Report of the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement

University of Illinois at Chicago

September 15, 2000
Amended January 31, 2001

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement, appointed by Provost Elizabeth Hoffman early in winter semester 2000, met and discussed how UIC could better evaluate and reward the scholarship of engagement as one aspect of the mission of UIC as a public land grant university. In this report, the term scholarship of engagement is used to highlight a way of thinking of what is often called public service: a focus on partnerships, not one-sided outreach; the co-creation of knowledge; involvement in real-world problems that can enrich research and teaching rather than be separate from them.

In Section VI, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. The Provost should instruct units to establish norms for the amount and kinds of scholarship of engagement that faculty members at specific tenure levels are expected to achieve and the method of evaluation. These norms should be appropriate to the mission of the unit and will be approved by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost's office. The Provost's office recognizes that for some units there will be a minimal expectation of public service whereas for others the mission of the unit will dictate that the expectation will be substantial.

2. The Provost should circulate to appropriate bodies the enclosed proposed language changes in the Promotion and Tenure papers (see Appendix D). Sections III and V of the Report of the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement should be made available to candidates for promotion and tenure as part of the promotion and tenure papers.

3. The Provost should create an award for exemplary scholarship of engagement. Five awards should be given per year; the amount should be added to the base salary and should equal the amount given for Excellence in Teaching awards.

4. The Provost should make available seed grant funds to be awarded for the first time in FY 2003 (July 1, 2003).

Drawing heavily on "A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process" (1993), prepared by the Senate Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service, UIC, Sections III and V, respectively, discuss characteristics of the scholarship of engagement and suggest ways to document it in order to evaluate and reward it.

I. Defining the Issues, Identifying the Language

Traditionally, research university mission statements have been organized around the unbalanced triumvirate of research, teaching and service, with a primacy given to research. The service mission, in particular, has been viewed as a rather ancillary activity of "outreach" whereby the expertise of the university is "extended" to needful and relevant external communities. Faculty and student activities of research and discovery, not serviceability, have remained central to the university's production of knowledge.

Recently this traditional configuration of university mission has begun to change in response to a host of pressures from within and outside the academy. (For example, the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois has added a fourth element: economic development.) Students, parents, public officials, academic organizations, foundations, and public and private agencies from the regional to the global level have challenged the processes and relevance of much of the research produced by higher education, calling for changes that reflect a new and fuller integration of research, teaching, and service. The notion of service especially is changing. Rather than isolate the service mission of the urban public research university through discrete activities and programs of outreach and extension, service is increasingly seen as a comprehensive activity of an "engaged university."

At the national level there is a movement afoot to make the research university a central institution in what the Wingspread Declaration terms "the democratic society." Here a broad array of universities, foundations, and organizations of higher education have recast the notion of "service" as the "civic mission of the university." Borrowing from a liberal and pragmatic tradition of education going back over one hundred years, there is a call for students and faculty to engage in a renewed, if not totally new, research and teaching that supplies "civic purpose and public meaning" to the production of knowledge in the university."[1] Here the notion of service is captured in a new language of civic engagement. Faculty and students engage in research produced through partnerships with community. Graduate and undergraduate classwork is couched in new curricular compacts of service-learning that produce new and innovative modes of teaching and learning.

International organizations from every quarter are developing policies to "harness university education and research to specific economic and social objectives."[2] The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, for example, has undertaken a formal program to encourage "universities to make a contribution to the national and subregional development process."[3] The European Union through its EUREXTER project has moved to create precise models of university-region engagement in pursuit of excellence in research that in turn will advance the civic and economic development of region and Europe in general. The very notion of service is transformed into research excellence that in turn reflects regional development in global contexts.

These national and international reformulations of university-community relations suggest a broader, more inclusive institutional mission. In this document, we call this the "scholarship of engagement." Scholarship of engagement implies not outreach but partnership,

---

[1]Wingspread Declaration, *Renewing the Civic Mission of the American University,* p 1.

[2]OECD, *The Response of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Needs,* p. 9.

[3]OECD, *The Response of Higher Education Institutions,* p. 3.

whereby students, faculty, and external communities are fully and equally engaged--working in transdisciplinary, dynamic, flexible partnerships of research and learning. As such, university faculty and students and community actors all become co-creators of knowledge and jointly responsible for dissemination and application. The notion of service is replaced by a new practice of engagement, partnership, and learning in all the sites of knowledge production--the classroom, the community and the laboratory.

This new and reinvigorated language and practice of the public research university requires recognition and evaluation. It is a product of new conditions of knowledge creation, new disciplinary relations both within and without the university, and new pressures from academic organizations, foundations, regions, and the world.

No consensus has emerged about the appropriate language to use in discussing this activity and these issues; for this reason, the report uses several terms somewhat interchangeably. The Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement was established using with the terminology suggested by Ernest L. Boyer, the *scholarship of application*, by which he refers to the application of knowledge to "consequential problems," in contrast to the discovery of new knowledge, or the synthesis and integration of existing knowledge, or the transformation of knowledge through teaching.[4] Although this term captures some aspects of what is under discussion, namely the use of knowledge to solve real-world problems, it does not convey the notion of partnership that is central to the relationship between the university and its publics.

The term *scholarship of engagement* borrows from Boyer's formulation of four types of scholarship but underscores the idea of partnership through the term engagement. Both the terms scholarship of application and scholarship of engagement seek to link these activities to the research work of universities, emphasizing how engagement and application can generate new research questions and result in better data through the involvement of non-university partners who are active participants rather than passive subjects.

The term *public service* has been used for many years to identify the third in the university's description of our work--teaching, research, service, and now economic development. Service is part of our evaluation structures and processes already, both for promotion and tenure and for annual salary increases. Service has been seen to be part of the responsibility of the public land grant university. The term public service is somewhat broader than scholarship of application or scholarship of engagement, for it applies not only to activities that may generate new knowledge while being primarily focused on utilizing existing knowledge; public service also includes activities that benefit the public but may not be linked directly and immediately to a faculty member's research. (Note: although for promotion and tenure the category "service" includes service to the discipline and to the university and its units, the activities addressed in this report do not include disciplinary or university service.) "Public service" has the benefit of being clearer: most people have a general sense of its referent. As new terms, scholarship of application and scholarship of engagement have the benefit of bringing the new understanding that service is not as disconnected from research and teaching as the promotion and tenure papers suggest.

II. Background at UIC and Appointment of the Task Force on the Scholarship of

---

[4]Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, chapter 2; quote is p. 21.

Engagement

A. Background

In the past eight years, UIC faculty have been examining the issue of what, in our promotion and tenure documents, is called public service. These discussions culminated in Provost Elizabeth Hoffman's appointment of the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement (TFSE), which began work winter semester 2000.

The Senate Committee on Public Service surveyed the UIC faculty in 1994 and determined that faculty felt that a) there was "currently only limited public service provided by members of the faculty," b) "there [was] support among the faculty for rewarding public service," and c) "academic units have an obligation to provide public service. However, at [that time], undertaking public service activity [was] primarily at a faculty member's discretion."[5] The committee made several specific recommendations, many of which are incorporated into this document.

In December 1998, a group of Great Cities Institute (GCI) Faculty Scholars produced a "White Paper on the Scholarship of Application: Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University," which was based on discussions among GCI Faculty Scholars in 1997 and 1998. The White Paper reviewed some of the relevant literature and argued, as did the Senate Public Service Committee, that activities that are identified variously as public service or the scholarship of engagement should be systematically evaluated and rewarded. The White Paper included examples drawn from UIC faculty work. Compared with the Senate Committee on Public Service document, it focused more narrowly on the expansion of traditional notions of research into the scholarship of engagement and application in partnership with entities in the Chicago area. Although the White Paper addressed the integration of this scholarship with teaching, it did not for the most part discuss public service that was not closely linked to research.

On March 9, 2000, the UIC Senate debated a resolution proposed by the Senate Committee on Public Service and passed an amended version. The resolution, included as Appendix B, concluded that the Senate "concurs with the principle that public service by the faculty should be better defined, evaluated, recognized, and rewarded at UIC." Those Senate members who spoke against the resolution expressed concern that a) units should not be engaged in what is essentially busywork, i.e., creating norms around public service, b) an emphasis on public service would be perceived by junior faculty as yet another burden in achieving tenure, and c) there should not be, as the resolution suggested, a campus-wide committee to evaluate the scholarship of engagement.

The TFSE has taken these concerns into consideration in the following ways: a) we recommend that the Provost bring our report forward to appropriate campus bodies to hear and discuss faculty concerns, b) junior faculty would only be expected to have the scholarship of engagement taken into account with regard to tenure if the unit norms so specified, and c) our

---

[5]Senate Public Service Committee, "Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service,"1994, p. 4. Committee members were Raynard Dooley, Chair; Dick Simpson; Chris Beecher; Hatem El-Agha; John Skosey; Kevin Van Kanegan; Stephen Zepe; Jane Whitener, ex officio; William Jones, ex officio.

recommendations do not include the provision for a campus-wide committee. We consider the establishment of unit norms regarding public service to be essential for the creation of a flexible, decentralized set of expectations on the basis of which faculty can be judged. Hence, we have retained that feature of the original Senate resolution.

B. Charge
The TFSE was appointed by Provost Hoffman to:

1) Generate discussion at UIC of the issues involved in evaluating and rewarding scholarship of engagement. Describe the kinds of activity that the terms scholarship of engagement /public service/scholarship of engagement cover. Promote discussion of the issues and complexities of evaluating and rewarding public service.

2) Propose a document as a model for how to evaluate the scholarship of engagement so that it can be incorporated into evaluations of faculty for purposes of promotion and tenure. This proposal should then pass through appropriate channels.
Responsibility for defining and establishing the appropriate weight of the scholarship of engagement in the promotion and tenure process for a particular unit will be set by that unit. If a unit does not now expect and reward public service, it should think about the appropriateness of doing so. If a unit is presently hiring faculty who practice the scholarship of engagement, it should establish expectations and standards for evaluating the scholarship of engagement.

3) Make available to the campus current literature and best practices on assessing public service.

C. Task Force Members
The Provost appointed a committee that represented various colleges of UIC. Because of scheduling conflicts, only the following members were able to attend meetings and contribute to the drafting of the report:

Margaret Strobel, chair
Professor, Gender and Women's Studies Program and Department of History; Interim Director, Hull-House Initiative

Gerald Graff, Associate Dean for Curriculum and Instruction, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Professor, Department of English and College of Education

Tamar Heller, Professor of Human Development, Associate Head for External Affairs, Director of Aging Studies Program, Department of Disability and Human Development.

William G. Jones, Chair, Senate Executive Committee; Associate Professor, University Library

Irma Olmedo, Associate Professor, College of Education

David C. Perry, Director, Great Cities Institute, and Professor, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs

Barbara Ransby, Assistant Professor, Department of African-American Studies and Department of History

Dick Simpson, Professor, Department of Political Science

Other Task Force members were unable to attend meetings but commented on the draft document: John M. Pezzuto, Professor and Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, College of Pharmacy; Tonse Raju, M.D., Professor, Pediatrics; Rosemary White-Traut, B.N.S.C., R.N., Associate Professor, Acting Head, Maternal Child Nursing.

