Maintaining a Culture of Engagement: Challenges and Opportunities in an Evolving Institution

BY GLEN HAHN COPE AND MARYA L. LEATHERWOOD

Abstract

This article considers the challenges and opportunities facing one university whose primary mission has, since its inception, encouraged faculty engagement and outreach. Changing student and faculty populations, accreditation standards for professional schools, and the realities of balancing teaching, scholarship, and service, create new challenges and opportunities for continuing to integrate engagement and scholarship. In order to maintain a culture of engagement, outreach and engagement must be included in an integrated concept of faculty roles.

Colleges and universities, like business and public organizations and the geographic regions of the larger society of which they are a part, have distinct and identifiable institutional cultures. A particular university culture may or may not be actively designed and cultivated, but an identifiable culture eventually emerges in any university from the values and priorities held by its faculty, administration, staff, and students. In some cases, there may be competing cultures that emerge in different parts of the university, and in most cases different nuances of cultural values evolve over time as the university changes, often leading to fundamental changes in the university's culture. Such change may be slow and may not be perceptible until the cumulative small changes have combined to produce a larger and more obvious change apparent to an outside observer. However, overt attempts to change the culture of a university are fraught with difficulties and are not always successful, as is often the case in any attempt to change an organization's culture (Schein 1992).

Organization theorist Edgar Schein defines the culture of a group or organization as "A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (p.12). In a college or university, those shared assumptions include the faculty's values concerning research, publication, teaching, and service activities that are embedded in standards and rules related to faculty recruitment and hiring, tenure and promotion, salaries, merit pay, and other faculty personnel policies. These assumptions are held by the existing faculty and communicated to newly hired faculty through both formal and informal mechanisms. Developing and maintaining a culture of engagement in a university requires that engagement become one of the shared values or assumptions held by the faculty, either by design from the beginning, as a part of the continuing adaptation and change usually

occurring in the slow evolution of a university's culture, or as a determined effort to change the culture in order to foster engagement.

This paper explores the challenges and opportunities of maintaining a culture of engagement in a university that was designed from its inception to be engaged in public affairs activities, community service, and outreach.

A Thirty-Year Culture of Engagement

The University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) was founded in 1969 as Sangamon State University, an upper division and graduate university with a public affairs mission located in the state capital. The vision of the founders, as ratified by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the General Assembly, was to create an engaged university, one that had a mandate to emphasize public affairs education and to be involved in the community. The university's founding president fostered this vision by hiring faculty members at all ranks who valued community service and outreach, as well as excellence in teaching. He created and maintained a campus culture that valued teaching, active community involvement, and public service by both students and faculty. This was done through several mechanisms. One of these methods was the famous "blue memo" (so-called because it was always printed on blue paper) that was sent to all faculty when they were offered positions at the university. The blue memo stated clearly the expectations that faculty would both be excellent teachers and would engage in community service and outreach. The message was quite clear that faculty who did not accept these mandates as appropriate or desirable should not accept positions at the university.

One of the assumptions on which this university's culture of engagement was built was that experiential learning was beneficial and desirable for both students and faculty. In addition to active learning techniques in the classroom, experiential learning included internships known as "applied study terms" for undergraduate students as well as for graduate students, inclusion of community outreach and involvement projects in course requirements, and community service as either curricular or extracurricular activities. This was institutionalized through the development of interdisciplinary upper division general education courses on public affairs issues that are still required of all students and often include community outreach and involvement as part of the course requirements. Students must complete twelve hours of course work in a combination of at least two of the three types of upper division general education courses: applied study term, public affairs colloquium, and liberal studies colloquium. The public affairs colloquia are focused on current public issues of the day, while liberal studies colloquia emphasize writing and can be of a more historical or literary nature. All three types of upper division general education are intended to broaden the students' horizons beyond their majors and to encourage community engagement and understanding.

The founders' philosophy of requiring community engagement was not limited to students, however. The blue memo also proposed a sort of faculty internship called the "community experience" term. Originally envisioned as an academic quarter spent at full salary in community involvement of some type, this faculty experience was pro-

posed to be required of every faculty member every nine semesters, not as a sabbatical but as part of the regular professional development of the faculty member. The faculty community experience term was intended to keep faculty in touch with the "real world" of work in the community that their students would enter upon graduation. The faculty member might work in a community project or might even teach at another school or university of a different character. Since the experience was not to be for profit, but rather for experience, it could not be spent consulting or completing an individual research project, and thus the faculty member's full salary was to be supported by the university. While this proposal was never implemented, most faculty members readily accepted the philosophy it expressed and some used their sabbatical leaves for engagement in community activities in the spirit of this proposal.

A related assumption of the university's founders was that teaching, service, and scholarship were competitive demands on faculty time and effort. That is, if a faculty member spent sufficient time on teaching-related work to be an excellent teacher, he or she would have significantly less time for scholarly or service activities. Since service activities, outreach, and engagement were also strongly encouraged in the early culture of the university, scholarship was seen as less necessary. The university was specifically trying to counter the "publish or perish" mentality of most research universities at the time, and instead chose to emphasize teaching excellence, faculty availability to students to advise them and guide their scholarly pursuits and learning, and community engagement and service as the primary values of the institution.

