The involvement of Erin’s

faculty in service with the Center for Conflict Resolution was typical. The center received grant funding to provide partial released time for faculty to work with schools on conflict resolution programs. The director of the center said, "We've shaped the whole way of thinking about multicultural education and conflict resolution based upon the expertise of academic people here, developmental approaches to it. . . . This all comes from theoretical ideas that have been garnered by our faculty and the grass-roots efforts of community members." One education professor said, "I think it is definitely something about Erin College and this program. Service is considered part of our responsibility. A direct link with the schools is important to us." Faculty involvement in service, their widespread belief that service was a critical part of their institution's identity, and their view of their own faculty roles supported the belief that service should be assessed as scholarship for promotion/tenure.

Not only were faculty socialized to see service as part of their institutional identity and faculty role, but they were also socialized to see service as a critical part of their identity as scholars. Even though the idea of service as a form of scholarship was new to most faculty linguistically and conceptually, the concept of "service as important work for scholars to do" was embedded in each college's culture at the time of promotion and tenure policy changes. A PSU faculty member reported: "The intellectual work of education professors is to conceptualize issues of community." It was clear that, at all of the institutions but especially at Erin College, education faculty considered a close partnership with local schools as essential to their own research and teaching. This understanding among faculty was a strong foundation from which to cultivate the idea that service should be assessed and rewarded as scholarship.

In addition, the applied and professional nature of the education discipline greatly shaped role socialization concerning service. Faculty in each case, even in the most research-oriented cultures of PSU and MWSU, valued applied knowledge and thought it would ultimately make the biggest difference in their discipline. One Erin College personnel committee member said, "I think that one of the things that Erin College tries to do is to really live the rhetoric of balancing theory and practice; and there is new knowledge to be gained in basic research and new knowledge to be gained in the domains of practice." Faculty and administrator service orientation created a fertile ground for accepting the new reward policy.

*"We don't want to be like other institutions."* Another value that advanced the adoption of an expanded definition of scholarship was a clear message emanating from faculty and administrators: "We don't want to be like the other institutions." Each of the four institutions in this study exhibited anti-isomorphism or resistance to resembling other institutions in the environment. Like the school child who is picked last for the team and then decides

he didn't want to play anyway, some might argue that anti-isomorphism was the institution's response to being less distinctive in the mainstream competition and, consequently, opting to play a different game. For example, one PSU administrator said PSU didn't have as much to lose from risk-taking as other institutions because it was already "a wart on the back of higher education." By this, he meant that both research universities and liberal arts colleges would look down on PSU for its professional service focus (as opposed to research and teaching), no matter what it did. Therefore, there was no reason for the university not to "be itself." Furthermore, because of PSU's perpetual budget crises, its leaders shared the consensus that "we can't afford to do things the normal way."

By virtue of being deemed second class by one rating system or another, these institutions wanted to appear markedly different than the status quo. They wanted to stand out without being elitist and sought ways to be at odds with the established norms of higher education. For example, in the mindset of the faculty, Erin's social justice values and reputation for teaching excellence were opposite to the qualities a research university cultivates. Consequently, Erin prided itself on not being a research university.

The anti-isomorphic attitude seemed to be based on more than sour grapes. In a positive way, these institutions and their faculty seemed to have made choices to be different—even when (in certain areas) they could have been or already were first on the team, among their peers. They were proud of these choices. The belief among faculty and administrators that they personally and their institution were "an underdog," "different," and/or had "chosen the road less traveled" in higher education also paved the way for faculty to buy in to the idea of multiple forms of scholarship. These faculty and, collectively, their institutions, enjoyed being considered a maverick in a variety of ways and were proud to be among the first institutions in the country adopting a new or different way of thinking about faculty roles and rewards.