D. Task Force Meetings

The committee met on February 22, March 7, April 4, April 25, and May 9.   Members read various reports and documents included in the bibliography.[6]

The draft document was circulated to selected members of the campus community for comment, for example those who had expressed concerns at the Senate discussion of a resolution on public service, before a final report was forwarded to the Provost. Committee members met with Provost Hoffman July 21 to discuss a preliminary draft of the report; some language changes were agreed upon, which were incorporated into the final report.

E. The Report

Sections III and V substantially reflect the material in "A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process," prepared by the Senate Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1993, which is quoted extensively with permission.[7] The UIUC document has been modified to reflect UIC and more recent conceptualizations. Where the UIUC document uses the term "public service," we understand the "scholarship of engagement" to be appropriate as well.

III. Distinguishing Characteristics of Public Service or the Scholarship of Engagement

A. Identifying Public Service

The types of public service activities that faculty members engage in reflect the nature of their appointments, their training and experience, as well as specific external needs. This leads to diverse forms of interaction by faculty members with communities, individual clients, industries, agencies, governmental entities, and other constituencies. Although the forms can be diverse, public service activities share the following five distinguishing characteristics:

---

[6]Items read by the Task Force are indicated with an asterisk in Appendix E: Bibliography.
[7]We thank Steven Schomberg, Associate Chancellor, Office of Continuing Education, UIUC, for granting permission.

1. They contribute to the public welfare or the common good.

2. They call upon faculty members' academic and/or professional expertise.

3. They directly address or respond to real_world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.

4. They engage with off-campus publics in reciprocal partnerships.

5. They may contribute to the creation of new knowledge.

The first characteristic signifies the importance of determining the purpose of a particular activity. Doing so can help avoid confusing public service activities that are for the common good and those that are primarily of only private interest and benefit. The second characteristic emphasizes the importance of differentiating volunteer community activities from activities that require the professional expertise of the professor. The third characteristic reflects a weighting toward applied activities rather than theoretical ones on the perceived continuum between theory and practice. Public service activities tend to focus primarily on the concrete rather than on the abstract. The fourth indicates that public service means engaging with some public outside the university in a reciprocal partnership in which both parties gain and learn. The fifth characteristic, which is sometimes but not always present, is that the work of the faculty members in cooperation with a public about real world problems may lead to new understanding and knowledge.

B. Examples of Public Service Activities

The diversity of external needs as well as faculty training and experience leads to many different forms of public service. To the extent that they are in keeping with all of the previously stated characteristics, the following activities are examples of how faculty members, through their academic or professional expertise, can contribute to the public good while directly addressing real_world problems, issues, interests, or concerns:

1. Provide services for the public through a University clinic, hospital, or laboratory.

2. Make research understandable and usable in specific professional and applied settings such as in technology transfer activities.

3. Provide public policy analysis for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies and for non-governmental agencies.

4. Test concepts and processes in real_world situations.

5. Act as expert witnesses.

6. Give presentations or performances for the public.

7. Provide extension education.

8. Conduct applied research.

9. Evaluate programs, policies, or personnel for agencies, using existing evaluation instruments or developing new ones.

10. Engage in informational activities (seminars, conferences, institutes) that address public_interest problems, issues, and concerns and that are aimed at either general or specialized audiences such as commodity, trade, practitioner, or occupational groups.

11. Participate in governmental meetings or on federal review panels.

12. Engage in economic and community development activities.

13. Participate in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, or civic agencies.

14. Testify before legislative or congressional committees.

15. Consult with town, city, or county governments; schools, museums, parks, and other public institutions; companies; groups; or individuals.

16. Assist neighborhood organizations.

17. Conduct studies on specific problems brought to one's attention by individuals, agencies, or businesses.

18. Serve as experts for the press or other media; influence the framing of stories and understanding of events.

19. Write for popular and nonacademic publications, including newsletters and magazines directed to agencies, professionals, or other specialized audiences.

20. Address issues within the community via demonstration projects and research.

Such activities usually require (1) a background of significant scholarship, (2) adequate diagnostic skills, (3) use or development of creative and focused methodologies, (4) strong information organization and media skills, and (5) written and oral skills in interpreting as well as presenting information.

C. Potential Sources of Confusion
1. Public service may be performed in many different locations: on campus, as when serving in a clinic or hospital; or off campus, as when consulting with a school district or a governmental

agency. *Location,* therefore, is not a distinguishing characteristic of public service.

2. Public service typically entails the application of faculty members' areas of expertise in addressing real_world problems, issues, or concerns. Such service may be performed as part of their University responsibilities or in addition to their stated responsibilities, in which case it may be either uncompensated or compensated. In terms of compensation, the nature and extent of all public service work should be in keeping with University regulations. Whether or not *compensation* is received for public service is not a criterion for an activity's being considered public service. At the same time, activities that are engaged in mainly to make money, such as running a business or a consulting firm on the side, are clearly not part of faculty members' University public service activities, even though those activities may benefit the public, organizations, or individuals.

3. Recipients of public service may include individuals and organizations, as well as local, state, national, and international governing bodies and agencies. Activities directed primarily to regularly enrolled students would not normally be considered public service. While it is certainly a form of service to individuals and the state, *teaching* regularly enrolled students in this University, no matter where their instruction takes place, would normally be considered a form of instruction in promotion and tenure considerations.

4. *Clinical teaching* is clearly a blend of teaching and public service. Although arising from a primary teaching need, the primary obligation during its performance is to patients or clients, and only secondarily to the students. The welfare of the patients or clients must be kept foremost. Experimentation solely for instructional purpose would be unethical.

5. Not all forms of service are *public* service. For example, faculty members can provide service to the University: in an administrative capacity; as members of the senate; or as committee members at the University, campus, college, or departmental levels. Such service, however, is not public service and is referred to as *institutional service or internal service*; nor is service to professional organizations and scholarly societies, which is typically referred to as *disciplinary service*.

6. Not all activities engaged in by faculty members in settings external to the University are undertaken to help fulfill the university's or unit's public service mission. (College, unit, and departmental mission statements are important in this regard because the institution's mission is too broad to offer much guidance on this matter.) For example, faculty members may serve as jurors, as youth leaders and coaches, or on the PTA. They do so, however, in their role as private citizens. Therefore, such service is sometimes referred to as *private service*. In contrast, public service activities fulfill the mission of the unit and institution and utilize faculty members' academic or professional expertise.

7. The relationships among outreach, *continuing education*, and public service are potentially confusing. Both public service and continuing education are forms of outreach when they go beyond resident instruction and discipline_oriented research and are initiated in response to an

external audience or constituency. However, the outreach concept often does not describe the reciprocal nature of the interaction between faculty members and their publics. For example, while faculty members are working with external audiences, they often gain insight into problems and receive knowledge that affects their research and informs their teaching.

Some but not all types of public service are accomplished through continuing education such as community short courses and continuing professional education. However some types of continuing education primarily serve the University's teaching mission, such as when graduate programs are offered at off_campus sites. Continuing education that does meet the previously stated characteristics of public service serves the University's public service mission, while continuing education that does not meet the above criteria primarily serves the teaching mission.

8. *Consulting* with private companies can be an important form of public service, and interaction with companies can contribute to faculty members' research and/or teaching. To be considered part of one's University public service, consulting should conform to all of the above criteria of public service and reflect the department's and University's mission objectives. At the same time, the main purpose of consulting should be service rather than financial remuneration.

Public service is a complex set of activities reflecting the nature of faculty members' appointments, their training and experience as well as the specific external need. Sometimes, differentiating these activities from teaching and research is difficult, and in such cases multiple criteria should be used in assessing the quality of the activity. However, for the activity to be public service it must draw upon faculty members' academic or professional expertise and contribute to the public good, while at the same time directly addressing or responding to real_world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.

IV. Formulating Unit Norms
Because UIC is a diverse institution with a complex mission, the scholarship of engagement will be more central to some units than to others. Individual units must develop statements of norms and expectations appropriate to their respective missions. For some units, the scholarship of engagement may be relevant to achieving tenure; for others it may be more appropriately considered for promotion to full professor. In addition, units should specify expectations for rewarding public service in terms of salary increases. (See Appendix C for an example of a statement of unit norms.)
Unit statements of norms for public service will be reviewed by appropriate campus-wide bodies and by the Provost's office.

V. Suggestions for Planning, Documenting, and Evaluating Public Service
We wish to emphasize the importance of planning early, understanding departmental expectations, designing activities with evaluation in mind, and being sure that any evaluation is consistent with the demands of the promotion and tenure review process. Far too often, faculty members who make an impact through their public service activities fail to receive appropriate recognition because they and their department heads did not pay proper attention to one or more of these considerations.
The primary method of documentation should be the development of a public service

portfolio or dossier.

A. Recommendations for All Faculty Members
All faculty members will benefit from the following suggestions for planning, documenting, and evaluating public service.

A.1. Understanding the Institution
The University of Illinois at Chicago is a land_grant and research-intensive institution. Therefore, the general criteria applied to the judgment of merit reflect an expectation for excellence in teaching, research, and public service. The specific expectations are reviewed annually and communicated to the colleges by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

A.2. Understanding Unit or Departmental Expectations
The promotion and tenure process begins with the specific academic department or unit; therefore, faculty members' involvement in public service should reflect their position appointments. Departments vary in the emphasis they give to public service activities and those they consider important. Discussions with the department head or chair, other senior members of the department's faculty, and members of the department's promotion and tenure review committee can help to clarify the following:

a. Departmental expectations concerning the kinds of public service activities that are encouraged.

b. How each activity should be documented.

c. The criteria for public service to be used in judging performance at the departmental and college level.

Questions to be considered:

In what areas has the department established a history of quality in public service?

a. In what ways do the department's faculty members appropriately interact with practicing professionals or meet agency and industry needs for technical information and education?

b. What types of public service activities are encouraged as a part of the departmental mission?

c. Does the faculty member's position appointment fit within the mission of the department and/or college?

d. What balance does the department expect faculty members to maintain among research

(or other scholarly activities), teaching (including continuing education), and public service while working toward indefinite tenure?

e. How are public service activities evaluated in terms of excellence?

It is important to establish a dialogue at the appropriate level(s) of the University regarding expectations for professional development and productivity. Dialogues of this type should continue throughout faculty members' careers.

A.3. Preparing Early for Evaluation

Preparing for evaluation of public service work by promotion and tenure committees should begin early in a faculty member's University appointment. As public service activities are planned, conducted, and evaluated, consider how those activities might best be interpreted to promotion or tenure committees. Developing high_quality public service activities takes time and effort. Thoughtful evaluation and reporting of evaluation results also require time and effort. Beginning early will help to avoid a last_minute rush to document work and should result in a clearer and more complete interpretation of accomplishments.

