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Today’s Presentation

• Institutional Context
  – MSU’s Office of University Outreach and Engagement
  – NCSUE’s Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure studies

• Design, Data Collection, Analysis
  – Research Questions and Research Design
  – Data Collection & Data Analysis
  – Phase I Findings

• Implications & Future Research
  – Implications for Policy
  – Implications for Practice
  – Future Research Directions in Phase II & III
Michigan State University

- 1855 Land Grant University
- Research-intensive with international obligations
- North Central accreditation
- APLU, urban-serving institutions, AAU
- Carnegie Engaged Institution—both classifications
  - Curricular engagement
  - University-community partnership
- 46,648 students; 5,052 faculty & academic staff;
- 6,116 support staff; 420,800 alumni worldwide (2008)
- Center for Service Learning & Civic Engagement
  received & accommodated 14,511 applications (2007-2008)
Off. University Outreach and Engagement

- Reports to Office of Provost
- Academic Support Unit
- Consists of numerous sub-units:
  - University-Community Partnerships
  - Community Evaluation Research Center
  - Center for Community and Economic Development
  - Center for Service Learning and Civic Engagement (jointly with VP for Student Affairs)
  - National Center for Study of University Engagement
  - A few other smaller units
National Center for the Study of University Engagement

Studying the processes, relationships, and impacts of outreach scholarship on engaged faculty, the academy, and communities

- Institutional studies, measurement, benchmarking
- Research and inquiry
- Reflection, learning, & professional development
- Consulting & service
- Advocacy & advancement
NSCUE’s Promotion & Tenure Studies

1. Overall faculty reports of scholarly outreach and engagement in P&T
   - Intensity of activity
   - Degree of engagement
   - Analysis by demographic, appointment, college, and Biglan disciplinary variables

2. Types of scholarly outreach and engagement activities
   - Typology based on actual reports of faculty work
   - Analysis by demographic & appointment variables
Promotion & Tenure Studies, con’t

3. Integration of scholarly outreach and engagement with faculty work—research, teaching, and service

– Comparisons between those who reported
  • O&E integrated scholarship
  • Integrated scholarship
  • No integrated scholarship at all

– Analysis by demographic, appointment, and college variables
Scholarly Outreach and Engagement

• “Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involved generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.”

• ~The Provost’s Committee on Outreach, 1993

• Michigan State University
Scholarly Outreach & Engagement…

• Cuts across teaching, research, and service
  – Outreach & engagement-teaching
  – Outreach & engagement-research/creative activity
  – Outreach & engagement-service

• Is a form of scholarship
  – distinct from service to profession
  – distinct from service to university
  – distinct from volunteering or consulting

• Is documented by evidence of quality
Integration Literature & Research

• Research and teaching studies (Smeby 1998)
  • Historical overviews, principled arguments (Boyer 1990; Austin 2002; Wolverton 1996; Towes & Yazedijan 2007)

• Productivity studies (Fox 1992; Hattie & Marsh 1996; Marsh & Hattie 2002; Colbeck 1997; Olsen & Simmons 1996)

• Ways in which teaching & research inform each other (Neumann 1994; Rice 2002; Colbeck 1998)
Integration Literature & Research

- No definitive conclusions reached in productivity or integration studies
- Almost exclusively focused on integration of teaching and research—very little examines teaching, research, and service
- Of that literature, even less focuses on integration of outreach and engagement with teaching, research, and service
  - Saltmarsh, McKeachie, & Lin 1978; Moore & Ward 2008; Schomberg & Farmer 1994; Bloomgarden & O’Meara 2007
From Scholarship

• “Research evidence shows that faculty already integrate their work roles. Failure to account for the ways and the extent to which faculty jointly produce teaching and service, research and teaching or service and research may underestimate faculty contributions to institutional productivity.”

• (Colbeck, 1998)
• “Throughout this document I have attempted to differentiate between scholarship that deals with instruction, research/creative activities, and service. However, teasing apart these strands of my professional life is, for the most part, an artificial process that underemphasizes the connections between these activities.”

• (faculty member, Education)
Research Questions

• **Grand Tour Question**
  How do faculty describe the integration of their scholarly outreach and engagement activities into research, teaching, and service?

• **Sub-questions**
  What are differences between faculty who describe their scholarship as
  – integrated (including outreaching and engagement,
  – integrated (not including outreach and engagement)
  – not integrated at all

• Are there demographics, appointment, and college differences?
Research Design

• **Mixed Methods Research** *(Creswell & Plano Clark 2007)*
  – Exploratory
  – Sequential
    • Three phases, becoming more detailed, richer
  – Quantitative, then qualitative
    • With weighting on qualitative data analysis

• **Sources of Data**
  – Promotion & tenure forms (Phase I)
  – Faculty personal statements from P&T (Phase II)
  – Faculty interviews (Phase III)
• **Phase I**: analysis of P&T form question about the “scholarship of integration” (quantitative)

• **Phase II**: analysis of personal statements for more evidence of integration reported by faculty (qualitative)

• **Conceptual Framework on Integration**

• **Phase III**: analysis of interview data from faculty who integrate their scholarship (qualitative)
Consent and Access to Data

- Successfully tenured faculty 2002-2006
- Representative of MSU tenure track faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Did Not Respond</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>199 (88.8%)</td>
<td>8 (3.6%)</td>
<td>17 (7.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>178 (79.5%)</td>
<td>35 (15.6%)</td>
<td>11 (4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>224 (38%)</td>
<td>299 (51%)</td>
<td>19 (3%)</td>
<td>46 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Final number = 224 forms
## Faculty Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Primary College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69% male</td>
<td>26% Agriculture &amp; Nat. Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% female</td>
<td>12% Arts &amp; Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>2% Communication Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% White</td>
<td>5% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Non-white</td>
<td>5% Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Black</td>
<td>4% Human Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13% Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Hispanic</td>
<td>18% Natural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Native American/Alaska</td>
<td>2% Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current rank</strong></td>
<td>3% Osteopathic Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62% Assistant professor</td>
<td>3% Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% Associate professor</td>
<td>3% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall P&T Study

• 90% of MSU faculty reported at least one outreach and engagement activity on their P&T form.

