Engagement, Scholarship, and Faculty Work: Trends and Implications for Public Affairs Education

Christopher J. Koliba
University of Vermont

ABSTRACT

Building on the assumption that public administration and public affairs education has a role to play in helping students and communities bridge theory and practice, the author provides an overview of the "civic engagement movement" that is informing how higher education institutions, particularly their faculty, carry out their work. Ernest Boyer's effort to "reconsider scholarship" is reviewed in light of current practices shaping contemporary public affairs education. The author explores the current trends affecting faculty work load and performance appraisal. Suggestions for further research and dialogue around the issues raised in this article are provided.

Over the last two and a half decades, the early efforts of the now-deceased Ernest Boyer to stimulate the Academy to "reconsider scholarship" have lead many to review how faculty work is understood, valued, and assessed (O'Meara, 2005). Reform efforts around faculty review, tenure, and promotion guidelines along these lines have been fueled, in part, through what some have deemed as a "civic engagement" movement rippling across academia (Marullo, 1996; Kellogg, 1999; Ostrander, 2004; Campus Compact, 2004). This paper reviews the literature and the practices that colleges and universities have undertaken to support and encourage faculty civic engagement and the forms of "engaged scholarship" associated with it. It begins with a look at trends affecting college and university-wide policies and practices, providing a backdrop for a deeper exploration of the ways in which public affairs and public administration programs have woven civic engagement and Boyer's expanded views of scholarship into their teaching, research, and service expectations for faculty. It notes gaps between expectations and rewards and incentives, and it presents a series of further research questions.

RENEWING THE CIVIC MISSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Some 200 years after Thomas Jefferson established the University of Virginia, debates about the role of higher education in addressing the concerns and interests of local citizens and their communities persist. Advocates for the civic mission of higher education have helped to fuel a civic engagement movement, recently punctuated by the *Wingspread Declaration Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University*, a call for university and college faculty, students and administrators to rethink the priorities of higher education. This document, signed by 1,300 university presidents, states, "In celebrating the birth of our democracy we can think of no nobler task than committing ourselves to helping catalyze and lead a national movement to reinvigorate the public purposes of and civic mission of higher education. We believe that now and through the next century, our institutions must be vital agents and architects of a flourishing democracy" (as quoted in Ostrander, 2004, 76).

Reflecting on her study of several prominent universities that are noted as leaders in the civic engagement movement, Susan Ostrander concludes that the forces pushing today's campuses toward increased civic engagement include "(a) an effort to deal with increasing criticisms of higher education and contradictory views of educational goals; (b) an apparent consensus about the importance of reinvigorated national civic participation and the university's responsibility in relation to it; (c) a renewed call for relevance of academic knowledge paired with a growing sense among college faculty of isolation from real world questions; (d) ever more critical and pressing public concerns; and (e) more mundane matters such as space and town-gown relations" (2004, 78). Ostrander asserts that "the importance of connecting civic engagement to knowledge creation" is central if university-community engagement is to be normalized, institutionalized, and sustained over time (2004, 84).

An indicator of the extent of the civic engagement movement in higher education can be gauged through the activities of the member organizations of Campus Compact. More than 1,100 colleges and universities are members of this national coalition of college and university presidents that "advances the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility.... As [a] national higher education association dedicated solely to campus-based civic engagement, Campus Compact promotes public and community service that develops students' citizenship skills, helps campuses forge effective community partnerships, and provides resources and training for faculty seeking to integrate civic and community-based learning into the curriculum" (Campus Compact, 2004). Members of Campus Compact have made sustained efforts to train and support faculty and support their development in service learning and other forms of civic engagement. In some cases, seed money from the federal Department for Housing and Urban Development and the Corporation for National and Community

Service has been used to develop community outreach partnership centers and service learning offices designated to support the development of long-term partnerships between higher education and local communities. Substantive applied research or community-based research projects are being officially sanctioned and supported with institutional resources. Town-gown relationships are being addressed proactively with support for faculty and student efforts to meet the needs of local communities.

THE RATIONALE FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

The relationship between public affairs education and the civic mission of higher education has a long and rich history, particularly when public affairs education is understood and appreciated as an integral component of a democratically accountable public service (Denhardt, 2001). Reiterating a sentiment first articulated by Woodrow Wilson some 90 years earlier, Frederick Mosher devoted an entire chapter of his classic text, *Democracy and the Public Service* (1982), to the place and purpose of public affairs education, writing, "the nature and quality of the public service depend heavily upon the nature and quality of the system of education" (28). Citing the rise of professional disciplines and entire schools devoted to the professional development of public servants, he asserted that "[t]he development of specialization and professionalism in university curricula was accompanied by a growing recognition of broadening social goals of universities in contributing to progress and in solving social problems" (51).

Echoing Mosher's assertions, and bringing them into the context of contemporary public affairs education, Robert Durant asks, "Can collaborative political science, public administration, and public affairs educational efforts play any role in advancing civic trust, civic capital, and civic engagement in the United States?" (1999, 135). After discussing the need for public affairs educators to build the civic capital of citizens in general, and practicing public administrators in particular, Durant encourages "researchers on bureaucracy to 'reengage' the way they think about disseminating what they know," to encourage and deepen "today's heavy emphasis on partnering with for-profits, nonprofits, and volunteers, and create awards for curricular innovations in training aspiring public, nonprofit and for-profit managers in civic capital development" (141). Durant's call, coupled with Mosher's historical observations, point to the ways in which public affairs education can, and does, serve as the living embodiment of higher education's civic mission.