The main methods of developing and maintaining a university culture that gave primacy to teaching and engagement in the early years of the university were the blue memo, for as long as it was distributed to prospective and new faculty; recruitment and hiring practices and criteria; and personnel policies that established the reward systems for tenure and promotion. After the blue memo was no longer in active use, faculty still wrote job descriptions that were intended to recruit colleagues who valued teaching and community service. Personnel policies emphasized the importance of teaching excellence as the most important value and public service or community engagement as also very important. Promotion and tenure decisions were made on the basis of the criteria of teaching and service or scholarship, although the latter was not encouraged. While it was unwritten, there was a philosophy among many faculty members that if research were encouraged, this would lead inevitably to the "publish or perish" mentality. Service or community engagement, on the other hand, would lead to reinforcement of the values of community and experiential learning that had been at the forefront of campus values since the beginning.

Another early influence on the university's culture of engagement was the external environment of the 1970s, in which faculty engagement and activism were acceptable and encouraged, especially in certain social science and humanities disciplines. Throughout the years since the university's founding, this culture was maintained by valuing and rewarding service as an integral part of the criteria for faculty retention, tenure, and promotion. Many of the faculty attracted to the university and hired in the

1970s were activists either in their fields or involved in community and national issues, or both. The anti-Vietnam war and the environmental movements were strong on college campuses throughout the nation at that time, and many of the faculty involved in them were attracted to a non-traditional campus that valued activism and teaching. They chose not to work in research universities and rejected their "publish or perish" values in favor of activism, community involvement, and teaching excellence. They professed to be more interested in making a difference in their fields or in their community than in publishing esoteric articles in obscure journals. Individuals who already held these values in graduate school or in their early academic positions were naturally attracted to a university in which these values and activities were encouraged and actively rewarded.

In addition, there was significant anti-government sentiment among the faculty in the early 1970s, leading many faculty members to have mixed feelings about working for government agencies—even state or local ones—on contracts or grants. There was a desire to be involved, but also a fear of being co-opted and a strong anti-authoritarian sentiment that discouraged some faculty from seeking government grants or contracts even though the university had a strong public affairs mission. Many faculty members in public affairs and business fields, however, eventually began to consider working with state or local government agencies and nonprofit organizations on projects that benefited the community or state, especially in the social or human services fields, to be different from seeking federal grants. This led eventually to a strong focus on public service activities at the state level by many faculty, along with the continuing activism of their colleagues in social and environmental movements outside government. The energy generated by the active engagement of faculty in the first decades of the university's history was contagious, helping to maintain the culture among junior faculty as they were hired, as well as among the students.

Building on this culture of activism, community engagement at UIS has continued to evolve throughout the past thirty years. In order to organize the public service activities of the university and manage the grants and contracts that were received by various centers and other public service units, the university formed the Institute for Public Affairs (IPA). IPA consists of several centers and units that are actively engaged in research, evaluation, consulting, and training on public affairs issues, as well as operating the university's public radio station and publishing *Illinois Issues* magazine. The IPA is funded in part by the university's state-appropriated budget and in part by grants and contracts from state agencies, foundations, federal agencies, and other external sources. Through joint appointments and "non-instructional assignments" that give faculty members course release time to engage in service, research, or training activities, the IPA encourages and provides incentives to faculty members to be involved in projects that benefit state agencies or local communities. One of the projects funded through the IPA by a combination of grants and appropriations is The Springfield Project, a partnership of the university with individuals from one of Springfield's most run-down and depressed neighborhoods. After several years of operation, the university and the Springfield project received a federal Community Outreach Partnership

(COPC) grant to further the Springfield Project's community involvement. In addition to these projects, the IPA is also engaged in evaluation studies of the state Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program and many other projects. This sort of engagement in community and state activities has been typical throughout the university's history and is also similar to engagement by other universities in recent years (Plein, Williams, and Hardwick 2000).

The result of these deliberate and coincidental influences was a university in which teaching was primary, the culture of engagement was ingrained, and traditional research, especially research that needed government contracts or grants to succeed, and publication in mainstream journals were less important and not necessarily valued. In the more than thirty years since its founding, external and internal pressures, changes in faculty and administrative personnel, and a merger with a larger university system anchored by a flagship research university have challenged those assumptions and values. Thus, while the culture of engagement was intentionally established and has been continued in some form, maintaining and continuing it as a strongly held value among the faculty and administration is at once a challenge and an opportunity.

The current mission statement of the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) states that the university "…emphasizes public affairs instruction, research, and service carried out through community partnerships that contribute to social progress, governmental effectiveness, educational excellence, and economic development…." Current UIS faculty personnel policies emphasize the importance of service, as well as scholarship and teaching, in retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. More than in many other institutions, public or community service by faculty continues to be valued and to be considered in promotion and tenure decisions, over 30 years after the university's founding.