• 10% of MSU faculty reported no scholarly outreach and engagement activities.
Overall P&T Across Mission

- **47% Across Three Missions**
  - 47% across teaching, research & service

- **27% Across Two Missions**
  - 2% across teaching & research
  - 21% across research & service
  - 4% across teaching & service

- **16% In One Mission**
  - 3% teaching
  - 4% research
  - 9% service

- **10% No Outreach & Engagement**
Integration Reported by Faculty

- On the form, faculty members report on their “scholarly activities and contributions” that demonstrate “integration of scholarship across the mission functions of the university—instruction, research and creative activities, and service within the academic and broader communities.”
Phase I: Data Analysis

- **Source:** Form D IV D 2
  - New question on post 2001 P&T form about the “scholarship of Integration”
- **Coding:** absence/presence scoring
  - Yes answered, yes outreach & engagement
  - Yes answered, no outreach & engagement
  - Nothing reported
- **Quality:** coded by two people
  - inter-coder reconciliation meetings
- **Analysis:** descriptive statistics
  - Frequencies
  - ANOVAs, Chi-Squares, crosstabs
Variables

• Demographic Variables
  – Gender
  – Race
  – Number of years at MSU

• Appointment Variables
  – 9 month vs. 12 month appointments
  – Extension vs. non-Extension appointments
  – One department vs. multiple departments
  – One college vs. multiple colleges

• Primary College
Gender

Not statistically significant at p < .05.
Race

Not statistically significant at $p < .05$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration O&amp;E</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years at MSU

Not statistically significant at p < .05.
Number of Months (appointment)

Significant at \( p = .000 \).
Extension Appointments

Significant at $p = .008$. 

![Bar chart showing percentage of Extension Appointments in different categories](chart.png)
Number of Departments (appointment)

- **Integration O&E**: 55% (One department), 61% (More than one department)
- **Integration**: 23% (One department), 8% (More than one department)
- **None**: 21% (One department), 31% (More than one department)

Not statistically significant at p < .05.
Not statistically significant at $p < .05$. Colleges at $p = .06$. 

Number of Colleges (appointment)
## Primary College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Integrated O&amp;E</th>
<th>Not Integrated O&amp;E</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag. &amp; Nat. Resources</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Medicine</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Ag & Nat Res., Arts & Letters, & Nat Science at $p < .05$. 
Key Findings

• **Gender** and **race** continue to show no statistically significant differences—this goes against some other research findings.

• **Appointment structure**
  – Both 12 month & Extension appointments are significant in reporting integrated outreach and engagement
  – Current institutional restructuring will have major effects on appointment length & Extension

• **Colleges**
  – College & disciplinary differences matter
Implications for Policy

1. Revise reappointment, promotion & tenure policies, forms, and committee training to create a space for reporting and valuing “integration of scholarly outreach and engagement.”

3. Recognize the importance of disciplinary (or college) differences
   - Opportunities to “integrate” scholarly outreach and engagement vary, esp. by disciplinary differences in types of scholarly outreach and engagement
Implications for Policy, con’t

3. Consider out appointment structure affects faculty integration of outreach and engaged scholarship, especially at time of initial appointment and during times of institutional change.

- Remember, as institutional leaders, the structure of appointments can be changed to support engaged scholarship (unlike demographics or disciplines).
Implications for Practice

1. Convene departmental and college discussions about scholarly outreach and engagement (see Discussion Guide for Departments & Colleges)
   - about scholarly outreach & engagement broadly
   - regarding promotion and tenure specifically

2. Introduce graduate students to the potential of “integrated scholarly outreach and engagement” (see Graduate Certificate flyer)
   - In departmental seminars, workshops sponsored by Graduate schools or O&E Offices
   - At disciplinary conferences and meetings
Implications for Practice, con’t.

3. Emphasize “integrated scholarly outreach and engagement” in faculty development activities
   – Publicize faculty success stories about “integrated” scholarly outreach and engagement *(see Engaged Scholar magazine)*
   – Support small (6-8 people) faculty learning communities on integrated scholarly outreach and engagement by “topic area” *(see Coming to Critical Engagement)*
   – Connect junior faculty and senior faculty together for mentoring & collaboration
Phases II & III: Next Questions

• Phase II

  1. How do faculty describe their integrated outreach and engaged scholarship?
  2. What is a conceptual framework for faculty descriptions?

• Phase III

  1. What was the initial impetus for integrating outreach & engaged scholarship with research, teaching, & service?
  2. What are the dynamic interplays between your research, teaching, and service?
  3. How has the integration of your scholarship changed over time?
  4. In what ways has the integration of scholarship strengthened your scholarship overall?
• “A climate that encourages integration of teaching, research, and service is fundamental to the soundness of universities, and it provides for the best use of faculty resources, the effectiveness of the profession, and full benefits to students and other beneficiaries of college and university work.”

• (Krahenbuhl, 1998)
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