"*We define scholarship broadly.*" By the time the amended reward policies were introduced, at least two thirds of the education faculty in this study had been exposed to Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* and to the views of other higher education commentators that "scholarship" is more than traditional research. In addition, most personnel committee members had experience in assessing teaching as scholarship through teaching portfolios. Consequently, most personnel committee members approached assessing service as scholarship with at least some vague familiarity with the concept, even if they had no idea how to do it. Personnel committee members at Erin College (even before the policy change) prided themselves on Erin's openness to multiple forms of scholarship. A former personnel committee member at Erin College stated:

I define scholarship broadly . . . as creating a musical composition . . . as art work . . . as an expression through various modes of creative thinking and critical analysis . . . much more than publishing articles in obscure journals that are read by ten people in the universe and riddled with footnotes, as if that is the sign of an impressive mind at work. One of the reasons I like working here is Erin is an environment that allows one to think outside the traditional boxes.

The history of faculty having been exposed to the idea of multiple forms of scholarship and taking for granted that they themselves had “always defined scholarship broadly,” paved the way for adopting a new way of assessing faculty work for promotion and tenure.

“*Not all scholarship appears in Tier I journals.*” While standards for promotion and tenure had become more traditional on each of the campuses prior to the introduction of the new promotion policies, some faculty already viewed writing in practitioner journals, grant publications, and other less peer-reviewed venues, as scholarship. Some faculty in each institution further felt that applied writing venues were “making a bigger difference.” Erin’s dean of the School of Education explained that many of its faculty could publish in traditional journals but chose less traditional writing venues because they placed greater value in reaching practitioner audiences. The dean said:

There is a more comfortable fit in this community than there was at [former research university] concerning nontraditional scholarship. I think there are a number of people who became a faculty member at Erin College because of that viewpoint—not that they are opposed to writing in the narrow sense of scholarship, but they are more in the application stage, the doing. So, if they write a textbook, that is where some may feel more comfortable. I mean, that is where they would like to put their time and their energy rather than feeling as though they have to write just for refereed journals. I think there is a value part of service as scholarship. In many research universities, that would not get high marks.

Faculty at Erin College were the most comfortable, and MWSU faculty the least, with nontraditional writing venues, but all four campuses had some history of counting writing for practitioner audiences as scholarship for promotion and/or tenure. Values supporting the legitimacy of scholarship published in nonrefereed or practitioner journals were important for promotion decisions because service scholarship is often disseminated through practitioner periodicals rather than academic journals.

“*We should be rewarded for what we do.*” There was a belief among faculty in all four cases that they personally worked hard, did good work, and deserved to be tenured and/or promoted. There was no significant difference in this self-image between traditional scholars and those faculty engaged in

teaching and service scholarship, between faculty at the most research-oriented university (MWSU) or the least (St. Tims), or between younger and older faculty. Even though some faculty expressed concern over their chances for advancement, this did not diminish their own feeling of entitlement and the view that "not being rewarded for all that I do would be unfair." This belief among faculty complemented acceptance of the expanded definition of scholarship because every faculty member saw his or her work falling into this new model somewhere, even if he or she was more critical of peers.

*"Doesn't affect me. I don't care."* William Mallon (2002) has written about faculty zones of indifference in relation to promotion and tenure, and the tendency on some campuses for faculty members to be uninterested in their institution's national reputations in disciplinary associations or their department's rankings. This indifference to isomorphic pressures can enable change simply by not preventing it. To a small degree, a force that supported the adoption of the modified policies was a lack of resistance from faculty members who were too involved in their own work to care if the college changed their definition of scholarship and their reward policy. These faculty were willing to accept whatever definition of scholarship was provided and did not push to maintain the traditional definition of scholarship for promotion and tenure.

### *Values/Beliefs Supporting Traditional Scholarship*

Values and beliefs working against the assessment of service as scholarship reflected a desire on the part of faculty, administrators, and the institution to mimic more prestigious universities than their own in emphases and rewards. This tendency has been described as isomorphism, academic ratcheting, and institutional drift.