A.4. Seeking Help

Many sources of assistance are available to faculty members as they plan, conduct, evaluate, and report their public service work. Faculty members should seek out a mentor and advocate among the senior faculty members. Many committees do not have experience with evaluating public service activities; a senior faculty member who understands the public service concept and how to organize a dossier can help a committee evaluate these activities and understand how they fit into the portfolio.

A.5. Planning Public Service with Promotion in Mind

If public service activities are to be used to support a favorable promotion decision, they should be planned with that use in mind. Faculty members should plan their efforts far in advance and design them for qualitative evaluation. Department chairs or heads should be involved in the planning process to ensure that faculty members' proposed public service activities are consistent with departmental expectations. Departmental executive committee members, senior faculty members, and promotion and tenure committee members should also be asked to share their insights regarding the campus promotion process.

A.6. Planning Activities with Evaluation in Mind

As faculty members become involved in public service, evaluation should be included as part of the planning of any such activity. The best way to assure that public service efforts will be assessed at the end of an activity is to develop evaluative mechanisms that will track those efforts from the beginning.

Assessment can be helpful both to improve work along the way and to determine its quality at the end of an activity. These two types of evaluations should be performed separately. Evaluation of quality should consider the kinds of evidence and the outcomes that will be meaningful to promotion and tenure committee members at the departmental, college, and

campus levels. *Simply listing activities without attention to assessment of quality does little to enhance a ease for promotion or tenure.* Assessment of quality should include evidence of excellence, innovation, and impact. Faculty members should be able to identify relevant evaluative criteria and check their judgment against that of colleagues.

Public service needs to be visible, evaluatable, and improvable. Public service activities typically occur outside the view of other faculty members. Therefore, it is important that tangible products result from public service activities and that they can be evaluated by others. Writing up public service as a form of scholarship is one way to permit evaluation of the work.

A.7. Making a Case

Make a case for the quality of the public service work and how it relates to research and/or teaching. Relate the case explicitly to the terms of the appointment with the University. Promotion and tenure committees judge how well the case has been made either for the granting of indefinite tenure or promotion. They do not evaluate the specific work itself; this is done by the external referees. Therefore, it is not the quality of any one piece of work but the overall quality of the dossier and the accompanying documentation that will lead to a successful outcome.

A.8. Being Selective

Not everything undertaken as a public service will be or should be considered in promotion and tenure review. For example, routine talks to service clubs or repeated consultation on the same topic with similar information may not be considered as significant for review. Consider the following questions as a way of relating public service activities to the promotion and tenure process:

a. Do the public service efforts draw upon the faculty member's disciplinary or professional expertise?

b. To what extent do the activities represent potential new interpretations and applications of knowledge for use in specific settings?

c. Is there potential for the activities to generate new research questions or make more understandable the current body of knowledge?

d. Does the outreach activity make an impact on public policy, on the improvement of practice among professionals, or on those involved in agriculture or business?

e. Is there continuity among program ideas, or do they present a "shotgun" array of activities?

A.9. Making Quality Evident

Participants in public service activities conducted by University faculty members are often active professionals in various fields. They are in an appropriate position to assess the impact of such activities when the primary focus is on applying current knowledge to practical

problems. They may also be able to provide evidence of the contribution of scholarly endeavors to any increase of their awareness of the practical implications of theory or to any improvement of professional practice. In summary, documentation of the impact of public service activities and their contributions to professional improvement may be the most potent single manner in which comments by professionals can support the case in the review process.

Senior faculty members from comparable institutions represent a valuable source of evidence regarding the excellence of faculty members' public service efforts and related scholarly endeavors. In particular, they may be able to comment on the extent to which faculty members have made a substantial contribution to their discipline or profession and the extent to which they have been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers, or practitioners.

The qualifications of referees asked to comment upon leadership in the field or contributions to theory through public service efforts *must* be made explicit in promotion papers. Although faculty members from comparable institutions are preferred, it is imperative that review committee members be able to identify why the particular referees are to be viewed as highly qualified to assess the faculty member's standing. Referees' comments should be specific and concise. The context in which the faculty member is being judged and the evaluator's qualifications and background are all critical to the ultimate impact of the reference. The more familiar the referees are with the particular public service effort, similar efforts, and the field in general and the more focused their evaluative comments, the more helpful will be their evaluations.

B. Recommendations for Faculty Members Whose Public Service Constitutes a Substantial Portion of Their University Assigned Responsibilities

Faculty members whose University_assigned responsibilities entail a significant amount of public service work are strongly urged to develop with the department head or chair and the dean at the time of hiring any special *criteria* for judging the quality of public service activities to be used in evaluating the quality of performance. Such criteria should then be made available to candidates in writing at the time of their appointment. Subsequent modifications in official appointment papers should likewise be documented and become part of their official personnel records.

B.1. Special Criteria for Judging Public Service

When special criteria are being negotiated, the following topics related to how they will be evidenced in the final portfolio should be covered:

a. Quality of public service work.

b. Impact of the public service work.

c. Dissemination of the public service contribution as expressed through scholarship.

d. Interaction with a community of scholars.

e. Integration of research, teaching, and public service.

  f. Creation of new knowledge through engagement with the university's publics.

  For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, well_stated cases should be based on the overall public service activities, not on a single instance of public service. Faculty members will want to stress the nature and extent of interaction with society. Most committees will encourage that only those public service activities that are exemplary and can clearly demonstrate impact and innovation be put forward. Well_stated cases will also argue effectively how the efforts to bridge between theory and real_world problems, issues, or concerns have not only enhanced faculty members' careers, but have also contributed to the vitality of the University and larger community.

  Long lists of public service activities do not necessarily indicate the quality of those activities. Indeed, high_quality activities may be obscured or invisible when buried in a lengthy list of unevaluated activities. Only the best efforts should be included in the dossier. The activity should be described briefly, along with its impact and outcomes, the evaluation procedures used, the context in which comparisons were made, and the qualifications of evaluators.

  It is advisable to contact relevant professional and discipline_oriented associations and societies to obtain their statements, if available, about specific criteria for evaluating public service in their fields.

  Public service is generally regarded of high quality when there is evidence that it has resulted in the following outcomes:

  a. A beneficial impact attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up_to_date knowledge to the real_world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service. (Examples: favorable effects upon public policy or upon professional, agricultural, or business practice.)

  b. Honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition such as commendations that have been received in the execution of public service.

  c. Election to office or undertaking important service to professional associations and learning societies, including editorial work or peer reviewing for a national or international organization, as related to public service.

  d. Selection for special public service activities outside the state and invitations to give talks within the faculty member's field.

  e. Election or appointment to departmental or institutional governance bodies or to academic policy or procedure development committees related to public service.

  f. Participation in professional or scientific associations and meetings, and presentation of papers.

B.2. Evidence of Scholarly Excellence

Tenure_track and tenured faculty members whose main responsibility is providing public service are generally expected to engage in scholarly endeavors that result in innovations, advancement in knowledge, or contributions to their disciplines or professions in their service to society. Efforts to improve public service can be a form of scholarly activity related to research and can result in publication. In addition, public service that is truly innovative can advance a discipline or profession and attract external support. Evidence of scholarly excellence in these endeavors may include:

a. Publication in books, journals, and monographs; creation of videotapes, computer programs, and fact sheets; syllabus reprints; development of program materials; authored newspaper articles; exhibits, shows, and concerts; writing for business, trade, and community publications and technical reports. (In such publications, for example, the results of innovative links made between theory and practice may be described.)

b. Evaluative statements from clients or peers of quality and impact of reports and other documents produced by the faculty member that evidence creativity and scholarship in public service.

c. Receiving grants and contracts to fund the development and delivery of public service innovations, when such grants and contracts are competitive and subject to peer review and approval.

d. Being sought out by individuals from outside the state or nation who want to study the public service provider's work and innovations.

e. Development of instruments and processes adopted by others for solving persistent problems.

VI. Recommendations and Implementation

A. Recommendations

A.1. The Provost should instruct units to establish norms for the amount and kinds of scholarship of engagement that faculty members at specific tenure levels are expected to achieve and the method of evaluation. These norms should be appropriate to the mission of the unit and will be approved by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost's office. The Provost's office recognizes that for some units there will be a minimal expectation of public service whereas for others the mission of the unit will dictate that the expectation will be substantial.

A.2. The Provost should circulate to appropriate bodies the enclosed proposed language changes in the Promotion and Tenure papers (see Appendix D). Sections III and V of the Report of the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement should be made available to candidates for promotion and tenure as part of the promotion and tenure papers.

A.3. The Provost should create an award for exemplary scholarship of engagement. Five awards should be given per year; the amount should be added to the base salary and should equal the amount given for Excellence in Teaching awards.

A.4. The Provost should make available seed grant funds to be awarded for the first time in FY 2003 (July 1, 2003).

B. Implementation (with approximate dates)

After receiving the final report over the summer, the Provost should make the campus community aware of the report and schedule a series of events.

B.1. An article should appear in *UIC News* describing the issues and proposed activities (fall 2000).

B.2. Briefing sessions should be scheduled at which the document is discussed with relevant bodies and interested individuals (fall 2000): Senate Executive Committee, Priorities Committee, Deans Council, individuals with concerns.

B3. The Provost should circulate the Kellogg Report and make available articles on best practices (fall 2000).

B.4. The Provost should appoint a committee to select recipients of the Scholarship of Engagement Award, based up exemplary activity (Committee appointed July-August 2001; January deadline for nominations; first awards given out at commencement 2002).

B.5. The Provost should invite some individual or group to campus for a workshop with unit representatives to discuss assessment and develop unit procedures for evaluating and rewarding the SE (2001-2002).

B.6. Units should develop explicit statements of norms regarding public service (fall 2001).

B.7. The Provost should run the competition for seed grants through the Great Cities Institute. Five grants of up to $7,500 each should be funded (call for proposals fall 2002; January 2003 deadline; July 1, 2003, funding begins).

Appendices

Appendix A: Case Studies from UIC

Effective Mental Health Service Delivery in Urban Low-Income Communities
      Marc S. Atkins, Department of Psychiatry, and Great Cities Faculty Scholar

The Advocacy and Empowerment for Minority Youth with Disabilities Program: A UIC-CPS
Partnership
      Professor Fabricio Balcazar, Department of Disability and Human Development and
      Department of Psychology

Working with the Schools: Project Tempest
      Gerald Graff, Associate Dean for Curriculum and Instruction, College of Liberal Arts and
      Sciences; Professor, Department of English and College of Education

Contemporary Community Curriculum: Developing Art Education Models with Middle School
and High School Art Teachers
      Olivia Gude, Art and Design, and Great Cities Faculty Scholar

Effective Youth Programs in Urban Low-Income Communities
      Don Hellison, School of Kinesiology

The Ida B. Wells Communiversity Project: A Community--University Dialogue Based at UIC
      Barbara Ransby, Department of African-American Studies and Department of History

Reforming Chicago Politics and Government: Contributions by the UIC Department of Political
Science
      Professor Dick Simpson, Department of Political Science

Don't Throw It Away! Documenting and Preserving Organizational History
      Margaret Strobel

UIC/Benito Juárez Advisory Research Project
      Connie Yowell, Associate Professor, and Steve Tozer, Professor, College of Education,
      and Great Cities Faculty Scholars

Effective Mental Health Service Delivery in Urban Low-Income Communities
Marc S. Atkins, Department of Psychiatry, and Great Cities Faculty Scholar

Background

Professor Atkins' program of research is focused on the development of effective and culturally competent mental health services for children and families living in urban, low-income communities in the Near Westside. Professor Atkins views the Great Cities Faculty Scholars Program as an opportunity to further develop his interest in the link between mental health service programs and educational and social service programs.