The work of realizing the civic mission of higher education, and bridging theory and practice in the process, falls primarily on the shoulders of faculty who possess the capacity to facilitate, lead, or dictate their teaching, research, and service activities. Applied research and experiential education do put added pressures on faculty who struggle to strike a balance between supporting applied outreach activities and attending to more traditional teaching and research agendas:

> In the current environment, [public affairs and public administration]
> faculty who take the time to engage in applied work in the community
> often do so at their own risk, because the system often rewards faculty
> engaged in more theoretical research who cultivate national or
> international reputations. (Barth, 2002, 259–260)

A substantive effort to reform review, tenure, and promotion guidelines has
been mounted in recent years, using a framework for reviewing scholarship first
laid out by Ernest Boyer. His special report on *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities
of the Professoriate,* published by the Carnegie Foundation in 1990, stimulated a
great deal of dialogue among college and university administrative and academic
leaders (O'Meara and Rice, 2005). Boyer presented this framework as a means
of reflecting on the evolving and expanding nature of faculty work that arises
through the active cultivation of civic engagement practices.

BOYER'S *SCHOLARSHIP RECONSIDERED*

Lamenting what he viewed as the homogenization of the standards for scholar-
ship found on most college and university campuses, Boyer set the tone for *Schol-
arship Reconsidered* by stating, "While we speak of pride about the great diversity
of American higher education, the reality is that on many campuses standards of
scholarship have become increasingly restrictive, and campus priorities frequently
more imitative than distinctive" (1990, 2). Boyer claimed that this increas-
ingly restrictive standard of scholarship is skewed toward research leading to the
discovery of new knowledge, particularly within the research universities. His
research showed that faculty belief in the oft-cited "publish or perish" dictum
is still very strong. The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals is still
the preeminent criteria by which faculty are judged. Boyer noted, however, that
"[t]oday, on campuses across the nation, there is a recognition that the faculty
reward system does not match the full range of academic functions and that pro-
fessors are often caught between competing obligations" (1990, 1).

The traditional composition of faculty work has been along the lines of re-
search, teaching, and service. Within this paradigm, scholarship gets accom-
plished through research—specifically, through the publishing of research
findings. Such publications are generally the bastion of a relatively small group of
academics who share common expertise and interests. The composition of these
practices in faculty work load plans will vary depending on one's discipline and
type of college or university. Expectations at comprehensive research universities
will vary drastically from those at small liberal arts colleges, which will, in turn,
vary from those at community colleges.

Recognizing this reality, Boyer asserted that "[w]e proceed with the convic-
tion that if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent

academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered.... 'Redefining' (scholarship) means bringing to scholarship a broader meaning, one in which legitimacy is given to the full scope of academic work" (1990, 13). Boyer's reconsideration of scholarship hinges on a typology of faculty practice that encompasses four areas: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. This new differentiation of scholarship was predicated on an urgent need for "a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching" (1990, 24).

Scholarship of Discovery

Boyer introduced his new typology by recognizing and valuing the most traditional understanding of scholarship, the *scholarship of discovery*. Discovery of new knowledge lies at the center of most basic research enterprises. New knowledge creation has been a central mission of higher education institutions, particularly with the importation of more European—especially German—understandings of institutional structure and purpose. "At its best," Boyer wrote, discovery "contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university...." Boyer went on to quote former Princeton University President William Bowen, who said that scholarly research "'reflects our pressing, irrepressible need as human beings to confront the unknown and to seek understanding for its own sake. It is tied inextricably to the freedom to think freshly, to see propositions of every kind in every changing light. And it celebrates the special exhilaration that comes from a new idea'" (1990, 17).

Certainly, Boyer saw a place for traditional research in the pursuit of new knowledge; however, he remained concerned that the discovery of new knowledge is so dominant, particularly within the modern research university, that it tends to crowd out what he saw as other forms of scholarship.

Scholarship of Integration

Boyer asserted that another crucial facet of faculty scholarship lies in the interpretation of new knowledge, essentially recognizing that new knowledge is not produced in a vacuum. In proposing the scholarship of integration, Boyer wrote, "we underscore the need for scholars who give meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective. By integration, we mean making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists too" (1990, 18). He added, "Those engaged in discovery ask, 'What is to be known, what is yet to be found?' Those engaged in integration ask, 'What do the findings mean?'" (19).

Evidence suggests that most faculty do not question the validity of the scholarship of integration. In extensive faculty surveys, the vast majority report favor-

able attitudes toward work that crosses many disciplines. The merits of inter-disciplinary scholarship are becoming more widely accepted (Boyer, 1990, 22; Smith and McCann, 2001; Kezar, 2005).

Most social problems addressed within civic engagement activities can only be understood through a multidisciplinary lens (Kezar, 2005). The *scholarship of integration* calls for the breaking down of ridged disciplinary silos. Of course, the extent to which these silos are being breached is another matter. How faculty respond to pencil and paper surveys can be very different from actual practice.

Scholarship of Application

As Boyer saw it, the *scholarship of application* is oriented toward the use of scholarly inquiry to address social problems. This form of scholarship calls on one to ask the questions: "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?" and "Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" (1990, 21).