*"Our institution should try to climb the academic ladder."* Some faculty, administrators, and personnel committee members at each of the four institutions believed that their institution should try to become more like other higher education institutions and strive to climb the ladder of traditional ranking systems. Service scholarship was "nice" but would not help their institution gain higher rankings and more prestige. Therefore it was not a faculty activity they wanted to reward or "promote." For example, during the dean tenure at MWSU, the College of Education viewed itself as one of the best in the country and was eager to maintain and improve its status in *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. Because those ratings rely heavily on faculty publication productivity, and number and sums of research grants received, MWSU's personnel believed that, if its College of Education rewarded service as scholarship, there would be less traditional scholarship and the institution might slip downward in national graduate school rankings.



Self-interest also played a role. Each institution had faculty who felt that their college/university should not become too innovative, otherwise it would raise questions within the state and national system of higher education. School of Education programs, students, and faculty would not be transferable to other institutions, and their own professional standing within higher education would decrease. Considering their institution to already be too counter-cultural among their peers, they wanted it to become more mainstream, traditional. Becoming more traditional meant rejecting the expanded definition of scholarship and maintaining a hard line on research as the only form of scholarship to be assessed and rewarded.

Values concerning institutional self-image were most apparent in decisions regarding promotion to full professor. This evaluation became contested ground in a culture war between faculty who had supported the expanded definition of scholarship and those who wanted to increase the prestige of the college or unit of education and institution by hiring and promoting more traditional scholars. This phenomenon was most conspicuous at MWSU, PSU, and St. Tims to the same degree at all three and present to only a small degree at Erin College. Personnel committee members admitted that while they approved of the concept of multiple forms of scholarship—and felt good about approving “alternative career tracks” to associate professor—they felt less comfortable with teaching or service scholars being promoted to full professor. For example, when I asked a PSU personnel committee member what kind of service scholarship would lead to promotion to full professor, he answered, “The written products would have to be at a tremendous, mastery level, something of great magnitude that people could really sink their teeth into.” Yet he could not imagine what these products would look like and said he doubted they existed. Senior faculty conjectured that promotion to full professor sent strong messages about institutional identity and direction. A few senior faculty at PSU noted that reward systems are “culture-building.” They were not sure if they approved of the culture that would be formed under the new policy.

*“Scholarship is discovering theoretical knowledge which sets the scholar apart from others.”* Before the majority of faculty at PSU and Erin College, and many at MWSU and St. Tims were socialized by their institutions to see service as scholarship, faculty from each institution were socialized in graduate school to believe that scholars were people who created new theoretical knowledge for the academic community and that faculty hold their positions in universities by virtue of the theoretical expertise they demonstrate in writing. Most faculty in these cases were trained to believe that scholarship is completed apart from practitioners and is scholarship only when it appears in peer-reviewed print.

Service scholarship is often the application of existing knowledge in a practical setting and/or the creation of new knowledge about practice. Fac-

ulty engage in this work in partnership with practitioners in the field so that there is “a reciprocal movement between theory and practice” (Ramaley, 1999). When this happens, faculty members facilitate the flow of knowledge and become partners in knowledge production. Some faculty, administrators, and personnel committee members saw this partnership and facilitation role as an abdication of the appropriate faculty role as expert and, therefore, as something that should not be rewarded.

Some personnel committee members commented that they did not believe a university should consist of “field people.” For example, one PSU personnel committee member said, “There is some concern that we’re not even sure what scholarship is anymore. Are we really changing our culture here? I mean, are we really an academic, intellectual community or are we becoming like the people we serve—you know, more field based, more practitioner?” MWSU’s dean commented, “There were faculty involved in the schools who had, in many people’s view, gone sort of native in terms of service; you get involved with the troops out there and you become one of them, forgetting that you are part of the university community and that role has responsibilities in a different way.” The belief that expertise is exclusively demonstrated in writing, as opposed to demonstrated in practice, and that applying existing knowledge in community settings or discovering applied knowledge, especially in partnership with other community “experts,” does not demonstrate that expertise worked against the acceptance and application of the new promotion policies.

*“Research is harder and requires more professional knowledge than service.”* There were conscious and unconscious beliefs, even among those who advocated rewarding multiple forms of scholarship, that research is the “real hard work” of scholarship, and that it is more time-consuming and intellectual than service scholarship. Additionally, some senior faculty and personnel committee members said that, if they rewarded service as scholarship, they feared fewer faculty would choose to “carve out” time for research.