The reasons for the proposed linkages between educational and social service programs are twofold. First, there is considerable evidence that children showing disruptive behavior disorders are at high risk for poor school adjustment, thus providing a strong rationale for school-based mental services. Second, evidence shows the lack of benefits of mental health services provided through mental health clinics in urban, low-income communities. Moreover, mental health resources are scarce within inner city communities, and when available, comprise a fragmented and ineffective means of serving children. Therefore, alternative models for mental health delivery are of high importance.

Description

Professor Atkins' school-based mental health program incorporates an ecological-mediational model (Felner et al., 1995) that specifies proximal classroom experiences and linkages with families as mediators of distal school-level factors (e.g., school climate). The proximal experiences have been derived from an empirical literature that identifies four ecological contexts related to childhood disruptive behavior:

1.   Teacher context (behavior management skills, classroom organization, positive relationships),
2.   Peer group context (attitudes towards aggression, social support),
3.   Child context (attitudes toward aggression, social competence), and
4.   Family linkages to school (involvement in schooling, social support, parenting strategies).

The ecological perspective emphasizes the need for services that are flexible and individualized across multiple contexts, and that integrate into ongoing school routines and resources. Expansion of this model to include family linkages to socially supportive community activities, and children's involvement in after-school programs, is intended to provide a stronger network of care for children and families in urban, low-income communities.

Goals

The main goals of the program are:

1.   To develop a model for inter-agency collaboration and for the development of mental health service goals within educational and social service programs.
2.   To study models for linking mental health programs to Chicago Public Schools

initiatives such as, School-Based Problem Solving, Violence Prevention, remedial and special education programs, parent involvement, and teacher support programs.

3.   To develop plans for focus group and survey data to study the effects of community participation on the development and implementation of mental health programs serving children and families in urban, low income communities.

Community Involvement

Professor Atkins and his colleagues are actively studying the role that community members can play in the development and implementation of mental health programs in urban, low-income communities. For example, parents from the community assist in the design and delivery of mental health groups for participating parents, with initial contacts with families, and with follow-up care. Professor Atkins believes that these community members are providing an important contribution to these services that has significant implications for mental health policy. The model that Professor Atkins and his colleagues are exploring places schools as hubs for services and uses mental health providers to develop linkages between schools and other community resources, and to provide consultation to schools and agencies to maintain services for at-risk children and families.

Implementation and Assessment

The service delivery model proceeds in four phases:

1.   Engagement of key constituents in urban schools;
2.   Development of collaborative partnerships between classroom teacher, community parent and mental health service provider;
3.   Systematic assessment of ecological classroom and school contexts; and
4.   Delivery of empirically-based services.

The model emphasizes the development of positive opportunities for children and parents to assume leadership roles in school activities to counter mistrust and deteriorating relations between parents and teachers, to identify parents' and children's peers as resources for mental health services in schools, and to provide positive role models for children and for other parents.

The classroom-based collaborative teams become the foundation for a systematic assessment of:

1.   Factors associated with aggression within the four ecological contexts (teacher, peer group, child, family);
2.   Available resources for the delivery of services and the maintenance of service groups, and,
3.   Empirically-based interventions specific to identified needs that are teacher-centered, classroom-based, and family-linked.

Empowering Choices for Low Income Minority You with Disabilities
Fabricio E. Balcazar, Ph.D.
Department of Disability and Human Development and Department of Psychology

Background

Minorities with disabilities are significantly less likely than non-minorities to have a competitive job after graduation. The mean employment rate for students with disabilities is only 14.8% and minority students are significantly less likely than non-minorities to be employed among the severely disabled (National Longitudinal Transition Study, 1991, p. 8-39). Students with disabilities within the Chicago Public School System (CPS) are concentrated in schools with very limited resources, where the norm is that half the students drop out of high school (Hess & Lauber, 1985). In addition, the Vocational Rehabilitation Services of Illinois (VR) are not adequately meeting the needs of inner city youth with disabilities. Although CPS schools attempt to provide social skills curriculum and employment experience, they do not have the resources to meet the needs of the ever-growing number of youth with disabilities enrolled in special education. Over the last seven years, my colleagues and I have been working with minority youth with disabilities, teachers, parents and administrators in a research and demonstration project designed to develop and evaluate innovative solutions to the transition shortcomings of inner city youth with disabilities. CPS is the third largest school district in the country, with over 45,000 employees, over 400,000 students and almost three billion dollars in annual funding.

Description of Project Activities

The intervention model has the following components:

a. Functional Skills Development geared at teaching goal setting, action planning, self awareness, and help-recruiting skills, through classroom training in collaboration with local special education teachers. The curriculum provides students multiple opportunities to practice the skills through role play simulations and field experiences. The project involved high school students at all grade levels.

b. Intensive Case Management provided by UIC staff

c. Educational advocacy and social support (mentoring) provided through case management interactions

d. Employment Support through vocational guidance, job search assistance, and job coaching as needed. Case managers do not provide jobs to any student. Students are trained to find and secure their own jobs in order to promote independence and self-sufficiency.

e. Family Support through education around disability awareness, disability rights, and community resources. Case managers become available to family members and students for assistance in advocacy or crisis situations that may arise. Home visits are common and information is provided to parents as needed for them to be able to affectively address a student's need (e.g., steps required to open a VR case).

Our program has three project case managers that are primarily responsible for working with the project participants and their families. The case management component provides comprehensive services that promote positive transitions from school to work. Our curriculum is unique in that it teaches students about themselves, how to write goals that are realistic and how

to develop action plans with specific steps for pursuing their goals. We also provide advocacy support within the school for more accessible and inclusive educational opportunities that will enhance the participants' abilities to obtain competitive employment. We provide some job readiness training, support with accessing post-secondary education and training programs, transition planning for youth moving from school to work, dropout prevention support, family/parent training, and advocacy training. We have also done some work with employers for supporting students with disabilities at their job sites.

Community Involvement

Project participants are supported in seeking out and setting up mentoring relationships that will ultimately help them in the attainment of employment and/or education goals both during and after high school. This effort includes the recruitment of UIC undergraduate students who volunteer as mentors or tutors for students. In some cases, those students can earn extra credit as part of a community psychology class or field research experience. In other cases, students recruit teachers or relatives to assist them with particular tasks. Our parent training is innovative in that it is conducted one-on-one within the parent's home by the case managers who often develop personal relationships with the project participants and families. Teachers and school administrators participate actively in the process of providing input and suggestions about better
ways to implement the program or strategies to overcome certain obstacles students may face. Case managers often volunt eer at their schools to assist teachers and/or administrators with their multiple tasks. Case managers have also developed good working relationships with some local
employers who are now willing to offer jobs to minority youth with disabilities based in their previous positive experiences.

Project Outcomes

The following data represent preliminary findings of the study. All participants in both years received the same services as mentioned before. Some students needed varying degrees of job coaching but this service was provided to all at some level at least once during their time of employment.

During year 1 of this project, 30 individuals were served. Of these students, 18 (60%) graduated from school, while the others continued.

22 students with disabilities were placed into employment (73%).
20 of them were employed on a part time basis, and 2 on a full time basis.
12 (67%) of the 18 students who graduated enrolled in some type of post-secondary education or training program.

During year 2 of this project, 49 individuals were served. During this year, 31 (63%) were employed.

27 individuals were employed on a part time basis, and 4 on a full time basis.
We do not have the post-educational data for the group of recent graduates.

Evaluation Methods

This project employs a multi-level assessment strategy that involves both quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies. Students' acquisition of help-recruiting skills was evaluated using role-play simulations before and after training. We also evaluated students changes in the composition of their social support network, and changes in self-efficacy and self-esteem before and after the intervention. We asked students to set a number of goals at the onset of the program and collected on-going checks to verify progress in goal attainment, identify new goals or goals that were dropped or changed. We used a goal attainment scale to quantify students' goal attainment scores. We also conducted semi-structured interviews with students to document the ways in which they sought help from others in the process of pursuing their transition goals. Finally, we collected project satisfaction surveys from students, teachers, school administrators and parents.

Working With the Schools: Project Tempest
Gerald Graff, Associate Dean for Curriculum and Instruction, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Professor, Department of English and College of Education

(Note: This article will appear in the October 2000 *PMLA*.)

One of the most striking recent trends in American education is the increasing degree of collaboration between universities and high schools. Spurred by deepening national concern over the schools, universities are making a far greater commitment than ever before to the preparation of secondary teachers (see American Council on Education, 1999; Franklin, Laurence, and Welles, 1999; Franklin, 1999). This long_overdue development marks a dramatic change in outlook from the days when I began university teaching in 1963.

In that era, most college professors outside of education schools would sooner do hard labor in prison than work with high school teachers, much less high school students. Such work was seen as a retrograde career move for the few selfless professors who took it on. Many academics still think this way about teacher education, but attitudes are changing, as my own career may illustrate.

I certainly would never have guessed back in '63 that a generation later I would find myself working extensively with high schools. Nor would I have guessed that I would end up where I am now, a university associate dean with major responsibilities in secondary teacher preparation. And far from retarding my career, my work in the schools has become part of my research and writing as well as my university teaching.[8]

The turning point that led all these things to come to pass was a project I helped develop in the Spring of 1997 and will describe in this essay. The project linked several English courses in Chicago area public high schools with my undergraduate college course, "Literature and Society in the Culture Wars," at the University of Chicago. A goal of the project was to see if linking college and high school courses around a set of controversial issues would help students at different educational levels to enter the academic intellectual conversation. The idea was to see if such a collaboration could provide a <u>way</u> <u>in</u> to academic discussions, especially for students for whom "academic" means boring and irrelevant.

The project's guiding ideas came in part from my book, <u>Beyond</u> <u>the</u> <u>Culture</u> <u>Wars:</u> <u>How</u> <u>Teaching</u> <u>the</u> <u>Conflicts</u> <u>Can</u> <u>Revitalize</u> <u>American</u> <u>Education</u> (Graff, 1992), in which I argued that since academic subjects best clarify themselves for students at moments of controversy, educators should "teach the conflicts" between (and about) books and ideas rather than keep those conflicts hidden from students. The guiding ideas also came from another of the project's organizers, high school teacher Thomas McCann, whose Education Ph.D. dissertation explored ways of improving the argumentative skills of high school students (McCann, 1995).