The credibility of applied research on college and university campuses undoubtedly varies between campuses and within campuses. Applied research is often seen as the stepchild of research that is pursued in an effort to generate new knowledge. Referring to a perception found in many of the social sciences, Argyris and Schön have observed that

> ...social scientists are faced with the fundamental *choice* that hinges on a dilemma of rigor or relevance. If social scientists tilt toward the rigor of normal science that currently dominates departments of social science in American universities, they risk becoming irrelevant to practitioners' demands for usable knowledge. If they tilt toward the relevance of action research, they risk falling short of prevailing disciplinary standards to rigor (Argyris and Schön, 1989, 612).

Although it should be noted that rigor and relevance do not have to be mutually exclusive (Koliba and Lathrop, 2007), Argyris and Schön's assumptions carry a great deal of weight within the academy.

In addition to the perception that applied research is seen as somewhat more academically soft, common assertions about the nature of faculty service, particularly a failure to distinguish between obligations to be good corporate citizens and conducting scholarly outreach, persist. Boyer observed, "Colleges and universities have recently rejected service as serious scholarship partly because its meaning is so vague and often disconnected from serious intellectual work.... To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor—and the

accountability—traditionally associated with research activities" (1990, 22). He went on to say that "[w]hat should be included are activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor and [are] carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, and the like" (1990, 36).

A set of applied research approaches and techniques has established a series of best practices and principles designed to ensure the application of rigorous methodology and the development of relevant findings (Table 1). All of these approaches share an action orientation and an appreciation for the fact that the research process and the ultimate products of the research must have some measure of usefulness, purpose, and meaning to practitioners, and not just practitioners in general but the immediate subjects of the research being undertaken. In some instances, like participatory action research, the traditional subjects of the research play an integral role in forming research questions, collecting and analyzing data, and distributing the resultant knowledge to their peers. In other instances, such as organizational action research and utilization-focused evaluation, the researcher plays a prominent role in the collection and analysis of the data but works with the research subject to use the data to inform practice.

Scholarship of Teaching

Boyer's fourth classification of scholarship concerns the art and science of teaching: "Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but trans-

Table 1. Sample of Applied Research Practices

Action research (for organizations)	McNiff, 1992; Argryis and Schön, 1996
Action research (for teachers)	Mills, 2000
Participatory action research	Park, Brydon-Miller, Hall, and Jackson, 1993; Whyte, 1991
Rapid rural appraisal	Beebe, 1995
Applied rural appraisal	Whittaker and Banwell, 2002
Participatory rural appraisal	Campbell, 2001
Utilization-focused evaluation	Patton, 1997
Empowerment evaluation	Fetterman, 2001
Community-based research	Cotter, Welleford, Vesley-Massey, and Thurston, 2003; Strand et al., 2003
Rapid ethnographic assessment	Taplin, Scheld, and Low, 2002
Participatory research	Hall, 1984; Brown, 1985
Pragmatic action research	Greenwood and Levin, 2007
Appreciative inquiry	Cooperrider and Whitney, 2005
Collaborative inquiry	Heron, 1996

forming and extending it as well" (1990, 24). Just as the *scholarship of application* calls for the blurring of lines between research and service, the *scholarship of teaching* calls for the blurring of lines between teaching and research. Faculty members' assessment and documentation of their own teaching practices is receiving increased attention through the growing number of peer-reviewed journals devoted to disciplinary teaching. Since the time of Boyer's special report, the *scholarship of teaching* has garnered greater validity through the creation of these journals. As outlets for reflection on good teaching practices and systematic research conducted on these practices, these journals provide forums through which this form of scholarship can be realized.

The *scholarship of teaching* extends, as well, into professional development opportunities. Although often understated in the faculty review process, faculty attempts to build and refine their capacities as teachers deserve to be recognized. Just as attendance at disciplinary research conferences are standard expectations for most faculty because they provide an opportunity to be educated about the latest discoveries in the field, so too do professional development opportunities expose faculty to new teaching practices. Thus, the *scholarship of teaching* is as much about understanding the faculty member as a lifelong learner as it is about understanding the faculty member as a master teacher.

As we return our attention to the place and purpose of civic engagement within Boyer's scholarship framework, it is not a hard leap to see the ways in which faculty civic engagement activities benefit from Boyer's call to reconsider scholarship. The scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching can all benefit from faculty efforts to engage in meaningful partnerships with community-based organizations. Efforts to discover new knowledge can benefit from the greater accessibility to research informants and sites afforded by partnerships. The social problems encountered in service learning and action-oriented community-based research require faculty support to interpret the meaning behind data and theories. Because civic engagement implies an adherence to an understanding and appreciation of the reciprocal relationships between and among partners, many of the best practices to help guide the scholarship of application can be forged. In addition, faculty development efforts to support civic engagement practices such as service learning often provide an opportunity or an excuse for faculty to talk about their teaching with others.

FACULTY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

As an academic discipline that focuses on the principles and practices that affect and involve present and future practitioners, public affairs and public administration programs are called upon to bridge theory and practice and to prepare students for a future of doing public service as well as being public servants (Ventriss, 1991; Dunn, 1994; Englehart, 2001; Cunningham and Weschler, 2002; Denhardt and Denhardt, 2003). As McGaw and Weschler noted, "[m]any,

if not most, of the public administration and policy masters' programs listed by NASPAA experiment with a variety of innovative ways to bridge the theory-practice gap and to provide students with rich learning environments" (1999, 91). Recent literature speaks to these trends; this includes literature on how university-community partnerships lead to applied research projects (Plein, Williams, and Hardwick, 2000; Miller-Millesen and Mould, 2004; de Lancer Julnes, 2006; Rivera and Heady, 2006), the assessment of service learning opportunities (Bushouse and Morrison, 2001; Bernstein, Ohren and Shue, 2003; Reinke, 2003; Dicke, Dowden, and Torres, 2004; Killian, 2004; Baker-Boosamra, Guevara, and Balfour, 2006), accounts of oral history projects (Donald and Tribbey, 2002); the facilitation of reflection on experiences (Koliba, 2004); and the exploration of internships and experiential capstone projects (McGaw and Weschler, 1999; Denhardt, 2001; Cross and Grant, 2006).