*“They should have the same standards I did.”* Some senior faculty and administrators who had been at their institutions fifteen years or more commented that, to be fair, new faculty should have to live up to the same “harder” standards they had had to endure. These faculty wanted to continue assessing scholarship the “old way” to ensure that junior faculty did not “get over” by changing research requirements. If the unspoken understanding in a particular department in 1980 was that a faculty member needed to have 10 articles in Tier I journals for tenure, some senior faculty believed junior faculty should have the same number of articles completed in 1998, regardless of service scholarship. One way this view manifested itself was in hallway conversations among senior faculty. A senior faculty member at PSU commented, “I don’t know what all the fuss is about. All education faculty work with communities.” She then explained that she and other senior fac-

ulty had been commenting that, when they went up for tenure, they remembered having to engage in this kind of service *and* meet rigid research requirements. This viewpoint shaped some personnel committee members' decisions and negatively influenced the application of new policies to promotion decisions.

*"Real scholarship is published in Tier I journals."* Despite how some senior faculty remembered their own tenure reviews, there were histories, dating back a few years for some institutions and many years for others, of promotion and tenure applications with very little traditional scholarship. By the early 1990s, changes in the academic labor market had brought more traditional scholars to campus. There was a tendency by some committees to compare the scholarly portfolios of traditional and nontraditional scholars and give more praise to the traditional portfolio simply because it was different from the submissions of more "home-grown" faculty. This was most true at Erin and St. Tims but less true at MWSU and PSU. The chair of the personnel committee at Erin College commented:

There was tension. You might think that our faculty would be the first to embrace broader ways of thinking about scholarship and teaching and service but people articulate certain things and then fall back into old frameworks when they are evaluating applicants for promotion so that even though people could articulate, "Yes, scholarship is more than that esoteric piece in that obscure journal," once the esoteric piece was in front of them, they were drooling. You know, it was like—this is real . . . This is REAL scholarship.

Faculty on personnel committees had been trained to understand that the peer review system that governed journal publications was a sanctioned indicator of quality research. These faculty had no experience discerning quality service scholarship and had no way of pointing to any existing rating system for assistance. For example, one personnel committee chair commented:

It is harder to make the case (for service as scholarship) because we don't have the typical indicators for service that we have for research where we can search Citation Index and see how many times people cited your work and say, "You must really be hot stuff because all of these people are using your name in their work." We don't have those kinds of indicators in service.

Consequently when committee members saw research published in Tier I journals, it was hard for them not to believe that it was of greater quality than service scholarship.

*"The best scholarship brings the most prestige to the institution."* An important undercurrent running beneath all promotion and tenure decisions was, "What has/will this candidate do to distinguish the college and, consequently, my position?" Because service scholarship was a newer form of

faculty work with fewer disciplinary and national allegiances, fewer journals, and fewer national methods of dissemination, it also had fewer opportunities than those existing in research to garner national prestige or raise the institution's national rankings. In most cases, it was very difficult for faculty members to demonstrate national impact in a medium that was structurally more local. Newspaper articles, small grants, and even national service awards were not perceived as adding anything substantial to their colleague's "positions." The belief that scholarship should help the institution climb the academic ladder disadvantaged the acceptance and application of the new policies for promotion decisions.

"*We must appear to have high standards.*" MWSU, PSU, and St. Tims's personnel committee members all reported that, in the first few months or years after expanding the definition of scholarship, they experienced pressures to appear to their colleagues as if they were doing a "rigorous assessment" when they evaluated service scholarship portfolios. Committee members said there was a "saving face" aspect of their work after policy implementation that made decisions on service-as-scholarship cases into political statements, rather than objective assessments of faculty work. They believed that promoting someone who emphasized service scholarship might seem as if they were letting "anyone pass through."

### IMPLICATIONS

These findings reveal three interesting challenges for institutions trying to strengthen their service mission, support a diverse faculty, and/or reform faculty roles and rewards.