Here is how Project Tempest, as it came to be called, worked. Several high school teachers and I agreed that during the same period in our semesters we would all assign William Shakespeare's play, <u>The</u> <u>Tempest</u>. We also agreed to assign a selection of critical pieces that we

---

[8] I draw extensively on my work with high school teachers and students in a book now in progress entitled "Clueless in Academe: How Schools and Colleges Mystify Intellectual Culture." My work in the Tempest Project here described has resulted in a textbook on Shakespeare's play and the critical debates on it (Graff and Phelan, 2000).

would choose or devise ourselves to represent the disputes over the aims of literary study that had been provoked by multiculturalist and feminist reinterpretations of Western culture. My college class enrolled 12 students, five of whom volunteered to take part in the project; on the high school side, two schools, five teachers, and over 400 students from the 9th to the 12th grades were involved. Delegations of 5 to 10 high school and college students made visits to each other's classes and reported back to their classmates on the discussions that occurred. Centrally employing e_mail (which was crucial in the instructors' day_to_day planning of project), students exchanged papers and responses with each other and with their teachers, creating a common conversation across the different institutions and grade levels. The unit culminated in a student symposium on The Tempest hosted by the University, attended by approximately 120 students and instructors. (An abbreviated program of this symposium appears at the end of this essay.)

Why The Tempest? Traditionally Shakespeare's play has been read and performed as a magnificent expression of universal human experience, exemplified in Duke Prospero, whose magical powers are thought to symbolize the transcendent power of art itself. Some recent revisionist readings, however, depict Prospero as an oppressive colonialist, and see his bestial slave Caliban, previously taken to be a comic villain, as a heroic voice of protest on behalf of the wretched of the earth.

The debates sparked by these clashing ways of reading and staging the play raise central educational questions that we sought to address in our unit: Is it legitimate to read a work in the light of concerns that may not have been central to its intention? Can we determine what a text's intention is, especially when its author is long dead? Do our racial, gender, or ethnic backgrounds matter in how we read__e.g., do males and females, or blacks and whites, read differently, or should readers try to rise above such differences? What do we do when our interpretations and evaluations of texts conflict? Why are some works judged to be better than others, and can such judgments be defended rationally or are they purely subjective or ethnocentric? Why read books anyway, and why analyze them for their "hidden meanings" instead of simply reading for the fun of it?

Such literary disputes opened out into questions about cultural difference and diversity that have entered school and college curricula. We hoped to get students to see that though questions may not have a single correct answer, some arguments will be better grounded than others. At the same time, we were less concerned with the answers students might arrive at than with the extent to which they were able to enter oral and written discussions about them in a disciplined way.

We recognized that the level at which our questions could be posed would vary widely from course to course and grade to grade. Since it was understood, however, that each instructor would tailor the unit to the needs of his or her students (and since each instructor was still responsible for his or her class), the project could allow wide variations in the way the material was handled while still sustaining a common discussion with shared reference points.

In one of the highlights of the culminating symposium (which we recorded on videotape), students on the opening panel debated whether The Tempest is about universal themes, political power struggles, or somehow both. Mike, a college sophomore, argued for a political interpretation, leading to the following exchange:

EMILY (a high school senior): According to a book called The Celestine Prophesy...to

transcend [the] struggle for power between human relationships is to go for a greater good. And I believe this is what Prospero is doing toward the end of the play when [he forgives Caliban for potting his overthrow]....Prospero is no longer engaging in this struggle, this power struggle.

MIKE:...But if you look at who has the power in this situation, Prospero or Caliban, it is very easy for Prospero to say, "Oh, I can transcend politics..." because he's already got the power. Caliban has no chance to forgive because he has no power, and he can't forget the politics because he's at the bottom.

ZACK (a high school junior, from the audience]: Right. That's not transcending politics, that's just another continuation of it.

EMILY: It comes down to what you believe, and I happen to believe that human beings are inherently good, not power hungry....

Such articulate and incisive give and take created tremendous excitement in both the students and the teachers, giving us a sense of the educational potential of such projects. Our project challenged high school and college students to perform such fundamental tasks as reading with close attention, listening to and summarizing arguments opposed to theirs, and formulating their own arguments and giving reasons and evidence for them. Students also got an opportunity to see that arguing over ideas can advance mutual understanding even when a consensus is not reached. Yet though we had made a promising start, the instructors came away feeling that much work remains to be done to bring a wider range of students into the kind of discussion we had created.

Yet we also came away feeling that bringing schools and colleges together in projects like ours can do more than either institution alone to heighten student interest intellectual work. The high school students benefited from the models of intellectual engagement offered by their older peers, while in the process getting an inspiring view of college intellectual life. On their side, the college students benefited from the rhetorical challenge of communicating their ideas to audiences outside the course. As for me, I was surprised to realize that having to explain myself to high school students, far from making me dumb down my ideas (as I might have expected), forced me to be clearer and more in control of them.

In still another unanticipated result, the experience left me feeling that such collaborative projects can play a role in teacher education. In the process of planning and executing a unit together, my fellow teachers and I learned much from each other about both our subject matter and how to teach it to different kinds and levels of students. Instead of a top_down process in which professors bestow their expert secrets on high school trainees, professors and teachers learned while doing in the course of working through their unit together. "Staff development" became part of the daily business of planning and teaching the course itself.[9] At the same time, the curriculum and the intellectual climate at our different institutions was enriched. In my new position as associate dean, I hope to encourage such projects and introduce them into teacher education.

---

[9]Deborah Meier notes that in her successful Central Park East middle schools, "there is no sharp dividing line between 'staff development' activities and student educational activities" (Meier, 1995: 58).

Works Cited

American Education Association. "An Action Agenda for University Presidents," To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught. 1999.

Franklin, Phyllis, "An Urgent Request to Rethink Teacher Preparation," MLA Newsletter. Summer 1999: 4_5.

Franklin, Phyllis, Laurence, David, and Welles, Elizabeth B., ed. Preparing a Nation's Teachers: Models for English and Foreign Language Programs.

Graff, Gerald. Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education. New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.

Graff, Gerald and Phelan, James, ed. William Shakespeare. The Tempest: A Case Study in Critical Controversy. Boston. Bedford/St. Martins. 2000.

McCann, Thomas M. Argumentative Writing at Three Grade Levels: The Effects of Age, Prior Knowledge, Available Information, and Instruction. Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago. 1995.

Meier, Deborah. The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons for America from a Small School in Harlem. Boston. Beacon Press. 1995.

High School/College Student Conference on Shakespeare's The Tempest
Saturday, March 8, 1997, 1:00_4:00 p.m., University of Chicago

1:00 pm: Welcome and Opening Remarks: Gerald Graff, departments of English and Education, U. of Chicago

1:15_2:20: Plenary Debate and Panel: The Tempest__Is It Really About Colonial Oppression and Other Political Issues?

Presenters: Paul C., U. of Chicago, 2nd year
Abel M., U. of Chicago, 1st year
Respondents: Susan K., Community H. S., West Chicago
Karen D., Downers Grove South H. S.
Professor Janice Knight, department of English, U. of Chicago

2:20_2:40: Break, Informal Discussion

2:40_4:00: Concurrent Small Group Discussions

A. Can We Know What Shakespeare Intended?

Can twentieth_century readers make legitimate claims about Shakespeare's intentions in <u>The Tempest</u> or about the culture supposedly reflected in the play? Or are our responses to literary works primarily a personal or subjective matter?

Leaders: Tad Howard, U. of Chicago MA Program in the Humanities
               Hillel Crandus, U. of Chicago MA Program in the Humanities; department of English, Downer's Grove South H. S.

B. Must We Always Look for "Hidden Meanings" in Literature?

Do literary works really contain all the "symbolism" that teachers love to attribut to them? How can one tell? Why not read literature just for the fun of it? Do real_world events and actions have "hidden meanings" too? (Discussion in part will focus on Gonzalo'speech on the innocence of nature in Act II, 1, 152_274 of <u>The</u> <u>Tempest</u>.)

Leaders: Erika S., U. of Chicago, 4th year
               Malissa M., U. of Chicago, 4th year
               Danielle Crawford, department of English, Community H. S., West Chicago
Respondent: Professor Richard Strier, department of English, U. of Chicago

C. Why Should Students Care About the Controversies Over Literature?

As our unit on <u>The</u> <u>Tempest</u> has illustrated, literary and humanistic studies have become a scene of intense conflict__over what texts should be taught, over rival interpretations, over clashing cultural traditions and perspectives. What stake, if any, do students have in these controversies? Do they help or hinder academic literary study?

Leaders: Tom McCann, department of English, Community H. S., West Chicago
               Joe Flanagan, department of English, Community H. S., West Chicago
               Carol Pennel, department of English, Community H. S., West Chicago
Respondent: Clarence P., U. of Chicago, 2nd year

Contemporary Community Curriculum:
Developing Art Education Models with Middle School and High School Art Teachers
Olivia Gude, Art and Design, and Great Cities Faculty Scholar

The Contemporary Community Curriculum Initiative investigates and shapes the culture of curriculum in middle school and high school visual art classes in the Chicago area through developing university, community, professional artist, and art teacher partnerships. The project encourages art teachers to develop and implement curriculum which uses contemporary artistic practices as a means of interdisciplinary investigation of vital themes in students' lives and communities.

Background

The CCC Initiative, led by Assistant Professor Olivia Gude of the School of Art and Design, is supported by the Illinois Arts Council and the Chicago Community Trust. Along with the Great Cities Institute and the College of Architecture and the Arts, project partners include the Museum of Contemporary Art and the Chicago Public Schools.

The CCC project explored the proposition that teachers who contextualize the making, understanding, and valuing of art within larger cultural frameworks of community, identity, agency, democratic control, and quality of everyday life will be motivated and able to create more dynamic art curriculum which engages students in introductory art learning through authentically representing contemporary cultural discourses. Expanding the definition of quality art education opens the field of middle school and high school art education to more meaningful connections with arts integration and interdisciplinary school reform initiatives which use thematic learning to educate students with sound basic academic skills, strong critical thinking skills, and fluid creativity, as well as with a sense of personal and community agency.

Description

The CCC Initiative included:
* a symposium for in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, and other art educators at the Museum of Contemporary Art. Professor Kerry Marshall was a keynote speaker at this event.
* a semester-long working group of 25 teachers, Professor Gude, and artists Heather McAdams, Mary Patten, and Bernard Williams which developed curriculum based on contemporary art and social issues.
* teaching the newly designed curriculum to over 1100 middle school /high school students.
* a show of teacher and student artwork at UIC's Gallery 400.
* an UIC-sponsored curriculum website.