In an attempt to gather some evidence on the extent of civic engagement practices in public administration, public policy, and urban affairs master's degree programs, we reviewed 143 Web sites of master's programs that have been accredited through the National Association of School of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). Although we recognize that information posted on a Web site is not an entirely accurate account of actual practice (Carlson and Repman, 2000), we do believe this preliminary research sheds some light on the importance that some accredited programs, at least, place on civic engagement practices.[1]

Within our review of these Web sites, we found that 20 percent mentioned service learning as being offered to their students. Internships were by far the most prevalent form of experiential education, with almost 89 percent of accredited programs mentioning them on their Web sites. Our review also found almost 56 percent of accredited programs listing some form of applied research being undertaken by faculty and students, suggesting a wide application of such practices across the field.

In total, fully 97 percent of accredited programs whose Web sites were reviewed mentioned at least one civic engagement practice undertaken by its faculty and students. This preliminary review of the place of civic engagement

Table 2. NASPAA-Accredited MPA/MPP Programs
        Citing Civic Engagement Practices on Their Web Sites (n=143)

	No. of Programs	% of Programs
Service Learning/Community-based Learning	29	20.3
Internships	127	88.8
Applied and Community-based Research	80	55.9

practices within the Web sites of NASPAA-accredited institutions suggests that these programs are making a tangible effort to link their programs with civic engagement missions and practices.

How Acceptable is an Expanded View of Scholarship within Public Affairs and Public Administration Programs?

The extent to which the practices outlined above translate into the different forms of scholarship that Boyer named are worth considering in greater detail. In reviewing the extent to which a given form of scholarship dominates public affairs programs, we must acknowledge the scholarship of discovery as the dominant mode. The vast majority of top-tier academic journals are devoted to the dissemination of new discoveries. Arguably, this is certainly the case for public affairs and public administration as with any other discipline.

Within the public affairs and public administration literature, the place of integration within public administration continues to be a point of debate (Whicker, Strickland, and Olshfski, 1993; Rodgers and Rodgers, 2000). In their 2000 article in *Public Administration Review*, "Defining the Boundaries of Public Administration: Undisciplined Mongrels versus Disciplined Purists," Rodgers and Rodgers make a case that the field of public administration is an inherently interdisciplinary one (2000). Analyzing the publication records of a cohort of assistant professors who started their tenure track in 1990 and were eventually granted tenure, they found that only 37 percent of their publications were in public administration journals. The remaining 63 percent of their publications spanned 24 additional disciplines. Debates over the interdisciplinary nature of public administration will inevitably continue, as we consider the appropriate places within the Academy to situate public administration and policy programs.

It should be clear, however, that practicing public administrators draw upon a variety of disciplines to carry out their craft. The public and social problems that they encounter are often complex, requiring the utilization of knowledge offered through many fields. The fact that public administration scholars originate from and publish in a variety of disciplines, thus, mirrors the reality that practitioners find in the field.

The extent to which *applied scholarship* is valued within public affairs education is a question worth deeper empirical consideration. The 2008 American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) call for proposals lists an "action research" track for the first time. However, a review of the literature yields only a few explicit accounts of applied or action research within public affairs and public administration journals within the field (Schneider, 1986; Chisholm, 1997; Grizzle and Pettijohn, 2002; Koliba and Lathrop, 2007). Several examples of scholarly accounts of applied research projects involving public sector organizations can be found within interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journals, including the *Journal of Applied Social Research, Human Organization,* and *Action Research.* The failure of this search

to uncover many explicitly defined applied research projects within the PA literature may not be indicative of a failure of scholars to publish the results of applied research. The results of research studies that are program evaluations or pieces of policy analysis initiated or sponsored by a given client or community partner can be published with their origins as applied research given nary a consideration in the text. Thus, applied research and publishing in peer-reviewed journals are not mutually exclusive activities.

Within public affairs and public administration, the legitimacy of the scholarship of teaching was solidified with the creation of the *Journal of Public Affairs Education (JPAE)* in 1994. Additionally, at least 48 articles that focus on teaching and teaching practices have been published in the *Public Administration Review* since 1983. These trends suggest a growing acceptance of the scholarship of teaching as a viable and necessary form of scholarship in the public administration field.

Noting the growing relevance of civic engagement to teaching, research, and scholarship, Curt Ventriss has asked, "What incentives are there in the university for such outreach activities?" adding, "perhaps it is time for every department of public administration to put in writing what specific goals it has (if any) in outreaching to the community and the means of obtaining (and supporting) these aims" (1995, 149). Ventriss' assertion brings to light the role that review, tenure, and promotion policies play in guiding faculty work. These guidelines essentially serve as the basis of a faculty member's performance appraisal, a concept very familiar to public administration scholars and practitioners.