*The first challenge is acknowledging that reward systems are about who we value as well as what we value.* Increasingly, faculty are responding to calls from the public and from their institution to link their expertise to public concerns (Hollander & Hartley, 2000). Faculty in professional schools most heavily experience these expectations to engage in service scholarship and to do so despite a socialization process and reward system warning that spending time in the community may jeopardize their careers in the university (Checkoway, 2001). The faculty most heavily engaged in service scholarship are also the most marginalized within academic culture—i.e. women, faculty of color, assistant professors (Antonio, Astin & Cress, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Sax et al., 1996). In this study, 90% of the faculty who self-identified as being involved in service scholarship were women and 25% were faculty of color. These findings underscore the argument others have made (Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin 2000) that the values and beliefs sustaining traditional academic reward structures do not support the professional interests of a diverse faculty nor a diverse mission.

Antonio, Astin, and Cress (2000) concluded that, as long as service activities are practiced by marginalized faculty, they will remain marginalized in academe. This study supports these findings, further adding the conclusion that, as long as values and beliefs supporting service scholarship are held by faculty with the least status within the academy, those values and beliefs will remain marginalized in academe. For example, service scholars tend to reject the positivist paradigm that scholars are “detached” experts and instead regard community members as research partners in knowledge production (Checkoway, 2001). As long as faculty invested in the status quo shape the definitions and rewards of faculty work, newer forms of scholarship and values about its creation may not have a voice in academic culture.

My findings suggest that many faculty hold values and beliefs about service scholarship that doubt and devalue its scholarly nature, purpose, and products. Other scholars have noted an ambiguity, lack of readiness, and resistance to assessing, rewarding, and valuing teaching scholarship (Brand, 2000). Given that service and teaching are two primary scholarly interests of women and faculty of color, should we be surprised that these faculty, more than any other, experience less satisfaction with the academic workplace, endure more subtle discrimination, and have greater concerns that they are taken seriously as scholars (Sax et al., 1999)?

Creamer (1998) argued that traditional measures of scholarly output skew productivity ratings toward White and Asian men and away from women and Blacks. Boyer’s (1990) framework for expanding the definition of scholarship was an attempt to mute the trend toward valuing traditional research exclusively by making multiple forms of scholarship visible and by elevating their status within the reward system.

Ultimately, faculty who fulfill their institutions’ mission of sharing and applying knowledge with their community should be rewarded. Asking faculty to do one thing and be rewarded for another is dysfunctional for individuals and for institutions (Checkoway, 2001). Faculty who commit their professional expertise to service scholarship should have the same opportunity to achieve recognition, respect, and standing in the academic hierarchy that faculty involved in other scholarly work are afforded. Institutions committed to attracting and retaining a diverse faculty might consider exploring the forms of scholarship their faculty most value and, if consistent with their mission, find ways to integrate this scholarly work, values, and commitments into their reward systems.

*A second challenge posed by this study is the need to make contradictions visible.* This study suggests that, even when official policy language includes the evaluation and reward of multiple forms of scholarship, conscious and unconscious values and beliefs held by faculty facilitating the reward system can prevent newer forms of scholarly work from being accepted and

rewarded. Data from this study demonstrate the critical role that values and beliefs play in organizational culture and change.

Administrators and faculty can initiate dialogue about the values and beliefs that shape faculty work-life in several ways. One of the most effective ways to highlight the differences between espoused values and enacted values is to develop an awareness of contradictions (Love, 1997; Peterson, Cameron, Mets, Jones, & Ettington, 1986). For example, administrators can gather information about promotion and tenure cases in aggregate form and point out to personnel committees, department chairs, and faculty that their institution says it rewards service scholarship but did not award tenure to any of the applicants with strong service portfolios in the past three years, without delving into individual cases. This approach can facilitate a discussion focused on underlying values of institutional identity and direction, the nature of scholarship, and faculty careers. Values and beliefs that support and discourage the valuing of multiple forms of scholarship could be explored. Intentionally using elements of the culture to introduce dissonance about faculty roles and rewards may allow critical analyses of institutional values and philosophy (Love, 1997). By doing this, the institution and individual members might "evoke their better nature" (Burns, 1978, qtd. in Bolman and Deal, 1991, p. 314) and decide to work toward greater congruence between what they say they value and what really counts in faculty rewards.