A Critical Crossroads

Although the university has a history of successful engagement in community service both by faculty members individually and through the Institute for Public Affairs, it is now poised at a critical crossroads, leading to questions about how to maintain this focus in the future. In the past six years, several major changes have forced the university to change and grow in both planned and unexpected ways. In 1995, the university became part of the University of Illinois, as its third and smallest campus, as a result of a legislative reorganization of higher education in the state. In fall 1998, after ten years of planning and proposals for approval by the state Board of Higher Education, the first doctoral program began at UIS in public administration. In fall 2001, also after about ten years of planning and as a result of a lengthy approval process, the campus became a full-four-year university for the first time when its first class of first-year students enrolled in the Capital Scholars program. Capital Scholars is an honors-type program for excellent undergraduate students that includes an integrated general education program for the first two years followed by the normal requirements in their chosen majors in their last two years. Finally, as a result of retirements, the university gained a new chancellor and a new provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs in 2001, both from outside the university.

The merger with the University of Illinois is perhaps the most significant of these changes, since the new lower division and doctoral programs, while significant in their impact on faculty workloads and campus life, are natural extensions of the upper division and master's degree programs already in place. The University of Illinois campuses at Urbana-Champaign and Chicago are each well-known research universities. The Chicago campus hosts a major medical college and a recent tradition of nationally recognized medical and bioengineering research. The Urbana-Champaign campus is the original land-grant campus in the state with its traditions of research excellence in agriculture, engineering, and, most recently, super-computing. In contrast, Sangamon State University, prior to the merger, emphasized excellence in teaching and strongly encouraged outreach and community service. The University of Illinois, unlike some other multi-campus university systems, however, is an integrated university with a philosophy of one university, three campuses. Most of the business and human resources systems are fully integrated across all three campuses. Only the academic and student affairs activities of the campuses are separate, although all of the computer systems supporting those functions are also integrated. Thus, the merger that brought UIS into the University of Illinois family also led to a need to examine how institutions with very different cultures could become one university.

The changes at UIS that have resulted from the merger have been subtle, but profound. The merger reinforced the trend that had already begun at UIS toward a greater interest in faculty research and publication, but not necessarily at the expense of teaching or outreach and engagement. The land-grant mission of the University of Illinois had always stressed the value of outreach activities, through such units as the agricultural extension service. In the mid-1990s the leadership of the University of Illinois in the use of the Internet and World Wide Web and its interest in outreach led to the development of an online database of public affairs and outreach activities accessible to the public. UIS contributed a significant number of these activities outside of agriculture and medicine, a fact that was noticed and appreciated by the University of Illinois administration.

It became clear as the various academic components of the university worked together over the past six years through the Senates' Conference (a representative body of the three campus senates), administrative channels, and other cooperative activities, that while UIS needed to develop a culture somewhat more conducive to scholarly publication than in its early years, it did not need to abandon its commitment to teaching excellence or community engagement. It was beneficial to the University of Illinois to have a smaller campus that was different from the others, and that emphasized public affairs in the state capital. The UIS public affairs mission and faculty commitment to teaching and service, accompanied by research and publication appropriately linked with the university's mission, would benefit the university as a whole. The campus needed to evolve in a slightly different direction, but did not need to abandon its roots or profoundly change its educational philosophy.

One difference since the merger that has implications for maintaining the campus culture of engagement has been seen in the faculty recruitment process. Faculty who

are recruited to UIS now respond to a university identified with the University of Illinois, albeit its smallest campus. The prior status of the campus as a sort of counter-culture university is no longer obvious or valid. The faculty now being attracted to UIS, therefore, are sometimes more research oriented and are not as likely to have come from academic cultures that value engagement. The predominance of public affairs disciplines on campus tends to temper this tendency somewhat, however, because in fields like public administration and social work the value of service and engagement is still very strong nationally. This change in the academic values of some of the individuals in the faculty recruitment pools has led to the need for both more specific search criteria that include service and engagement and the need for more socialization of new faculty if the culture of engagement is to be maintained.

Both the merger and other societal and economic trends have led to changes in the student body of the university, as well. For the first twenty years or more of the university's history, the primary educational emphasis was on serving semi- or non-traditional students who were older and often employed in either public or private sector organizations in the city and region. In the early years of the university, it was completely a commuter institution, but eventually university housing was built in the form of apartments for both single and married students. Even with on-campus housing, however, only about ten percent of the students live on campus. The rest commute to campus, and many of them attend part-time. Faculty at UIS have learned to teach students who are older and have considerably more work and life experience than traditional age students, often by encouraging students to build on their experiences in class discussions and assignments. Many of the older students are also committed to community service and value the opportunity to attend a university that is engaged in the community.