Goals

The Contemporary Community Curriculum Initiative explored creating change in visual art education by using the regular "coin of the realm" in which art teachers exchange ideas--art projects--as a way of exemplifying new paradigms of choosing and structuring aesthetic

investigations.
The CCC Initiative goals are to:
* Develop art teachers' educational and artmaking capacities.
    * Foster collegiality and build networks among art teachers, artists, and other art educators.
    * Develop a cadre of art teacher leaders who model creating and teaching art curriculum which addresses community issues.
    * Develop a demonstration body of workable curriculum based on contemporary art which can be used in everyday classroom situations.
    * Develop collaborative, democratic models of in-service teacher education and curriculum change.

Outcomes
A highly rated MCA Symposium attended by 175 art teachers and art educators.
A committed group of teacher/artists in the CCC semester-long workshop series.
A varied and interesting body of curriculum projects.
Teacher plans for on-going affinity groups.
A developing UIC-Spiral Art Education curriculum website.

Community Involvement
The CCC Initiative grew out of discussions of the UIC Secondary Art Education Advisory Committee, a group of city and suburban teachers who meet regularly with the UIC art education professor to discuss issues related to pre-service teacher education and current challenges to the field of art education locally and nationally.
Teachers from 22 city and suburban schools participated in the CCC Initiative. Schools ranged from what is considered to be one of the best city magnet schools to schools of economically and educationally disadvantaged students which are currently under remediation to highly rated suburban schools with many resources. An important aspect of the CCC Initiative was teachers sharing knowledge and creating collaborations across city/suburban district lines.

Methods of Evaluation
* Exit surveys after each session of the Museum of Contemporary Art Symposium.
* Teacher-conducted surveys of students' interest in and learning from CCC projects.
* Written surveys, interviews, and closing discussion groups of CCC teacher participants.
* Evaluation meeting of university art educators, professional artists, funders, and representative CCC teachers.
* Presentation to and feedback at National Art Education Association conferences.

Effective Youth Programs in Urban Low_Income Communities
Don Hellison, School of Kinesiology, College of Health and Human Development Sciences

Background
Hellison's research focuses on:

ï   The creation, implementation, and evaluation of alternative curriculum models and programmatic structures for urban low income youth.

ï   A university_community linkage model (the Urban Youth Leader Project) for kinesiology that integrates service, professional preparation/service learning, and applied research at urban low income community sites.

ï   Dissemination to teachers and youth workers via workshops and publications as well as evaluation of the effectiveness of the dissemination process.

The Great Cities Institute Faculty Scholars Program has facilitated Hellison's research by providing resources that culminated in a national partnership with five other university kinesiology units and a co_authored book describing the issues, goals, strategies, and evaluation procedures for implementing university-community youth programs in underserved communities. This work is particularly important, because kinesiology (physical education, exercise and sport science) has not been very involved in community_university collaboration activities beyond traditional student teaching.

Description
The following innovations have resulted from Hellison's work:

ï   A curriculum or program development model consisting of specific goals and instructional strategies that uses physical activity as a vehicle to empower youth people to take more personal (e.g., motivation, goal_setting) and social (e.g., self-control of temper, helping others) responsibility both in and outside the physical activity setting.

ï   Programmatic structures that provide alternatives to traditional physical activity delivery systems (e.g., in_school PE, organized sport) _including the coaching club, the apprentice teacher program, the neighborhood scholar program, and, based on Martinek's work (Hellison, Martinek, & Cutforth, 1996), the responsibility_based mentor program.

ï   The Urban Youth Leader Project which is an integration of youth services in the community; professional, preparation and service learning opportunities for university students; applied research by students and faculty; and dissemination by students and faculty.

ï   New kinesiology faculty positions in urban community physical education, several of which have been advertised in the past two years.

Community Involvement
The Urban Youth Leader Project has required extensive involvement with the community. His partnerships include the Southwest Youth Collaborative (5 years), Teen Reach

(5 years), Communities in Schools (2 years), Youth Guidance (5 years), Chicago Housing Authority (1 year), Boys & Girls Clubs (3 years), Bond School (9 years), Cycle (2 years), Westside Consortium (1 year), Duncan YMCA (2 years), and Haines School (2 years). This work has also required linkages within the university, for example, the Great Cities Institute Neighborhoods Initiative, the Center for Youth and Society, the Center for Urban Educational Research and Development, the Jane Addams College of Social Work, the College of Education, and the School of Public Health.

Implementation and Assessment

Hellison's work is based on field testing followed by service_bonded inquiry and mixed methodology studies.

ï   Extensive field testing has been conducted: 30 years of field testing various versions of his curriculum model, 20 years of field testing approaches to teacher/youth worker dissemination, 15 years of field testing alternative structures, and 15 years of field testing alternative professional preparation arrangements. Field testing, followed by written reflections containing both theoretical_ philosophical and practical insights, have led to most of the alternative ideas underlying his work (Hellison, 1978; 1985; 1995).

ï   Service_bonded inquiry (Martinek & Hellison, 1997) was created in order to integrate field testing with several separate qualitative methodologies (e.g., practical inquiry, reflective scholarship, ethnography, curriculum as craft) in order to gain a better understanding of behavior and attitude change in and outside the youth programs.

ï   Mixed methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, has been used more recently to determine impact of the youth programs on specific issues, e.g., dropout prevention, violence prevention, transfer of responsibility to the classroom, and extent of youth development supports compared to school.

Since gaps in assessment are apparent in evaluating the effectiveness of dissemination, this is a current focus of the university partnership. In addition, a study is currently being conducted on the barriers to effective youth program collaboration with schools and social agencies and how these barriers can be overcome. Another current study is looking at attitudes of cultural diversity among university students participating for the first time in urban youth programs.

The Ida B. Wells CommUniversity Project:
A Community-_University Dialogue Based at UIC
Barbara Ransby, Department of African-American Studies and Department of History

Background
        A group of scholar/activists from six universities in the Chicago area began meeting informally several years ago to explore ways of bridging the gap between knowledge generated within the Academy and reservoirs of knowledge outside of it. We were struck by how many public discourses, most notably the discourse on race, were insulated from much of the work being done on the subjects within university communities.

Description
        This project consists of a series of monthly public forums held at the Carter G. Woodson Library on Chicago's south side. Topics and speakers are determined by a ten-person planning committee made up of academics and community representatives. In selecting topics and speakers we try to tap into public interest in a particular topic (affirmative action, electoral politics, school reform, or recently released films on historically or socially relevant topics). We then invite speakers with expertise in the topic area to offer a 40 minute talk in a stimulating and accessible fashion to a popular audience.

Goals

ï   Build better university_-community relations and encourage more open dialogue across the boundaries of university and community.

ï   Demystify and make academic language more accessible to a popular audience by giving academics practice and feedback in engaging audiences beyond the classroom.

ï   Promoting public education and an open exchange of ideas independent of the unequal power relations within the formal classroom and the view of knowledge as a commodity that one has to pay for in order to access.

ï   Engage academics in debates about popular culture and contemporary issues as they relate to larger issues of history, social science theory, etc.

ï   Provide academics with access to community_based constituencies in intellectual settings divorced from the pressures of data collection or human subject research. The hope is that this will foster improved relations and possibly influence research agendas.

Community Involvement
        The success of CommUniversity forums depends upon the active involvement and support of the non-university community. Community members help to plan and publicize

events. We also encourage active participation in the forums themselves, including feedback on the relevance and substance of the programs. Audience members are asked verbally and then given contact information to facilitate such feedback. Half of each forum is devoted to audience participation and the content of discussions often shifts to reflect priorities and concerns of the audience. We have consciously maintained an informal and fluid structure to encourage new participation. When those attending forums demonstrate an interest in a particular topic they are invited to serve as resource persons in order to incorporate those interests into future programs.

Methods of Evaluation

Attendance is one measure of the value community members place on the project. Therefore we record attendance and have built up a mailing list. We keep track of those who attend regularly. Repeat attendance is another measure of the quality of the forums from the perspective of those who attend.

Media coverage is another measure of whether we are reaching a larger audience and whether the existence of such a program offers community members a different view of university_based intellectuals, i.e., as part of the community, engaged in it, and providing a service to it. We keep a media file.

Once a year we send out an evaluation form to all who have attended program over the past year to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program. There is about a 50% return rate. We ask detailed questions about whether terminology was clearly defined, whether the topic related to their concerns, whether they thought they could obtain such information readily elsewhere, etc.

We ask academics and community leaders who make presentations to offer their feedback in the form of follow up conversations or letters. We keep a file on this too.

Future Goals

This project initially received seed money from Great Cities at UIC. We have subsequently received a grants from the Crossroads Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation to explore how the CommUniversity model might be used elsewhere and how it compares to similar efforts in other cities and at other institutions, i.e., Yale's Public University and University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill's CommUniversity.

Reforming Chicago Politics and Government:
Contributions by the UIC Department of Political Science
Dick Simpson, Department of Political Science

Background:
        When executive officials are first elected to major offices, the trend in the last several decades has been to appoint transition teams to help with the assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of various governmental units. Under the direction of Professor Dick Simpson, UIC faculty and students in collaboration with civic and community organizations have been involved with four transition teams since 1979.

Description of Projects
        Based upon his government experience, Simpson has served on Transition Teams for Mayor Jane Byrne, Mayor Harold Washington, Cook County Clerk David Orr, and Cook County State's Attorney Jack O'Malley. A series of four book length publications on local city and county government have been the result. The best known is *Blueprint of Chicago Government 1989* (Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago, 1989). Others include Dick Simpson and Charles Williams, eds., *Blueprint of Chicago Government* (Chicago: University of Illinois and League of Women Voters, 1983) and Dick Simpson and Dona Vitale, eds., *A Reform Agenda for the Cook County Clerk* (Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago, 1991).
        The process for most of these transition team reports was that Professor Simpson would be asked to serve on the transition team by the elected official. Grants from local foundations would supply the funds necessary to do and publish the studies. Students from the course POLS 211 Chicago's Future would do the groundwork of studying the agencies involved, under the supervision of graduate students and faculty. Community and civic experts would review the reports and make corrections and recommendations, and a final document with more than 100 recommendations would be delivered to the elected official. With the official's permission, the documents would be published, released to the press and public, and distributed to new administrators for implementation.

Involvement of Community
        Over 100 civic and community organization leaders have participated in these four transition team reports.

Outcomes
        Over 65% of the hundreds of recommendations have been implemented. The publications are still the most complete studies of local city and county study which have been done to date and are therefore a benchmark for all future studies.

Methods of Evaluation
        Besides the publication and implementation of the transition team reports, several officials have had positive reactions. Both Mayor Harold Washington and Cook County Clerk David Orr were especially appreciative of the UIC efforts. The same methods of work have led

to other studies of County Government, the Chicago City Council, and the C.T.A. All of these have been funded by local community foundations and the final reports have been carefully reviewed by those foundations.