*The third challenge implied in these findings is the question of fairness.* What is fair? At the heart of faculty anxiety about promotion and tenure seems to be the question, "What will my colleagues value?" The answer, of course, lies both within and outside of official faculty evaluation policy. Faculty evaluation, like education, will always be shaped by history, relations of power, values, and assumptions. Given this reality, debates about "appropriate scholarship" should be unpacked within departments before candidates are evaluated. Otherwise the discrepancy between espoused values and actual values will hurt academic careers and thwart institutional goals. Tenure and promotion are the valuing of people's professional lives. If nothing else, this process should not take place in the dark.

## REFERENCES

- ACE. (1999). *On change III: Taking charge of change: A Primer for colleges and universities*. An occasional paper of the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation. Washington, DC: ACE.
- Antonio, A., Astin, H., & Cress, C. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-397.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bellas, M., & Toutkoushian, R. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race, and family effects. *Review of Higher Education, 22*(4), 367–390.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham, Eng.: Open University Press.
- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *Four cultures of the academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Biglan, A. (1973) The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 195–203.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brand, M. (2000). Changing faculty roles in research universities: Using the pathways strategy. *Change, 32*(6), 42–45.
- Braxton, J., Luckey, W., Helland, P., Coneal, W., & Carey, S. (2000, November). *The institutionalization of Boyer's four domains of scholarship by institutional type and by academic discipline*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Burns, G. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Campoy, R. W. (1996, March). Teacher education goes to school. *American School Board Journal, 32–34*.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1976). *A classification of institutions of higher education* (Rev. ed). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chait, R. (1998). *Ideas in incubation: Three possible modifications to traditional tenure policies*. American Association for Higher Education, New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry No. 9. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Checkoway, B. (2001) Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 125–147.
- Creamer, E. (1998). *Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 26, No. 2. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Gamson, Z. F., & Finnegan, D. E. (1996). Disciplinary adaptations to research culture in comprehensive institutions. *Review of Higher Education, 19*(2), 141–177.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilkie, P. K. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor analysis results form a national study. *Research in Higher Education, 24*, 266–286.

- Hollander, E., & Hartley, M. (2000) Civic renewal in higher education: The state of the movement and the need for a natural network. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Higher education and civic responsibility*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryz Press.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). Scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 31(5), 11–15.
- Kirshstein, R. J. (1997, March). *What faculty do? A look at academic work*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lindquist, J. (1978). *Strategies for change*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.
- Love, P. (1997). Contradiction and paradox: Attempting to change the culture of sexual orientation at a small Catholic college. *Review of Higher Education*, 20(4), 381–398.
- Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Mallon, W. (2002) Why is tenure one college's problem and another's solution? In R. P. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure* (pp. 246–272). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K. S., Mets, L. A., Jones, P., & Ettington, D. (1986) *The organizational context for teaching and learning: A review of the research literature*. Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.
- Ramaley, J. (1999, July). *Concluding plenary session: What are the priorities? What are the next steps? What have we learned*. Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.
- Rice, E. (1986, January). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. *Teaching Sociology*, 12–23.
- Rice, E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry No. 1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rice, E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry No. 7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Sax, L. J., Astin, A., Arredondo, M., & Korn, W. S. (1996). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1995–96 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. S. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Currency Doubleday.



- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.). *Developing new and junior faculty*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning (Vol. 50, pp. 27–37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sanderson, A., Phua, V. C., & Herda, D. (1999). *The American faculty poll: Final report*. New York: TIAA-CREF.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996) *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Viechnicki, K. J., Yanity, D., & Olinski, R. (1997, March). *Action research in a school/university partnership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, No. 5. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.