While nearly half of the university's students are enrolled in graduate study, the proportion of undergraduates is expected to rise considerably over the next decade, including both those entering as first-year students and attending for four years, as well as transfer students who will attend either full or part time for two years or the equivalent in part-time semesters. This will greatly increase the population of traditional-age students on campus who have little or no work experience and may have very different expectations about their educational experiences from the part-time students who have traditionally comprised the bulk of the UIS student body. All of these changes are challenging the faculty to rethink how they can teach different types of students and how they can maintain and encourage the values of public and community service both in the classroom and in extracurricular activities.

The merger and these changes in the student body and in the new faculty have led to an increased interest in research and publication on the part of the faculty, including some of the senior faculty, and in the university's expectations regarding scholarly activities of the faculty. While UIS is not likely to adopt research as its primary mission, faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activities in their fields and to publish the results in appropriate journals or as books. Junior faculty members who are unsure of

their future career paths are now much more motivated to do research than in the past and to publish in respected academic journals. The faculty personnel policies regarding scholarship requirements for tenure and promotion reflect these trends. They are based on the Carnegie Foundation/Ernest Boyer model of scholarship that describes four types of scholarship: scholarship of discovery, or traditional original research; scholarship of integration; scholarship of application; and scholarship of teaching (Boyer 1990). Using this model, faculty personnel decisions at UIS can remain true to the intent of the founders and the public affairs mission of the university that emphasizes teaching and service, while at the same time rewarding faculty who engage in any of the types of scholarship described by Boyer.

Much of the research done by faculty at UIS has been and continues to be applied research, or the scholarship of application, in conjunction with the public affairs mission of the university and its commitment to engagement in the community, and building on the service activities of the faculty. Since a significant portion of this scholarship results from faculty members' service and community activities, it has become necessary to distinguish between service activities of the faculty and scholarship of application. Boyer draws a clear distinction between the scholarship of application and citizenship, or service. To be considered scholarship of application, the activity must be directly linked to the faculty member's field of knowledge and relate to his or her professional activity. Scholarship of application interacts with practice in a dynamic way so that the act of applying knowledge also gives rise to new intellectual understanding that can inform both theory and practice (Boyer 1990).

One way to distinguish between the complementary activities of scholarship of application and service, or engagement, is to consider the publication of the results of the activity in appropriate professional journals or books as evidence that it is scholarship of application rather than a service activity. This is not a perfect solution, however, and one current issue on campus is how to assess the scholarship of application as well as the other types of scholarship in order to make good, informed tenure and promotion decisions that are consistent with the university's culture. This is not a unique problem, but one with which many universities are struggling. The companion volume to Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* is *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professorate* (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997). The university has been using both of these books for the past several years as guides in the effort to develop methods for evaluation of both service activities and scholarship of application in the various personnel processes, especially tenure and promotion. New faculty members are given copies of these books at the new faculty orientation sessions, and they have been the basis of several faculty seminars in recent years.

The changes described here have been more subtle than overt, and have happened over a period of years beginning before the merger but accelerating somewhat since then. The university remains committed to teaching excellence, to a culture of engagement, and to scholarship under its new campus leadership as part of the University of Illinois.

Future Challenges

Changes in both the types of students being taught and the scholarship expectations of the faculty are challenging the university to adapt to these new situations while still maintaining a culture of engagement and outreach. The mission of the university encourages faculty involvement with public policy, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, education, the arts, criminal justice, and human services, as reflected by the curriculum and faculty activities. As new faculty are hired, however, and most of the founding faculty and those who were hired in the early years retire, the expectations, values, and academic cultures brought to campus by new faculty may differ significantly from the existing campus culture. At the same time, the numbers of those who are available to pass on that culture to new faculty in order to foster and maintain it have diminished. This leads to several challenges that must be addressed if the culture of engagement is to be maintained and nurtured.

These critical challenges are:
1. How can we continue to balance teaching, service, and scholarship in an equitable manner that allows for individual faculty development and renewal?
2. How can we ensure that successful accreditation of our professional colleges and programs can be attained and/or maintained when traditional scholarship remains a standard for some accrediting bodies?
3. How can we maintain our objectivity and independence when the primary sources of local grants and contracts are state agencies in the capital city in which the university is located?
4. How can we create a long-term incentive structure that encourages engagement and the scholarship of application while ensuring that faculty careers are maintained in the disciplines and professional programs?
5. How can we effectively recruit new faculty to the university who share a common value for engagement?

These challenges and the opportunities they present for "making a place for the new American scholar" (Rice 1996) for the UIS campus, and probably for other universities as well, are discussed below.

