



COMMISSION_{ON}
DIVERSITY_{AND}
INCLUSION

Tenure Standards Report

Submitted to:
Chancellor Mark S. Wrighton
Provost Holden Thorp

June 24, 2017

Recommendations for Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Standards

June 24, 2017



Last year the chancellor and provost charged the Commission on Diversity & Inclusion with making recommendations to implement a 12-point action plan designed to make Washington University in St. Louis a more diverse and inclusive community. The Commission requested a working group explore and consider how to best implement action item number #2: “The university will commit increased resources to ensure that we recruit, hire, and support diverse faculty through a variety of initiatives, including pipeline work...” In consultation with the working group, the Commission on Diversity & Inclusion makes these recommendations.

BACKGROUND

Washington University in St. Louis is a global research institution that prides itself on not only our pathbreaking research and patient care, but also our outstanding teaching and professional service to our professions. Accordingly, all seven of our schools incorporate research, teaching, and service into their requirements and standards for appointment, promotion, and tenure. (We note the Medical Campus also includes patient care, where applicable.) Importantly, each school’s faculty exercises autonomy over its tenure and promotion standards and process, as there is no University-wide tenure and promotion faculty committee.

Increasingly, the University has been embracing community engagement as an additional academic value. Community engagement is an explicit part of the academic and patient-care mission in many units on the Medical Campus. On the Danforth Campus, community engagement and impact are valued in almost every field and discipline, ranging from social work to law to architecture and design to engineering to business to public health. Indeed, many of our faculty have compiled robust portfolios of

community engagement, lending their academic expertise to solve some of the toughest problems facing our region. Our faculty often take rightful pride in this deep engagement; some faculty members report that leveraging their research in partnership with the community is among the most rewarding work they do. Our faculty’s engagement with the community also is foundational to the University’s relationship with the St. Louis region. Collectively, the faculty’s community engagement portfolio significantly strengthens the University’s position and role as an anchor institution in St. Louis; it is a primary benefit of a research University in a city’s backyard. However, most academic units at the University do not see academic value in community engagement, excluding it from having any weight or value in the appointment, promotion, and tenure processes that define faculty careers.

The Commission notes that civic and community engagement go hand in hand with diversity and inclusion because many social issues afflicting communities have racial, ethnic, or other disparities at their heart. We also note that addressing and ameliorating these disparities is the life’s work of many of our faculty, across the schools

and disciplines. Indeed, some of our faculty are drawn to the University precisely because of the opportunities our geographic positioning offers to leverage their academic expertise and do transformative work by engaging a community with a deep set of needs. We note that other universities are beginning to explicitly incorporate community engagement as an academic value. For instance, Auburn University calls it “outreach scholarship” (See [Appendix A](#) at page 3). At Washington University, some academic units have begun this process. The Medical School has begun to do so at the departmental level with prescribed standards for both tenured and clinician-educator portfolios; however, this has not been reflected in the Appointments and Promotions Guidelines and Requirements (APGAR) document. The Commission recommends that the academic units at the University undertake a review of whether including community engagement in their appointment, promotion, and tenure standards and processes would align with the unit’s academic mission, goals, and priorities.

We believe this is an especially timely opportunity for the University. The events that led to the Commission’s

creation, the death of Michael Brown and the subsequent uprisings in Ferguson and the broader region, accelerated and amplified many community engagement efforts already being undertaken by academic units and faculty. For others, the events sparked a desire to leverage academic expertise in partnership with the community. Indeed, it would be fair to say that, since the fall of 2014, the University has been engaged in deep reflection about our role as an anchor institution in the region. Initiatives and commitments too numerous to list here emerged from that self-reflection, many of them involving our faculty. In the fall of 2015, one of the University's signature efforts, the Gephardt Institute for Public Service, marked its tenth anniversary by relaunching as the Gephardt Institute for Civic and Community Engagement with an explicit goal of encouraging more faculty participation:

Civic and community engagement touches the entire campus community. Community-based resources for faculty include University-wide initiatives, funding for civic engagement projects, partnership development, and

technical assistance. A special emphasis is placed on our support of community-engaged teaching and scholarship across all schools and evaluation of community-engaged teaching and other outreach efforts.¹

The Commission believes that now is the time to consider opportunities to explicitly align our academic mission with our individual and collective values of helping the community of which we are part.

The Commission is aware of the challenges of defining and measuring community engagement. It is a capacious concept and one that will vary widely between disciplines as well as individual faculty interests and careers. The attached document from Auburn University offers an example of both a definition and process for including a community engagement portfolio in the appointment, promotion, and tenure process. (See Appendix A.) Auburn defines outreach scholarship as a “set of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise.” We note the emphasis on a portfolio of work that is focused and grounded in the

faculty member's disciplinary expertise. Under Auburn's policy, faculty members applying for appointment, promotion, and/or tenure may include in their materials up to a five-page commentary that explains their portfolio of outreach scholarship including:

- needs addressed and target audience;
- how the program was compatible with University and academic unit missions;
- role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and execution of the program, emphasizing new knowledge production and increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences;
- observed and anticipated impact.