RESEARCH ON FACULTY WORKLOAD

Although it can be safely stated that a civic engagement movement touches at least the 1,300 Campus Compact universities and colleges across the country and to some degree a large majority of accredited MPA/MPP programs, that is by no means the only trend and factor impacting faculty work. Citing a recent study of the perceptions of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) O'Meara, Kaufman, and Kuntz (2003) identify several trends influencing the nature of faculty work:

- Scarce resources (funding, assistance and time) to support faculty work.
- Faculty being expected to be entrepreneurs, raising their own funds to support their work.
- Increased expectations for teaching, research, and service.

These factors have led several writers to assert that today's college and university faculty face increasing burdens, and this leads to their perception of being overloaded (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000). "Significantly, younger faculty believe that the quality of their work is, in fact, diminished by competing obligations," observes Boyer (1990, 45). Extensive interviews and campus studies have revealed that early-career faculty are facing an overloaded plate and that, in recent

years, "scholarly responsibilities of early career faculty have not only broadened, but also increased" (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000, 16).

Given these results, O'Meara and her associates conclude that, with the growing burden to reduce budgets, faculty are being asked to do more and facing greater opportunities for burnout in the process. They assert that "it will be critical for faculty to navigate change in ways that revitalize as opposed to leaving them tired and unfulfilled" (O'Meara, Kaufman and Kuntz, 2003).

Scarce resources, higher expectations to bring in external funding, and increased expectations to engage in new forms of scholarship that involve various forms of civic engagement have created certain problematic conditions for faculty. This makes it difficult for them to determine exactly what is valued and most important to accomplish for their work to be respected and recognized.

THE STATE OF REFORM IN FACULTY REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

Many have argued for the need to reform official university structures, academic reward systems, and policies (Glassick, et al. 1997; O'Meara, 1997; Driscoll and Lynton, 1999; Diamond, 1999; Rice et al., 2000). In practice, these reforms have come in the form of "(a) changing institutional mission and planning documents to acknowledge a broader definition of scholarship; (b) amending promotion and tenure or contract language and criteria; (c) providing opportunities for flexible workload programs; and (d) providing incentive grants" (O'Meara, 2005, 259).

Boyer called for significant reforms in the ways in which faculty work is assessed. This call is premised on the broadening of what is considered valid faculty practice and the individuating of these practices to suit the wider conditions within which faculty find themselves operating (1990, 50). These individualized expectations could be realized through the creation of what he termed "creativity contracts," "an arrangement by which faculty members define their professional goals for a three to five-year period, possibly shifting from one principal scholarly focus to another" over time (1990, 48).

In reviewing the impact of Boyer's work within research universities, O'Meara observes that the assessment of scholarship as the number and quality of peer-reviewed journal articles and books still dominates faculty evaluation in these institutions. "At the same time," O'Meara notes, "doctoral and comprehensive universities (especially those located in urban areas) were involved or becoming more involved in regional or community problem-solving, linking graduate and undergraduate programs to community concerns, while examining how faculty involvement in economic community development fit with established faculty roles and expectations for scholarship (Crosson, 1983; Finnegan, 1993; Aldersley, 1995; Braskamp and Wergin, 1998; Cohen, 1998; Ramaley, 2000)" (O'Meara, 2005, 257).

Despite the dominance of the scholarship of discovery in most institutions, O'Meara did find that approximately two-thirds of the CAOs surveyed said "their institution had changed mission and planning documents, amended faculty evaluation criteria, provided incentive grants, or developed flexible workload programs to encourage and reward a broader definition of scholarship" (2005, 260-261); the other third had not. She grouped these colleges and universities into one of two areas: reform-minded institutions and traditionally-minded institutions.

O'Meara found that the reforms most frequently identified were

> expanding the definition of scholarship in faculty evaluation policies (76 percent), and providing incentive grants for multiple forms of scholarship (75 percent). Approximately 45 percent of CAOs [from reform-minded institutions] noted that they had expanded the definition of scholarship written into institutional mission and planning documents, and 41 percent reported that their institution had used the expanded definition of scholarship to develop flexible workload programs (in the spirit of Boyer's 'creativity contracts') (2005, 261).

Although the *scholarship of discovery* still plays a dominant role in most institutions' assessment schemes, it does appear that Boyer's call for a reconsideration of what constitutes scholarship is being heeded.

DISCUSSION

Within higher education, as in most any other industry or institution, the formal evaluation of worker performance provides important indicators about what is valued. Formal evaluation is, in essence, a form of quality control:

> Other than hiring new faculty members, the principal expression of academic values about faculty work load lies in the promotion and tenure decision. It is here rather than in institutional rhetoric that the faculty seek clues about the value of different aspects of their work. It is here that productivity is most meaningfully defined and evaluated (Fairweather, 2002, 26).

Presidential declarations, objectives stated within a strategic plan or Web site, and even the devotion of institutional dollars to the pursuit of civic engagement activities are only minor expressions of an institution's support. The structure, format, and criteria that guide the faculty review, tenure, and promotion process informs faculty practices more than any other factor. The Kellogg Commission on

the Future of State and Land Grant Universities stated that "[o]f all the challenges facing the engagement effort, none is more difficult than ensuring accountability for the effort" (1999, 28). Echoing Boyer, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) note that "evaluation that uses different standards for research, teaching, and professional service has outlived its day. Academia needs a single standard, but it cannot implement that standard simply by applying to other forms of scholarship the traditional criteria that have usually been used for judging research" (23–24). O'Meara's research suggests that the pursuit of reforms would not only support greater faculty civic engagement, it also would garner deeper faculty alignment with institutional goals and possibly improve faculty satisfaction (2005).