Balancing Teaching, Service, and Scholarship

First, the university must address the issue of continuing to balance teaching, service, and scholarship in an equitable manner that allows for individual faculty development and renewal. In the early years of the campus, when the primary concern in promotion and tenure decisions was the quality of teaching, and when faculty in many disciplines and interdisciplinary programs were hired specifically with the mandate to be engaged in some sort of public affairs activity, this issue was perhaps easier to resolve. Now, over 30 years later, faculty are expected to engage in scholarship that is peer reviewed (most often demonstrated by publications), to be excellent teachers, and to be involved in professional and community service. Except for faculty who are hired in the College of Public Affairs and Administration in public affairs-related programs and those who

are hired with joint appointments in the Institute for Public Affairs specifically to engage in service activities and research, new faculty members are no longer hired with a mandate to be engaged in public affairs activities. The blue memo is no longer sent to new faculty members, and the standards for promotion and tenure now emphasize teaching and scholarship much more than service.

Use of the Carnegie/Boyer model of scholarship helps to address this issue, as do the UIS faculty personnel policies that provide for faculty to be tenured and promoted to associate professor if they are excellent teachers and also perform well in one of the other two categories of professional growth and development: scholarship and service. Because faculty members applying for tenure can choose to emphasize service rather than scholarship as their second area of excellence in addition to teaching, faculty who engage in community service can count that activity toward tenure, as long as they are also excellent teachers. When faculty apply for promotion from associate professor to professor, however, according to the faculty personnel policies, faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellent records in all three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The emphasis on service continues throughout the two levels of promotion, but excellence in scholarship also must be demonstrated in order for a faculty member to be promoted to professor. Thus, there is a need to continue to balance these sometimes competing demands (UIS Faculty Personnel Policies 2001).

The current UIS faculty personnel policy defines service as including service to the university, the discipline, and the external community. Service to the external community is defined as including but not limited to: "contributions to community activities or agencies which are based on the specific professional expertise or skills of the faculty member; transmission and dissemination of knowledge to public and/or private entities as a public service; improvement in the cultural and/or educational climate of the community; and public affairs service efforts, activities, and programs which educate in public affairs. Community service is desirable, but those activities which are open to any responsible citizen will not normally be considered as part of a faculty member's professional performance" (UIS Faculty Personnel Policies, pp. 21-22). Since the definition of service includes service to the discipline and the university, not all service activities that count for tenure and promotion decisions will involve engagement in the community. Some faculty members will be involved in university governance activities, for example, and others in disciplinary service through their professional associations. There is still a strong emphasis on service to the community, however, even among new faculty members, that is part of the legacy of the original campus culture.

Because the university uses the Boyer model of scholarship for tenure and promotion decisions, applied scholarship is encouraged and allowed as part of a faculty member's scholarly record at both the tenure/promotion to associate professor level and the level of promotion to full professor. This model allows faculty members engaged in community service to count at least some service work as scholarship if they publish articles related to their service activities in appropriate places or otherwise demonstrate that they are engaged in the scholarship of application in addition to or as part of their

service activities. For example, in public administration and a number of other social science fields, case studies often are used as part of the data sources for applied studies of various topics, and field studies also are frequent sources for research and analysis of social and community issues. If case studies or field studies developed in service activities are then published as applied scholarship or as teaching cases or materials (making them part of the scholarship of teaching in the latter case), they could then be counted as scholarship.

While not all public service or outreach activities lead to opportunities for applied scholarship and to publications, at least some of them are likely to result in publications in public affairs fields (Plein, Williams, and Hardwick 2000). This gives public affairs scholars an advantage over those in many other disciplines because of the multitude of outlets that are available for publishing articles related to outreach and community service activities. The potential to publish in these journals allows faculty in public affairs fields to include articles on applied research activities in their scholarly publication records much more easily than faculty in other disciplines. These journals might not necessarily be considered appropriate or acceptable for tenure or promotion consideration for faculty in some other disciplines, especially those with particular accreditation requirements in disciplines unrelated to the particular service or applied scholarship. Nonetheless, the number of journals that publish articles related to outreach and community service are increasing in many fields. Similarly, because of the emphasis placed on teaching at UIS, faculty who can incorporate case studies or student projects related to their community service activities into their classes also can count these activities as part of their teaching record; or if they develop teaching materials or write about their activities, this may be counted as scholarship of teaching, thus contributing to their scholarship record. Fortunately, journals emphasizing teaching and learning, pedagogy, assessment, and related scholarship of teaching are increasing in number, thus affording faculty in all disciplines more opportunities to publish such articles. Thus, service activities can contribute more significantly to the faculty member's professional development than if they were counted only as community service.

Maintaining the balance that allows community service to count in tenure and promotion decisions and in annual evaluations for merit pay (done at UIS by a peer review process in the departments and/or colleges) requires a common understanding of the importance and value of service to be present in all disciplines, not just those in public affairs departments. This may require more attention as the university moves farther away from the founding vision. The ability to incorporate some service activities into teaching or scholarship will help encourage some faculty members to perform more service and be more engaged in the community, but for this to remain a strong value among the faculty in the future, it will have to be reinforced frequently.

Incorporation of the concepts of community service and engagement in new faculty orientations, inclusion of this topic and its importance for the university in the occasional faculty development seminars, and attention to the issue in tenure and promotion discussions and merit pay evaluations all are possible ways to maintain the importance

of outreach and service in the future. By continuing to emphasize service as an important component of the evaluation and decision-making process along with scholarship and teaching, the university will be more likely to reward those who have a balanced approach that includes community outreach and engagement.

