

OFFICE FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

TASK FORCE ON FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP, DEVELOPMENT AND REWARDS

CHARGE: To articulate a set of institutional policies and practices that will enhance faculty members' capacity to participate in engagement initiatives and will support their engaged research and teaching.

RATIONALE: An engaged institution is one that encourages faculty to use community engagement as a means to produce significant research that advances the discipline while addressing real and complex issues in the community. An engaged institution also provides students with opportunities to participate in community-based learning experiences that enhance their academic, personal, vocational, and civic learning and development. Policies and structures that support faculty engaged work need to be in place in order for public engagement to become fully institutionalized at the University. While the University has many examples of policies, practices, and structures that support and reward faculty engagement work (e.g. recent revisions to the University's promotion and tenure guideline), faculty engaged scholarship remains largely a marginalized practice.

CO-CHAIRS:

Greg Lindsey, Professor and Associate Dean, Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs

Cathy Jordan, Associate Professor, Pediatrics and Director, Children, Youth, and Family Consortium

RECOMMENDED TASKS AND QUESTIONS TO EXPLORE:

- 1) Assess faculty members' current attitudes towards engaged research and teaching. Is engaged research and teaching preferred among faculty members in certain disciplines, at certain ranks, etc.? To what extent do faculty members feel that engaged research and teaching is supported or encouraged by their department? What do faculty members perceive to be the greatest hindrances to participating in engagement work?
- 2) Develop a landscape of the different ways that engaged research and teaching are interpreted in different disciplines. In what ways are disciplinary interpretations of engaged research and teaching similar or different? What are the implications of these nuanced interpretations in implementing the new faculty promotion and tenure guidelines?

- 3) Identify faculty development needs that can advance engaged scholarship and teaching. What kinds of experiences and opportunities should the University offer to strengthen faculty capacity for engaged scholarship and teaching?
- 4) Identify a set of items or activities in which the University should invest in order to further the institutionalization of engaged scholarship. Given limited resources, towards which initiatives (faculty development workshops, seed grants, release time, conference travel, syllabi development consultation, literature sources, etc.) should budget allocations be made?
- 5) Explore the status of faculty community engagement at peer institutions. How does the engaged scholarly work at the University of Minnesota compare with that at peer institutions? How unique or similar is the engaged scholarship and engaged teaching work of the University of Minnesota?

REFERENCES:

CIC Committee on Engagement (2005). *Engaged scholarship: A resource guide*. Committee on Institutional Cooperation Members Committee (Chief Academic Officers).

Sandmann, L.R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd J., Rauhe, W., & Rosaen, C. (2000 Jan/Feb). Managing critical tensions. How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change*, 45-52.

Sandmann, L.R., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 47-64.

Weerts, D.J. (2007). Toward an engagement model of institutional advancement at public colleges and universities. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(2), 79-103.