The systematic appraisal of an individual employee's performance has become standard practice within the private and public sectors. Students of public affairs and public administration will likely encounter such personnel systems in their workplace. For college and university faculty, performance appraisal systems are implemented within a "loosely coupled system," (Weick, 1978) in which the unity of command is weaker than more tightly coupled organizations.

Thus, the matter of review, tenure, and promotion reform is one to be addressed at several layers of higher education. In many cases, each individual academic department is allowed to define its own understanding of the nature of peer review, which academic journals count and by how much, what kinds of service are valued, and what a minimum threshold for quality teaching is acceptable. Institution-wide reforms to the review, tenure, and promotion process will thus need to be vetted and interpreted by each academic unit.

For public affairs and public administration programs, the place and purpose of civic engagement within a faculty member's total performance may be less of a stretch than within other disciplines. The widespread acceptance that public affairs programs need to bridge theory and practice lends even greater credibility to public affairs scholars' civic engagement activities.

However, to what extent do these givens translate into the review, tenure, and promotion processes and criteria that public affairs scholars encounter? The same trends affecting all higher education faculty—including scarce resources, expectations for faculty entrepreneurship, and increased expectations for teaching, research, and service—are undoubtedly faced by many public affairs scholars. With 97 percent of NASPAA-accredited programs promoting at least some form of civic engagement on their Web sites, it might be surmised that public affairs scholars suffer from an even greater crowded-plate phenomenon. This question certainly should be pursued through further research.

Although this review of NASPAA members' Web sites provides a glimpse into the articulated practices of accredited programs, more work must be done to survey program directors and to systematically review the review, tenure, and promotion guidelines that public affairs and public administration programs use. Only then may we be able to gauge with any certainty the extent to which civic

engagement activities are actively supported—or hindered—through the review, tenure, and promotion process.

If we transfer O'Meara's "traditional-reform" typology from the institutional to the departmental or programmatic level, we are faced with a series of additional questions. The shift from a traditional to a reform minded review, tenure, and promotion process and criteria is, in part, a cultural one. The publish-or-perish norm that privileges the scholarship of discovery over other forms of scholarship is, in all likelihood, the dominant culture of most public affairs and public administration programs. Just how can such a norm coexist with programmatic attempts to link theory and practice through civic engagement?

Several different responses appear possible. As noted earlier, with the advent of *JPAE* and the acceptance of pedagogically inclined articles by *PAR* beginning in the early 1980s, legitimate media for the peer review of the scholarship of teaching are beginning to take root. Arguably, public administration journals draw upon a variety of social science disciplines, and thus scholars may find a more open and willing audience to accept efforts encompassing the scholarship of integration. A case has been made that the public affairs and public administration fields are, in practice, integrative in nature (Rodgers and Rodgers, 2000).

It would appear that outlets for the peer review of the scholarship of application within public affairs publications are possible and perhaps even more prevalent than we know. We must critically ask, however, are there ample places to publish scholarly accounts of the applied research practices and their effects on clients and partnering entities? Our search of the literature suggests that public affairs journals have yet to openly embrace applied research as a valid form of scholarship. That said, what begins as applied research may be presented within the literature as more traditional research undertakings. Tracing the origins of the funding for these studies (often noted in the acknowledgement section of an article) will likely reveal that, in many instances, clients and/or practitioner-recipients of research findings are involved.

Yet, other compounding factors that often accompany faculty civic engagement activities and diverse forms of scholarship further complicate matters. Anyone who offers a service learning component to a course or engages in extensive partnership building around an applied research project will note that these activities take up a great deal of time. They require that faculty get out of their offices and classrooms and actively engage other partners. It is no wonder that faculty face an overcrowded plate. Must something give?

If our field is one that is called upon to bridge theory and practice and to prepare students for public service, the questions raised in this article are deeply important. Opportunities to link theory and practices must become more than an option. They must become an imperative if the field of public administration is to continue to serve the needs and interests of current and future public administrators.

NOTE
1. NASPAA-accredited programs present themselves through their Web sites in a wide variety of ways:
   - Programs with independent Web pages within their university's Web site. These pages usually have a navigation bar for information within the program's Web pages.
   - Programs that have their Web pages housed within another program's Web pages, such as a political science department.
   - Programs have their own Web site, but not offering a navigation bar or many links to additional information about the program.
   - Programs that do not maintain a Web site, but the graduate college provides a place in its Web pages for simple information about program requirements and how to apply.

We found many shades of grey within these categories. Information about civic engagement practices was more likely to be found on programs' independent Web pages. These Web pages often had links to expanded versions of their mission statements, course syllabi, program handbooks in PDF format, faculty Web pages, in-depth course and program descriptions, and information about outreach and research activities. Because the wealth of information presented, it was easier to simply discern whether the program did or did not have certain civic engagement practices. In many of the other Web site categories, a program may have mentioned a philosophy such as "linking theory and practice." If the Web site did not provide an opportunity to look at course syllabi or detailed mission statement goals, many of the criteria for civic engagement practices were absent. In the case of programs that only presented themselves via their graduate college's listings, there was typically little or no information about the program's philosophy and no links to further information. For this reason, programs that have this type of Web site are at a disadvantage when it comes to communicating their civic engagement practices.