Ensuring Accreditation Can Be Attained and Retained

The second challenge the university faces concerns how accreditation and reaccreditation of our professional colleges and programs can be attained when traditional scholarship remains a standard for some accrediting bodies. Two possibilities present themselves. First, many accrediting bodies are beginning to include engagement and outreach as important contributions a university or particular professional program can make to its community. Involvement in accreditation activities and accrediting organizations by faculty from engaged universities may be necessary and desirable to help in rewriting some of the standards to include applied scholarship or community service as well as traditional research and teaching as part of the faculty qualifications. Second, by incorporating the Carnegie models of scholarship and assessment into personnel policies, universities can send a strong signal to the accrediting bodies that while they value traditional research, applied research and community service are also important.

In the field of public administration, the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation of the National Association of Schools and Programs in Public Affairs and Administration includes in its *Standards* the faculty member's consulting, service, and outreach activities as well as published research and excellence in teaching as criteria for faculty quality. The accreditation process is mission-driven, so that Master of Public Administration (MPA) programs can vary from the standards a little in order to achieve their mission, but in general must meet the standards for curriculum, governance, and student affairs in order to be accredited. These standards also require involvement of public administration practitioners in the instructional activities of the schools or programs that are being accredited (Commission on Peer Review and Administration 1999). For this reason, encouraging faculty engagement in applied research and/or service activities while successfully seeking accreditation or reaccreditation is not as difficult in public administration as in other fields. It does require that university policies allow—if not encourage—faculty involvement in community service and outreach and that the missions of public administration programs include community outreach, engagement, and public service. Similarly, the university's and program's tenure and promotion policies should include the scholarship of application (or applied research) as one of the scholarship options, so as not to penalize public administration scholars and those in other fields who engage in applied rather than basic research. UIS policies and the public administration program's mission include these factors.

The situation in other professional schools is a little different, however. In the early 1990s, AACSB revised its accreditation standards for schools of business. The mission-based standards neither encourage nor discourage engagement and outreach. Nor do

they only recognize traditional forms of research as being acceptable forms of intellectual contribution activity. Instead, the standards require schools of business to provide evidence of the alignment between the types of intellectual contributions of the faculty and the mission of the school.

The mission-based standards allow schools of business to include engagement and outreach as important and valued contributions by faculty. However, in addition to these activities meeting the standard's requirements of being appropriate to the school's mission, "…the outputs from intellectual contributions should be available for public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners" (AACSB 2000). Thus, schools of business seeking accreditation will be challenged to find ways to publicly disseminate the results obtained from engagement and outreach to their professional and academic peers. This could be done through some of the same outlets available to other scholars, but if so, the journals would have to fit the mission of the school of business sufficiently to be acceptable for consideration as a peer review source for the professional qualifications of the faculty members involved.

Schools of social work, education, and other professional disciplines have still different accreditation standards. The accreditation standards for social work programs are more compatible with community engagement than are those of many other disciplines. Colleges and schools of education allow for service and applied research on the part of their faculty, as do a number of other professional schools. On the other hand, professional accreditation in fields like law and medicine are less concerned with community engagement than with technical competencies, even if applied scholarship is acceptable. If professional schools with a lesser involvement in community service are influential at a university, this may affect campus-wide tenure and promotion standards. UIS does not have a college of medicine or of law, but programs in both education and social work at UIS are accredited, and both have faculty who are strongly engaged in the community.

Maintaining a Reputation for Independence and Objectivity

The third challenge involves maintaining the university's objectivity and independence when the primary sources of local grants and contracts are state agencies in our capital city location. This is an issue that the Institute for Public Affairs has had to address, as have other university public affairs programs and institutes all over the country, especially those located in capital cities. The answer to this dilemma is that a high level of integrity and a determination to maintain objectivity and independence are the keys to success. Once a reputation has been established that an institute, center, program, or individual faculty member will always be independent, objective, fair, and open in grant and contract work and consulting, those offering grants and contracts will accept this as the normal situation. Compromising that integrity, however, whether in the beginning or at any point in the organization's or individual's history will make it very difficult to retain a reputation for independence and objectivity.

Universities are expected by most state agencies to be independent, nonpartisan, and objective. If in each contract it is explained that this will be the practice and that the results cannot be compromised, this will generally be accepted. If that is not what the agency wants, they must be advised to go elsewhere and the contract or grant cannot be accepted. Constant vigilance is required, as well as the courage to forego grants or contracts that would compromise these principles. It has been the authors' experience in several universities that if these principles are strongly held and insisted upon, they will be respected by private and public grantors and contractors, thus allowing the university to maintain its independence and objectivity.