Don't Throw It Away! Documenting and Preserving Organizational History
Margaret Strobel, Professor of Gender and Women's Studies and History;
Interim Director, Hull-House Initiative

Don't Throw It Away! Documenting and Preserving Organizational History is a collaborative project designed to help community-based organizations to create an archive of organizational records to either maintain in-house or donate to a repository.

Background

Don't Throw It Away! represents the collaborative efforts of Professors Gretchen Lagana and Maryann Bamberger (Special Collections Department, UIC University Library) and Professor Margaret Strobel (Gender and Women's Studies Program and the Department of History, UIC). We were concerned that community-based organizations were unlikely to collect their own organizations papers because they lacked the resources and knowledge to put together an archive. The absence of archival collections from such groups means the absence of their voices from the historical records and thus from written histories of the very issues that concerned these groups.

Description

Throw! consists of three parts: a booklet, a course, and workshops. The booklet (cite it) describes the need for organizations to collect their documents, the relative benefits of keeping them in-house or donating them, and the work of organizing and preserving these documents. In the course, taught by Professor Strobel and Professor Melvin Holli, Department of History, UIC, with the help of Professors Lagana and Bamberger, undergraduate and graduate students work as interns with community-based organizations of their choice. Their job is to put the group's papers into as good an order as they can in the given time and to create a records management plan for the organization to follow in the future. In the workshops, Professors Lagana, Bamberger, and Strobel cover the same information found in the booklet. Workshops have been given for specialized audiences (e.g., the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the National Council for Research on Women, UIC units and individuals; Chicago-area women's organizations) and on occasions that brought together a collection of, for example, environmental and social justice organizations.

Goals

1. To enable community-based organizations to understand the importance of preserving a historical record of their work and then to assist them in doing so.

2. To enhance UIC relationships with these organizations.

3. To offer student interns the hands-on experience of working with documents and archives.

4. To increase the number and range of archival collections that record the work of grassroots organizations for future research use by scholars and students.

Outcomes

The booklet was published and has been distributed to organizations, individuals, and professional librarians and archivists.

Descriptions of the project have appeared in the Newsletter of History Dept Chairs, the Coordinating Council of Women Historians Newsletter, and the NWSA Journal [give cites].

Eight workshops have been offered, reaching a total of 200-300 organizational representatives.

The course has been offered three times. Student interns have reported very positive experiences. Several ended up volunteering at the organization where they interned. Two decided to go to graduate school (in history and in library science). One secured two jobs in local museums. One was offered a position as executive secretary to the director of the organization where she interned. One delivered a paper about the internship at a regional women's history conference. Several graduate students reported learning important skills that became useful as they did archival historical research.

Several collections have been donated to UIC's Special Collections Department. One organization that had a student intern donated 75 boxes of materials. Five other, smaller collections, came from groups that had attended our workshops or, we believe, heard about the project from people who had attended the workshops.

Community Involvement

The project was designed by UIC faculty without the collaboration of community-based organizations. Professors Lagana, Bamberger, and Strobel, however, had developed a sense of the needs of such organizations over the years by participating in similar organizations themselves and/or by fielding questions from such organizations about archives.

Methods of Evaluation

Workshops participants and students can be asked to evaluate the workshops and courses, using standard types of questions and measures.

The Special Collections Department keeps track of which organizations donate their records; those that do so as a result of the project are noted. It is harder to know if organizations have decided to donate to another repository or to keep their records in-house as a result of participating in the project.

Eventually, one would expect to see published research that utilized the archival collections of organizations involved in some aspect of the project. It would be difficult, however, to collect this information systematically.

5/8/00

UIC/Benito Juárez Advisory Research Project
Connie Yowell, Associate Professor, and Steve Tozer, Professor, College of Education, and
Great Cities Faculty Scholars

Background

Professors Yowell and Tozer have initiated a project which integrates research on the development of Latino adolescents with the creation and implementation of a model school-to-career program at Benito Juárez High School. The research project is intended to support Juárez in its efforts to overcome dropout rates that have reached 40% in recent years, as well as low academic achievement levels that have led to academic probation for the school. The project involves both a five year longitudinal research program and a five year curriculum development project in which Professors Yowell and Tozer work in collaboration with Juárez faculty to reconceptualize the current understanding of students' transition from high school to post-secondary education and career experiences.

Description

a) *Research Program:* In our research we hypothesize that the congruence or dissonance that students experience between their sense of their future and their current school activities is both an overlooked and little understood factor in Latino students' school dropout patterns. We have designed a longitudinal research study exploring, (a) the content of Latino students' hopes, expectations, and fears for their futures; (b) students' understanding of the strategies and plans that might be necessary to fulfill their goals and avoid their fears; (c) the relationship between these conceptions of the future and school engagement, and (d) the role of family, schools, and peer groups in supporting or constraining students movement toward their futures.

b) *Curriculum Intervention*: The research study is designed to both explore hypotheses concerning the role of future orientation in school success and to inform the development of new curriculum. As a result of the research work Professors Yowell and Tozer have conducted thus far at Juárez, they have been able to guide teachers in their development of new curriculum. Such guidance involves building trusting relationships with teachers. Although Juárez has recently undergone considerable turnover of faculty and administrators, over the past two years Professors Yowell and Tozer have been regular visitors -- sitting in on classes, meeting with administrators, talking with students, and engaging teachers in biweekly discussions of the nature of their work and the purpose of the project. For example, the research has indicated that issues of students' procedural knowledge, teacher care, school structure, and the consistency of school settings from elementary to high school are critical to students' school engagement. In collaboration with teachers, Professors Yowell and Tozer have designed writing prompts, advisory curricula, and a Writing Skills Center that address the issues uncovered in the research. Importantly, as a consequence of this work students are now both reflecting on their goals, and engaging in explicit discussions of their futures and how the attainment of those futures are directly tied to their school experiences. Throughout the study, Professors Yowell and Tozer's continued investigation of students' conceptions of the future, and their relationships with teachers have been at the center of their school improvement efforts.

Recently, Professors Yowell and Tozer were appointed by the Chicago Public Schools to serve as the external partner to Juárez. They will work collaboratively with school staff, faculty,

students, and administrators in the process of whole school change.

Goals

The purpose of this research project is fourfold:

1) To continue to develop a longitudinal research agenda exploring;

2) To continue to use the research data collected from students to create and implement new curriculum that will help students form and sustain high-post-secondary aspirations, and increase students' understanding of how academic success at Juárez High School is essential to achieving their own post-secondary goals;

3) To continue to develop an integrated model for addressing purposes 1-2 above in a cost-effective way that does not add new responsibilities to the normal teaching day, but that incorporates new and useful information into already existing activities of teachers, counselors, and administrators, thereby representing a low cost model of school-to-post-secondary and school-to-career programs, and

4) To continue to support Benito Juárez High School in its efforts to elevate measured academic achievement of students and to increase the percentage of freshman who eventually obtain high-aspiration post-secondary education and training.

Community Involvement

In the past year, Professor Yowell has met regularly with community based organizations in the Pilsen neighborhood. Currently she is working with the Resurrection Project to determine how community organizations might support the academic progress of Juárez students.

Methods of Evaluation

The method of evaluation is twofold. First, we are following two cohorts of students through their time at Juárez. Cohort 1 entered Juárez in 1997 as freshmen and are not participating in the new curricula projects that are development and implemented as a result of this project. This cohort represents a rough control group. Cohort 2 entered Juárez in 1998 as freshmen and will participate in the new curricula as it is implemented. Comparisons between Cohort 1 and 2 will provide some insight into the effectiveness of our interventions.

Secondly, we are working to put methods in place that will allow us to track students' transition from high school to the worlds of work and/or post-secondary education. This form of follow-up will indicate the effectiveness of our curricular intervention to increase graduation rates from both high school and college.

Appendix B: Senate Resolution on Public Service, March 9, 2000

Senate Resolution on Public Service, March 9, 2000

 Whereas public service has long been recognized in principle as being a major responsibility of faculty along with teaching and research but is seldom significant in promotion, tenure, or salary increase decisions;

 Whereas two documents currently circulating within the university--the 1998 "White Paper on the Scholarship of Application: Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University" by the Great Cities Institute and the 1994 document "Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service" by the Senate Public Service Committee--produce significant research and arguments for evaluating, recognizing, and better rewarding public service by faculty;

 Whereas the Provost has appointed a campus-wide task force to clarify the UIC public service mission and to provide broad guidelines for defining and measuring individual public service scholarship;

 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate concurs with the principle that public service by faculty should be better defined, evaluated, recognized, and rewarded at UIC.

Appendix C: Example of Unit Norms

Documents from the College of Education

Appendix D: Language Change for Promotion and Tenure Papers Recommend by the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement

Part II: Suggestions for the Preparation of the an Effective Promotion and Tenure Case, p.3.

 Candidates are referred to sections III and V of the Report of the Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement August 25, 2000 for suggestions on preparing a persuasive case by assembling a portfolio of materials that thoroughly document the scholarship of engagement. The most compelling argument for promotion (or, where appropriate, tenure) will describe and document focussed, sustained, developmental partnerships with a public or publics around real-world problems. The portfolio should make a case for the quality of the public service work and how it relates to research and/or teaching. It should relate the case explicitly to the terms of the appointment with the University. Promotion and tenure committees judge how well the case has been made either for the granting of indefinite tenure or promotion. They do not evaluate the specific work itself; this is done by the external referees. Therefore, it is not the quality of any one piece of work but the overall quality of the dossier and the accompanying documentation that will lead to a successful outcome.

Under Department Expectations:
 Departments are expected to develop an explicit statement of norms regarding public service expectations by fall 2001. Drafts of proposed Department Expectations should be included in promotion documents as soon as they are developed.

Part III: Preparing the Forms.

 Section 5 G. Public Service on p.12 needs to be amended:

 G. Public Service

    Describe... [ADD] A portfolio or dossier should be prepared for candidates who wish to emphasize their public service contributions; other candidates may opt not to do the dossier. In addition to the Nominee's Statement (see I. below), this should include peer evaluations of public service, a statement of departmental expectations against which the public service should be measured, letters of evaluation from the public or agencies or community organizations for which and with which the service was done, and quotes from letters from external referees commenting on the quality of the public service.

 The Sample Letter for External Referees on p. 9 also needs to be amended by adding to paragraph three (the list of requests of referees): "Comment on the quality of the candidate's public service relative to the standards in the field."

Appendix E: Bibliography

Note:
The bibliography is broken into two sections. First, salient recent studies and reports on our topic. Two a selection of reports, studies and position papers from some of the more active associations and foundations.

Items read by the Task Force are marked with an asterisk.

Select Bibliography On Engaged Higher Education, Peer Review and Institutional Recognition

Arches, J., Darlington-Hope, M., Gerson, J., Gibson, J., Hanana-Hafner, S. & Kiang, P. (1997), "New Voices in University-Community Transformation," *Change* (Jan/Feb), p. 36-41.