Programs that maintain easily navigable Web pages with multiple links to additional program information were more likely to be identified as having a higher total number of civic engagement practices. Those that maintain Web pages with limited information and navigation possibilities tended to have a lower number of references found.

Criteria for Selecting Community Engagement Phrases
1. *Service Learning/Community-based Learning:* Any direct reference to the phrase "service learning." Includes courses and extra-curricular service learning opportunities. Also tallied in this category were references in course plans to student learning opportunities outside the classroom and the traditional university setting. For example, a college may have partnerships with community organizations and their students participate actively in those partnerships or actively with an aspect of the organization, either as part of university coursework or in an extra-curricular fashion.
2. *Internships:* Any direct reference to the word "internship" as part of a mandatory or optional program for students. Occasionally coupled with the phrase "field experience."
3. *Applied Research/ Community-based Research:* Any direct reference to the phrase "applied research," for students and/or faculty. Also tallied in this category: faculty and/or students do research on a community or community organization that is sometimes based from within the community or community organization. Also includes some faculty outreach activities that would include research for academic purposes and for the organization or community studied.

REFERENCES
Aldersley, S.F. 1995. "Upward Drift is Alive and Well: Research/Doctoral Model Still Attractive to Institutions." *Change*, 27(5):50–56.

Argyris, C., and D. A. Schön. 1996. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Argyris, C., and D. A. Schön. 1989. "Participatory Action Research and Action Science Compared." *American Behavioral Scientist.* 32(5):612–623.

Baker-Boosamra, M., J.A. Guevara, and D. L. Balfour. 2006. "From Service to Solidarity: Evaluation and Recommendations for International Service-Learning." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 12(4):479–500.

Barth, T. J. 2002. "Reflections on Building an MPA Program: Faculty Discussions Worth Having." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 8(4):253–12.

Beebe, J. 1995. "Basic Concepts and Techniques of Rapid Appraisal." *Human Organization,* 54:42–47.

Bernstein, J. L., J. Ohren, and L. Shue. 2003. "A Collaborative-Teaching Approach to Linking Classes and Community." *Journal of Public Affairs Education.* 9(2):117–127.

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

Braskamp, L. A., and J. F. Wergin. 1998. "Forming a New Social Partnership." In W. G. Tierney, ed., *The Responsive University: Restructuring for High Performance.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 62–91.

Brown, D. L. 1985. "People-Centered Development and Participatory Research." *Harvard Education Review,* 55(1).

Bushouse, B., and S. Morrison. 2001. "Applying Service Learning in Master of Public Affairs Programs." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 7(1):9–17.

Campbell, J. R. 2001. "Participatory Rural Appraisal as Qualitative Research: Distinguishing Methodological Issues from Participatory Claims." *Human Organization,* 60(4):380–389.

Campus Compact. 2004. *Annual Members Survey 2003.* Available at http://www.compact.org/newscc/highlights.html.

Carlson, R. D. and J. Repman. 2000. "Quality Control and Web Information: Is What I See What I Get?" *WebNet Journal,* 2(4):9.

Chisholm, R. F. 1997. "Applying Action Research to Public Sector Problems: International Perspectives." *International Journal of Public Administration,* 20(11):1979–2012.

Cohen, A. 1998. *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooperrider, D. L., and D. Whitney. 2005. *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cotter, J. J., E. A. Welleford, K. Vesley-Massey, and M. O. Thurston. 2003. "Town and Gown: Collaborative Community-Based Research and Innovation." *Family and Community Health,* 26(4):329–38.

Cross, J., and N. Grant. 2006. "Teaching MPA Internships Built on Reflection in Practice." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 12(1):19–31.

Crosson, P. 1983. *Public Service in Higher Education: Practices and Priorities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report (ED 284 515). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Cunningham, R., and L. Weschler. 2002. "Theory and the Public Administration Student/Practitioner. (The Reflective Practitioner)." *Public Administration Review,* 62(1):104–12.

De Lancer Julnes, P. 2006. "University-Government Partnerships in Support of State Reform: Lessons from the Caribbean. *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 12(4):439–460.

Denhardt, R. B. 2001. "The Big Questions of Public Administration Education." *Public Administration Review,* 61(5):526–34.

Denhardt, R. B. and J. V. Denhardt. 2003. *The New Public Service: Service, Not Steering.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Dicke, L., S. Dowden, and J. Torres. 2004. "Successful Service Learning: A Matter of Ideology." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 10(3):199–208.

Diamond, R. M. 1999. *Aligning Faculty Rewards with Institutional Mission.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Donald, C. G. and R. Tribbey. 2002. "Oral History as Teacher: A Case Study in Public Administration." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 8(1):71–81.

Dunn, D. D. 1994. "Public Affairs, Administrative Faculty and the Winter Commission Report." *Public Administration Review,* 54(2):109–10.

Durant, R. 1999. "Missing Links? Civic Trust, Civic Capital, and Public Administration." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 5(2):135–44.

Englehart, J. K. 2001. "The Marriage Between Theory and Practice." *Public Administration Review*, 61(3):371–374.

Fairweather, J. S. 2002. "The Mythologies of Faculty Productivity: Implications for Institutional Policy and Decision-Making." *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1):26–49.

Fetterman, D. M. 2001. "Empowerment Evaluation: Building Communities of Practice and a Culture of Learning." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(1):89–103.

Finnegan, D. E. 1993. "Segmentation in the Academic Labor Market: Hiring Cohorts in Comprehensive Universities." *Journal of Higher Education*, 64:621–656.