The experience of faculty members and the Institute for Public affairs at UIS has confirmed the assertion that funding agencies will respect the university's objectivity. Some reports have been written that did not confirm the agency's preconceived ideas about the results, for example, but in most cases this has not resulted in a loss of future grants or contracts. In the few cases where problems have occurred because of objectivity, it has generally been found that there was a misunderstanding of expectations from the beginning. When expectations are clear, the contracting or granting agency prefers the university unit or faculty member to have a strong reputation for objectivity and to uphold it. Then when the results of a project are favorable they still have great credibility, which benefits both the university and the agency.

Encouraging Engagement
While Retaining Disciplinary Focus

A fourth challenge for the university involves the development of a long-term incentive structure that encourages engagement and the scholarship of application while ensuring that faculty careers are maintained in the disciplines. This is perhaps the most difficult issue to address successfully. Within a university, if engagement and outreach are encouraged and the scholarship of application is acceptable or desirable as evidence of successful research in tenure and promotion decisions, then faculty engaged in such scholarship can be rewarded in the tenure and promotion processes, thus contributing to the success of their faculty careers. This does not guarantee that other universities will also recognize these scholarly contributions as valid and acceptable, however.

If in the long term most universities accept and adopt the Carnegie models of scholarship and assessment of scholarship, then the scholarship of application will become more universally accepted and rewarded (see Boyer 1990 and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997). This will allow faculty members who engage in the scholarship of application to be accepted and rewarded as scholars within the larger community of scholars in the same way that faculty who engage in the more traditional scholarship of discovery or original basic research are rewarded. Until this is the case, however, faculty members (especially junior faculty) who engage in scholarship of application may need to be coached in how to write articles on applied projects that are sufficiently scholarly and possibly even somewhat theoretical in nature to be acceptable to more traditional journals. They also may need to be coached in where to publish in order to

develop an acceptable research record based on the scholarship of application. Without such acceptance, it may be more difficult for faculty engaged in community service and outreach activities in larger proportions than would be traditional and for those engaged in the scholarship of application to develop strong reputations as scholars.

Engaging in applied scholarship will be less readily accepted in some traditional disciplines than in other more professional fields. Thus, in public administration, environmental studies, public health, social work, education, and business administration, for example, it may be easier to gain acceptance for applied research and to develop a reputation as a scholar on the basis of such research and service activities than it would be in a traditional discipline such as English, French, or history. A university that wants to develop and maintain a culture of engagement may not need to require or even encourage these activities by all of the faculty, if a sufficient number of faculty in fields where it is acceptable to engage in applied scholarship and service are so engaged. Establishment of a culture of engagement on the basis that some faculty in disciplines conducive to it are involved in community service and applied research, while others are not, however, requires that the promotion, tenure, and salary reward systems recognize the value of such work and do not penalize it.

A similar issue relates to selection of faculty for sabbaticals and non-instructional assignments or course releases in order to engage in service activities as well as or in place of more traditional curriculum development or scholarly research activities. Where sabbaticals are expected to result in the achievement of theoretical break-throughs or significant publications, for example, those criteria may need to be modified in order to allow faculty members to use sabbatical leaves for more applied activities. In order to encourage faculty development and renewal in a wide variety of disciplines and through traditional and nontraditional means, selection criteria for sabbaticals and course releases also should take into consideration the outreach and service activities of faculty members, as well as their teaching and traditional scholarship records. If criteria for selecting sabbatical recipients allow or even encourage sabbatical proposals that include community outreach components, these activities are more likely to be approved and to be accepted not only for sabbaticals and course releases, but also in promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

Recruiting Faculty Who Value Engagement

The final challenge that the university must address is recruiting new faculty members who share a common value for engagement. This is, in many ways, one of the more difficult challenges. Generally an individual within an organization will be more likely to do what is rewarded. If community outreach and service are valued and rewarded, therefore, at least some of the faculty will respond to that reward system and engage in activities in line with the reward system and values. In many disciplines, however, characteristics for which faculty will be recruited and rewarded at the departmental level will include primarily disciplinary expertise and good teaching rather than outreach and service. If the goal is to recruit only faculty who are committed to outreach

and engagement, it is not likely to succeed because of the competing need for departments to choose faculty members who meet their programs' teaching needs and the scholarly reputations of their departments. On the other hand, if the goal is to recruit some faculty who are interested in outreach and service as well as scholarship and teaching, and who may become and remain engaged in the community, possibly leading others to join them, then the goal is more reachable.

Faculty in applied, professional fields such as public administration, political science, social work, human services, criminal justice, public health, environmental studies, management, business administration, and education are more likely to be interested in applied research and community engagement. Paying attention to their interests and making outreach and community engagement formal criteria in faculty searches in those fields are likely to assist departments in recruiting new faculty who will become engaged in the community. Paying attention to the outreach and service criteria in searches for faculty members in fields that are likely to value service more highly in the first place is also more likely to result in hires who value engagement than would formal requirements attached to searches in fields that are less likely to value and reward community service and outreach. In other words, having an engaged university does not require all faculty to be engaged in community service, but it does require that some will continue to be involved and will recruit others to assist them.