Benditt, T. M. (1990), " The Research Demands of Teaching in Modern High Education," *Morality, Responsibility, and the University: Studies in American Ethics,* ed. Cahn, S. M., Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bok, D. (1990), *Universities and the Future of America,* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Booth, W. C. (1988), *The Vocation of a Teacher: Rhetorical Occasions 1967-1988,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bowen, W. G. (1987), *Ever the Teacher: William G. Bowen's Writings as President of Princeton,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1987), *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America,* New York: Harper Collins.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., and Whitelaw, M. J. (1994), *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective,* Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

*Boyer, E.L. (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered; Priorities of the Professoriate. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Braskamp, L. A. and Ory, J. C. (1994), *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990), *Campus Life: In Search of Community,* Princeton, N.J.

Checkoway, B. (1991), "Unanswered Questions about Public Service in the Public Research University'" *Journal of Planning Literature*, 5 (3), p. 219-225.

Clark, B. R. (1998), *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation,* Pergamon, Oxford.

Clark, B. R. (1993), *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds,* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Council on Outreach (1997), *Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, The Office of Outreach Development.

Cremin, L. A. (1988), *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980,* New York: Harper & Row.

Dahllöf, U. *et al.* (1998), *Towards the Responsive University: The Regional Role of Eastern Finland Universities,* Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council, Helsinki.

Davies, J. L. (1998), *The Public Role of the University: The Dialogue of Universities with their Stakeholders: Comparisons Between Different Regions of Europe,* CRE.

Davies, J. L. (1997), "The Regional University: Issues in the Development of an Organizational Framework," *Higher Education Management,* 9 (3), OECD, Paris.

Deetya (1998), "Learning for Life – Final Report," *Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy,* Canberra, Australia.

Dfee (1998), *Universities and Economic Development,* Higher Education and Employment Division, TSO, London.

Diamond, R. M., and Adam, B. E., eds. (1995), *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty,* Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Diamond, R. M., and Adam, B. E., eds. (1991), *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DTI (1998), *Our Competitive Future: Building the Knowledge Driven Economy,* TSO, London.

East/West Clearinghouses for the Scholarship of Engagement (2000), *National Project for the documentation and Peer Review of Professional Service and Outreach,* Cleveland State University, Cleveland.

Edens, M., Fear, F., Fergus, E., Moon, A., & Smith, P., (1992), *Service-Learning and Service-Outreach: Integrating the Knowledge Functions at the Transversity in the Land-Grant Tradition,* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Edgerton, R., (1995), "Evaluating Teaching as Scholarly Work," Keynote Address, Academic Affairs Symposium, University of Georgia, Ga., Apr. 7-8.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings P., and Quinlan, K. (1991), *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching,* Washington D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Ewell, P.T., & Jones, D.P. (1994, Summer). Data, Indicators, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 82, 23-35. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fear, F.A. (1992), *Multidimensional Connectivity: MSUE in the Transversity of the 21st Century.* Prepared for the Michigan State University Extension Retreat, Kellogg Center, Michigan State University.

de Gaudemar, J-P. (1997), "The Higher Education Institution as a Regional Actor," *Higher Education Management,* 9 (2), OECD, Paris, pp. 53-64.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzwan, S., Trow, M. and Scott, P. (1994), *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies,* London: Sage.

Goddard, J. B. (1998), " Managing the University/Regional Interface," *Higher Education Management,* 9 (3), OECD, Paris, pp. 7-28.

Goddard, J. B., and Chatterton, P. (1999), "Regional Development Agencies and the Knowledge Economy: Harnessing the Potential of Universities," *Environment and Planning-Government and Policy.*

Goddard, J. B., Charles, D., Pile, A. Potts, G. and Bradley, D. (1994), *Universities and Communities,* CVCP, London.

*Goldstein, Paul; Strobel, Margaret; Varelas, Maria; and Young, Wendy (December 1998), "White Paper on the Shcolarship of Application: Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University," Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago.

Gray, P. J., Diamond, R. M. and Adam, B. E., (1996), *A National Study on the Relative Importance of Research and Undergraduate Teaching at Colleges and Universities,* Syracuse, N.Y.: Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University.

Halliburton, D. (1997), John Dewey: A Voice that Still Speaks to Us. *Change* (Jan/Feb), pp. 24-29.

Hölttä, S. and Pulliainen, K. (1996), "The Changing Regional Role of Universities," *Tertiary*

Education and Management, 2 (2).

Howells, J., Nedeva, M. and Georghiou, L. with the assistance from J. Evans and S. Hinder (1998), *Industry-Academic Links in the United Kingdom,* PREST, University of Manchester.

Hutchings, P. (1993), Introduction to *Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio: Twenty-Five Profiles,* ed. Anderson, E. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Kellogg Commission (1997), *Returning to our Roots: The Student Experience,* National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington.

Lundvall, B.-Å. (1992), *National Systems of Innovation. Towards a Theory of innovation and Interactive Learning,* Printer, London.

Lundvall, B.-Å. And Johnson, B. (1994), "The Learning Economy," *Journal of Industry Studies,* No. 2, pp. 23-42.

Lynton, E. A. (1995), *Making the Case for Professional Service,* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Lynton, E. A. and Elman, S. E. (1987), *New Priorities for the University,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCaughey, R. A., *Scholars and Teachers: The Faculties of Select Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Place in American Higher Learning,* New York: Conceptual Litho Reproductions, 1994.

McNicoll, I. H., McClusky, K. and Kelly, U. (1997), *The Impact of Universities and Colleges on the United Kingdom Economy,* CVCP, London.

Magrath, C.P. (1996), "Creating the New Outreach University." Foreword in: *University-Community Collaboration for the Twenty-First Century: Outreach Scholarship for Youth and Families* (R. M. Lerner and L. A. K. Simon, Eds.).

Mawby, R.G. (1997), Boldness for Our Times. Ch. 17 in: *University-Community Collaboration for the Twenty-First Century: Outreach Scholarship for Youth and Families* (R. M. Lerner and L. A. K. Simon, eds.).

Montgomery, J.R., et al. (1989), *Evaluation of Faculty Performance in Extension and Service.* Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Baltimore, MD.

National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997), *Chapter 12: The Local and Regional Role of Higher Education,* TSO, London.

Neal, J.E. (1995), "Overview of Policy and Practice: Differences and Similarities in Developing Higher Education Accountability," *New Directions for Higher Education*, No. 91. Jossey-Bass Publications.

OECD (1999), *The Response of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Needs,* Paris: OECD.

OECD (1986), *Review of National Policies for Education: Spain,* Paris.

OECD (1996), *Review of National Policies for Education: France,* Paris.

OECD (1999), *Higher Education,* Paris.

Pelikan, J. (1983), *Scholarship and Its Survival: Questions on the Idea of Graduate Education,* Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

*Task Force on Missions, Criteria, and Process (1992), "Program for the Assessment of Institutional Priorities (PAIP)," Tucson: University of Arizona.

Ramaley, J.A. (1996), "Large-Scale Institutional Change to Implement an Urban University Mission: Portland State University," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 18 (2), pp.131-151.

Robson, B., Drake, K. and Iain, D. (1997), *Higher Education and Regions, Report 9,* The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, London: HMSO.

Rudolph, F. (1962), *The American College and University: A History,* New York: Knopf.

Schon, D.A. (1995), "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology," *Change*, 27(6), pp. 26-34.

Scott, P. (1995), *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education,* Buckingham: SRHE.

Seldin, P. (1984), *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

*Senate Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service (1993), "A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process." Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

*Senate Public Service Committee (1994), "Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service." Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago.

Shulman, L. S. (1993), "Teaching as Community Property," *Change,* Nov./Dec.

_____ (1987), "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform," *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (1).

UNESCO (1998), *Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development of Higher Education,* Paris.

Wingspread Declaration (1999), *Renewing the Civic Mission of te American Research University,* Washington D.C.: Campus Compact.

Wolfle, D. (1972), *The Home of Science: The Role of the University,* Twelfth of a Series of Profiles Sponsored by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Select Bibliography of Government, Association and Foundation Reports and Studies

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE):

Allen, C.E. (1997), *Research University Program Accountability to Society. Evolving Expectations for Scholarship and Accountability in University Programs.* AAAS Symposium, Philadelphia, PA.

Diamond, R.M., & Adam, B.E. (Eds.) (1995), *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings P., and Quinlan, K. (1991), *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching,* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Hutchings, P. (1993), Introduction to *Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio: Twenty-Five Profiles,* ed. Anderson, E. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Lynton, E.A. (1995), *Making the Case for Professional Service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R.E. (1996), *Making a Place for the New American Scholar.* (Working Paper Series). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Singleton, S., Burak, C. & Hirsch, D. (April, 1997), Faculty Service Enclaves. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin*, 3-7.

The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE):

Barrett, T.G., Green, D.O., Philson, R.M. & Sung, C.I. (1997, November), *Faculty Service in Higher Education: Who Does It?* Paper presented at The Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (ASULGC):

Arnold, R. G. (1997), Response to "Maintaining Public Trust in the New Century: A Land-Grant Imperative." Presentation at the 108th Annual Meeting of ASULGC, Lake Buena Vista, Florida.

Brown, G. N. (1997), Response to "Maintaining Public Trust in the New Century: A Land-Grant Imperative." Presentation at the 108th Annual Meeting of ASULGC, November 13, Lake Buena Vista, Florida.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:

*Boyer, E.L. (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered; Priorities of the Professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., and Whitelaw, M. J. (1994), *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective,* Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990), *Campus Life: In Search of Community,* Princeton, N.J.

Clark, B. R. (1993), *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds,* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

*Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997), *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate,*San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pelikan, J. (1983), *Scholarship and Its Survival: Questions on the Idea of Graduate Education,* Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education:

Illinois State Board of Higher Education (1992), *Guidelines for Productivity Improvements in Illinois Higher Education.* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Kellogg Foundation:

*Kellogg Foundation, (April, 1999), *Methods of Assessing the Quality of Public Service and Outreach in Institutions of Higher Education: What's the State of the Art?*, Kellogg Foundation Report.

Kellogg Commission (1997), *Returning to our Roots: The Student Experience,* National

Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington.

 Kettering Foundation:

Peters, S.J. (1997), Public Scholarship and the Land-Grant Idea, *Higher Education Exchange,* pp. 50-57, Kettering Foundation.
Rosen, J. (1997), Public Scholars: In Search of a Usable Present - A Reply to Alan Wolfe. *Higher Education Exchange,* pp. 44-49, Kettering Foundation.

Wolfe, A. (1997), The Promise and the Flaws of Public Scholarship. *Higher Education Exchange,* pp. 37-57, Kettering Foundation.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC):

American Association of State Colleges and Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. (1995), *Urban Community Service at AASCU and NASULGC Institutions: A Report on Conditions and Activities,* (Tech. Rep. No. 143). National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Jordan, B. (1997), "Maintaining Public Trust in the New Century: A Land-Grant Imperative," Presentation at the 108th Annual Meeting of NASULGC, November 13, Lake Buena Vista, Florida.