Although Auburn's tenure and promotion policy does not appear to provide for it, we note that in some institutions candidates submitting a community engagement portfolio may include a letter from a stakeholder with whom they have worked.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission recommends that each school, or where appropriate, each academic department, review its tenure and promotion standards and process to assess whether including a community engagement component aligns with the unit's mission, goals, and priorities.
2. Importantly, the Commission recognizes that appointment, promotion, and tenure must remain under faculty control. Hence the determination regarding a) whether to include a community engagement, or “outreach scholarship,” component in appointment, promotion, and tenure, and b) if so, how to define it and evaluate it must both be faculty determinations. (The document from Auburn University provides an example.)
3. Equally importantly, the Commission does not recommend that community engagement be incorporated as a mandatory component of appointment, promotion, and tenure or that it disadvantage in any way our faculty members who do not undertake it. We believe that as a research University, “research” will and must remain the hallmark of our academic mission.

¹ Gephardt Institute for Civic and Community Engagement. <https://gephardtstitute.wustl.edu/faculty/>

Note: The Commission would like to thank Amanda Moore McBride, the then Executive Director of the Gephardt Institute for Civic and Community Engagement and the Bettie Bofinger

Brown Associate Professor at The Brown School, and Jennifer Harpring, the then Assistant Director of Campus and Community Partnerships at the Gephardt Institute, for meeting with

the Commission on March 3, 2016. Their insights and perspectives were invaluable to our formulation of these recommendations.

APPENDIX

<http://www.auburn.edu/outreach/documents/AU%20Handbook%20-%20Outreach%20Criteria%20Excerpt%20Ch%203.pdf>

Auburn University Faculty Handbook

Excerpts pertaining to Outreach Scholarship

Chapter 3 – Section 3.6.1-C. OUTREACH

(Definition of Outreach)

As used in this chapter "outreach" refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. (While outreach may be sponsored by a unit other than the faculty member's department, both the faculty member and the sponsoring unit must recognize the activity as outreach. Outreach is not expected of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It is established in the letter of offer and may be modified in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. Please refer to <http://www.auburn.edu/outreach> for resources concerning faculty participation in Outreach Scholarship. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Chapter 3 – Section 3.6.5-C-(2)-3. OUTREACH

(Documentation of scholarly contributions for tenure and promotion review)

3. Outreach

The purpose of this section is to document achievement in outreach scholarship. It is divided into two parts. Part 1 is a reflective commentary on the candidate's outreach program or programs. It is intended to highlight and explain the candidate's most significant contributions. Part 2 is a list of all of the candidate's outreach activities and products.

a. **Commentary.** The commentary should describe and explain the scholarship involved in one or more outreach programs that you consider the major achievements of your efforts. A program is a set of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise. The entire commentary is limited to five pages, single spaced. Each program should include the following.

a. **Description.** Provide a brief overview of the needs addressed, the objectives, methods, and target audience. Describe selected activities and/or products from Part B that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to this program. Include example in the portfolio.

b. **Mission.** Indicate how the program was compatible with university and unit missions.

c. **Scholarship.** Describe the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and execution of the program. Describe how the activities applied the candidate's discipline to the needs of society, required integration with other disciplines, and/or generated new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience. Explain how this knowledge was communicated to broader audiences. Indicate how the program led to increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences. Indicators would include requests for information, invitations to make presentations, service on review panels, receipt of contracts, grants, and professional awards, etc.

d. **Impact.** Describe observed impacts and/or explain any unobserved impacts that are to be expected according to the discipline(s) applied. Identify the direct and indirect beneficiaries. Evidence of impact can include both quantitative results (e.g. changes in test scores, increased crop production, or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative results (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics).

b. **Activities and Products.** List activities and products using the categories outlined below. There is no page limit on Part B, but candidates are encouraged to be concise in order to focus reviewers' attention on the most important contributions. In particular, numerous activities or products of the same type should be summarized to the extent possible. Brief descriptions accompanied by examples and totals will suffice.

a. **Instructional activities.** List the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (curriculum, course, workshop, exhibit. etc.), the duration (usually in hours), the

candidate's role in creating (developer, presenter), the target audience, the method of reaching the audience (conference presentation, telecommunications, site visit, etc.) and the number of presentations given.

b. Technical assistance. List each type of assistance (e.g. job classification), the clientele, the contribution, and the number of times provided.

c. Outreach publications. Distinguish by type as indicated in paragraphs B1-B3 above: books (including published manuals and reports), article-length publications, papers and lectures. Provide complete publication data, including number of pages, names of all authors in correct order, and percentage of candidate's contributions. Indicate all refereed or peer-reviewed publications.

d. Electronic products: computer programs, web sites, etc.

e. Other outreach products: videos, job aids, etc.

f. Copyrights, patents, and inventions.

g. Contracts, grants, and gifts.

To view the full report click [here](#);
to view the Executive Summary of the report, click [here](#).