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

Greenwood, D.J., and M. Levin. 2007. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Grizzle, G. A., and C. D. Pettijohn. 2002. "Implementing Performance-Based Program Budgeting: A System-Dynamics Perspective." *Public Administration Review*, 62(1):51–63.

Hall, B. L. 1984. "Commitment and Action: The Role of Participatory Research." *International Review of Education*, 30(3):289–299.

Heron, J. 1996. *Co-operative Inquiry: Research into the Human Condition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kezar, A. 2005. "Moving From I to We: Reorganizing for Collaboration in Higher Education." *Change*, 37(6):50–58.

Killian, J. 2004. "Pedagogical Experimentation: Combining Traditional, Distance, and Service Learning Techniques." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 10(3):209–24.

Koliba, C. 2004. "Assessing Reflection Assignments for Public Affairs Courses: Implications for Educating Reflective Practitioners." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 10(4):295–309.

Koliba, C. J., and J. Lathrop. 2007. "Inquiry as Intervention: Employing Action Research to Support an Organization's Capacity to Learn." *Administration & Society*, 39(1):51–76.

Marullo, S. 1996. "The Service Learning Movement in Higher Education: An Academic Response to Troubled Times." *Sociological Imagination*, 33(22):117–137.

McGaw, D., and L. Weschler. 1999. "Romancing the Capstone: The Jewel of Public Value." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 5(2):89–105.

McNiff, Jean. 1992. *Action Research: Principles and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Millers-Millesen, J. L., and D. H. Mould. 2004. "Project-Based Learning in Nonprofit Management Education: Results from an Educational Partnership Between the United States and Kyrgyzstan." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 10(3):247–58.

Mills, G. E. 2000. *Action Research: A Guide for the Teacher Researcher*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mosher, F. C. 1982. *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Meara, K. A. 2005. "Effects of Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Findings from a National Survey of Chief Academic Officers." In K. A. O'Meara and R. E. Rice, eds., *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 255–289.

———. 1997. *Rewarding Faculty Professional Service*. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

O'Meara, K. A., R. R. Kaufman, and A. M. Kuntz. 2003. "Faculty Work in Challenging Times: Trends, Consequences, and Implications." *Liberal Education*, 89(4):16–24.

Ostrander, S. A. 2004. "Democracy, Civic Participation, and the University: A Comparative Study of Civic Engagement on Five Campuses." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(1):74–93.

Patton, M. Q. 1997. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*, 3rd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Park, P., J. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, and T. Jackson, eds. 1993. *Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Plein, L. C., D. G. Williams, and D. M. Hardwick. 2000. "Making Engagement Work: University

Outreach and Welfare Reform in West Virginia." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 6(4):245–55.

Ramaley, J. A. 2000. "Embracing Civic Responsibility." *AAHE Bulletin*, 52(7):9–13.

Reinke, S. J. 2003. "Making a Difference: Does Service-Learning Promote Civic Engagement in MPA Students?" *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 9(2):129–38.

Rice, R. E., M. Sorcinelli, and A. Austin. 2000. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation*. New Pathways Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rivera, M., and F. Heady. 2006. "Comparative Program-Performance Evaluation and Government Accountability in New Mexico: Some Applied Lessons for Intergovernmental Relations."*Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 12(4):557–562.

Rodgers, R., and N. Rodgers. 2000. "Defining the Boundaries of Public Administration: Undisciplined Mongrels Versus Disciplined Purists." *Public Administration Review*, 60(5):435–445.

Schneider, A. L. 1986. "The Evolution of a Policy Orientation for Evaluation Research: A Guide to Practice." *Public Administration Review*, 46(4):356–363.

Smith, B. L., and J. McCann. 2001. *Reinventing Ourselves: Interdisciplinary Education, Collaborative Learning, and Experimentation in Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Strand, K., S. Marullo, N. Cutforth, R. Stoecker, and P. Donohue. 2003. *Community-Based Research and Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taplin, D. H., S. Scheld, and S. M. Low. 2002. "Rapid Ethnographic Assessment in Urban Parks: A Case Study of Independence National Historical Park." *Human Organization*, 61(1):80–93.

Ventriss, C. 1995. "The Rating System: Determining What Constitutes a Quality Public Administration Program." *Journal of Public Administration Education*, 1(2):142–53.

_____. 1991. "Contemporary Issues in American Public Administration Education: The Search for an Educational Focus." *Public Administration Review*, 51(1):4–13.

Weick, K. 1978. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Dec.:541–52.

Whicker, M. L., R. A. Strickland, and D. Olshfski. 1993. "The Troublesome Cleft: Public Administration and Political Science." *Public Administration Review*, 53(6):531–41.

Whittaker, A., and C. Banwell. 2002. "Positioning Policy: The Epistemology of Social Capital and Its Application in Applied Rural Research in Australia." *Human Organization*, 61(3):252–261.

Whyte, W. F., ed. 1991. *Participatory Action Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Christopher Koliba is the director of the master of public administration program and an assistant professor in the Community Development and Applied Economics Department at the University of Vermont (UVM). He possesses a Ph.D. and a master of public administration degree from Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. His research interests include governance networks, organizational learning and development, civic education, action research methods, and educational policy. He teaches courses pertaining to public policy and public affairs, the foundations of public administration, governance networks, and science and society. Over the past 15 years, he has lead faculty development workshops and seminars pertaining to service learning, partnership development and action research. He may be reached at ckoliba@uvm. edu.