Recruitment of new faculty members who value engagement and public service also necessitates a commitment to them that these activities will continue to be rewarded in that particular university. When faculty members are recruited and hired in certain disciplines at least in part because they are engaged in or plan to engage in community service and related applied research, these activities must then be included as valid criteria for retention, promotion, tenure, salary increases, sabbatical leaves, and other reward systems. This is one of the challenges facing UIS as the university evolves. Many of the more senior faculty members were hired on the basis of these service and engagement criteria, as well as excellence in teaching. Even as the university evolves toward inclusion of more traditional scholarship expectations, these engagement criteria must be maintained in order to continue to encourage such engagement in the future. Encouragement is not sufficient, however. It may be necessary to offer seminars, mentoring, and other faculty development activities in order to assist faculty members in integrating their service and engagement efforts with their teaching and research activities and publications.

Addressing the Challenge

This article has attempted to address the challenge of maintaining a culture of engagement and outreach in an evolving institution. The above discussion of the five issues related to this question has set forth some ideas on how to maintain this culture within various constraints. It has drawn on the experiences of one university, but has attempted to extrapolate from them lessons that will be helpful to others. Overall, maintaining a culture of engagement may mean that universities accept that not all faculty need to be

engaged in outreach and community service in order for such a culture to be present and to continue.

If faculty and administrators accept the premise that the scholarship of application is a valid and desirable qualification for hiring, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases, along with the other types of scholarship, then faculty who engage in service and outreach activities and publish in the area of scholarship of application as a result of these activities will be encouraged and rewarded even if all faculty at the institution do not do so. This will contribute to a culture of engagement without requiring that all faculty members in all disciplines participate equally. Similarly, encouragement of community service and engagement on the part of some faculty as part of the service obligation does not preclude other faculty members from engaging in other types of service such as involvement in university governance or work with disciplinary or professional associations. But allowing community service as one of the activities that count as service does encourage some faculty and helps to maintain the culture of engagement.

UIS is somewhat unique in that it has had a culture of engagement since its founding. Its challenges are maintaining this culture in the face of organizational changes resulting from a merger with a major research university system and encouraging an increase in scholarship and publication that supports, rather than detracts from, engagement and service. While these challenges are perhaps opposite to those of most other universities, the methods used at UIS may be helpful to other universities with either similar or different challenges, since culture change involves ultimately individual motivation and commitment to a shared value system.

Creating a culture of engagement or changing an existing culture to include engagement may take time and effort, and possibly money for release time and project support, as well. Culture change is not easy; maintaining a culture already established is less difficult but still requires effort and vigilance to assure that members of the organization continue to accept the culture and operate within it even if other organizations—in this case other universities—do not always have the same culture. For faculty members, the acceptance by their peers on campus and in other universities of the validity of the scholarship of application and of the legitimacy of service and outreach activities may be the most important factor in developing and maintaining their reputations and careers. Everything universities can do to increase the acceptance and desirability of engagement across institutions will enhance the ability of individual institutions to create and maintain cultures of engagement.

Author Information

Glen Hahn Cope is Dean of the College of Public Affairs and Administration and professor of public administration at the University of Illinois at Springfield. She received her Ph.D. in Public Administration from the Ohio State University in 1981, and is engaged in research and service activities in local government, nonprofit management and finance, and public service education.

Dean Glen Hahn Cope, Ph.D.
College of Public Affairs and Administration, PAC 440
University of Illinois at Springfield
P.O. Box 19243
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9243
Telephone: 217-206-6523
Fax: 217-206-7807
E-mail: cope.glen@uis.edu
Website: www.uis.edu

Marya Leatherwood, associate professor of management and acting associate provost at the University of Illinois at Springfield, received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior from the University of Iowa in 1985. Her research interests include corporate and nonprofit governance and trends in higher education.

Associate Provost Marya Leatherwood, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Springfield
P.O. Box 19243
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9243
Telephone: 217-206-7405
Fax: 217-206-7623
E-mail: leatherwood.marya@uis.edu
Website: www.uis.edu

References

Boyer, E.L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

Commission on Peer Review and Administration, National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, *Standards for Master of Public Administration Programs*, 1999.

Glassick, C.E., M. T. Huber, and G. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professorate.* Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997).

The International Association for Management Education, American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business, *Achieving Quality and Continuous Improvement Through Self-Evaluation and Peer Review, Standards for Accreditation Business Administration and Accounting* (May 2000).

Plein, L. C., D. G. Williams, and D. M. Hardwick, "Making Engagement Work: University Outreach and Welfare Reform in West Virginia," *Journal of Public Affairs Education 6* (October 2000): 245-256.

Rice, E. R., "Making a Place for the New American Scholar," (American Association for Higher Education Forum on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, The New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry # 1, 1996).

Schein, E.H., *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992).

University of Illinois at Springfield, "Faculty Handbook Personnel Policies," (UIS, 2001).