

Methods of Assessing the Quality of Public Service and Outreach in Institutions of Higher Education:

What's the State of the Art?

Foreword

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has a longstanding interest in linking the intellectual resources of academic institutions to community needs. Historically, much of our work with institutions of higher education has focused on their role in advancing the economic, social and civic vitality of communities. In many of these institutions, the linking function has gone by the name of *service or outreach* and has concentrated in cooperative extension, professional schools, or special outreach centers.

When we received a request from a respected colleague to inquire into the changing nature of outreach at institutions of higher education and the criteria used to assess its effectiveness, the Higher Education staff within the Foundation was eager to respond. The issue of quality outreach fit well within the Foundation's current strategic work in higher education, and it seemed an opportune time to re-examine and connect lessons from past efforts, such as Fulfilling Higher Education's Covenant with Society, the outreach agenda project (1995) at Michigan State University, work of the Kellogg Commission, and a number of university/community grants (Trinity College, Albion College, the Service Portfolio Assessment project at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, the Expanding Community Partners Project and many other grants). More specifically, our interest in evaluating the work we do has brought to our attention the need for better documentation of outreach activities. We need to work with grantees to quantify and qualify impact, and to correct the lack of uniform measures that puts faculty and staff members who contribute time to outreach at a disadvantage within academic reward structures.

We began, as we often do, by gathering a number of leaders involved in outreach programs to discuss their first-hand knowledge of the changing nature of outreach and how institutions are attempting to assess and reward quality work. Immediately, we ran into questions. Questions of definition. What were we talking about: service, outreach, professional service, community service or other terms? Were these terms interchangeable, or did the terms denote different kinds of activities, and thereby different measures of effectiveness? What constitutes quality and how should it be measured. Should we and others concentrate on structured programs that might readily lend themselves to formal assessment or consider random collections of individual faculty initiatives that might be much harder to assess against some standards, but may be the reality of how a lot of outreach happens? Or should we be looking at some combination? Within the evolving body of literature and practice, what needs to be added to the discussion of effective outreach? How might the study of impact influence assessment standards?

While we shared the view that service / outreach should be considered a core activity throughout an institution of higher education, our efforts to understand the challenges involved in promoting excellence in outreach, to stimulate institutions to take their public service mission seriously and to produce the best possible work also affirmed the need for more information and study. The Foundation therefore commissioned a report that could cull from the literature important data that might address some of the questions our initial discussions had generated. Our intent was not necessarily to present new information but rather to collect what is known about outreach and service in a way that might allow us to think about assessment, effectiveness, and impact in new ways.

The report generated many conversations within the Foundation. As we began to talk about the paper and to share it with colleagues outside the Foundation, we discovered a broader interest in its content and received requests that it be printed and shared. In responding to these requests, the paper, in its present form, has been prepared by Foundation staff for dissemination to a general audience. We want to acknowledge Dr. Connie Schmitz's initial research and extend our appreciation for her subsequent efforts in preparing this document.

Dr. Betty Jean Overton
Higher Education Program Area
W.K. Kellogg Foundation
April, 1999

Introduction

Beginning in this decade, substantial effort has been put towards re-conceptualizing the nature of faculty work expanding the traditional definition of scholarship (i.e., "generate new knowledge through original research / innovations") to include the scholarship of integration, application, and dissemination of knowledge. The momentum to reconsider scholarship and to reward faculty and staff who work in applied areas has come largely from the efforts of E.L. Boyer, E.A. Lynton, R.E. Rice, C.E. Glassick, and others associated with the Association for the Advancement of Higher Education (AAHE) Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. This Forum was supported by the Carnegie Foundation's national survey of institutions in 1994. This survey found that impressive proportions of institutions were working either to redefine faculty roles (86%), to broaden the definition of scholarship (78%), or to develop new methods of evaluating applied scholarship (38%). Rice (1996) reported that in the process of collecting information, the survey team assembled 175 campus documents aimed at broadening concepts of scholarship and rewarding faculty accordingly.

This movement to redefine scholarship provided a backdrop-opened the door, so to speak-for examining the outputs of research and public service. It also ushered in new attention to the dilemmas of measuring scholarship when it is expressed through various forms of outreach and public service. How can faculty members' contributions be assessed, if not by counting the numbers of publications in peer reviewed journals or the number of citations received? This is not a small, innocuous question for the thousands of extension faculty and professional staff members who comprise a growing proportion of workers in higher education today and who experience a second class status in many research oriented institutions. Neither is this trivial problem for department chairs and deans of college who need to lobby for scarce resources in order to support their personnel and argue for programs desired by public and private constituencies. How do we demonstrate the positive effects of outreach and public service? How do we distinguish between high quality outreach / service, and inadequate outreach / service? This dilemma, which surfaced in the Faculty Forum, was alive in many people's minds as the Foundation convened interested leaders to discuss the issue in 1997-98 and commissioned this report in 1998.

The report itself summarizes a literature review that was undertaken to answer some of the basic questions alluded to above:

- How is outreach / public service being defined today in academic communities?
- In what ways does the definition vary across different institutions and campuses?
- What characteristics constitute quality outreach / service?
- How can outreach / service be measured at the faculty, department, school / collegiate unit, and institutional levels
- What does an institution desiring to achieve excellence in outreach "do," or "look like"?

The nature of the literature being what it is, information relevant to these questions was scattered across a wide range of documents (47 of which made it into the review), and some of the above questions were better answered than others. But the review does seem to document an absence of documented approaches for assessing the quality of outreach / service, especially at the administrative level. In other words, the field has made greater progress in outlining the steps to take in assessing individual faculty members' contributions in the area of outreach / service, than it has in understanding how to assess the aggregate value of faculty efforts across a division, department, or larger organizational unit. We know more about how to hold an individual faculty member accountable for quality outreach than we know about holding departments or larger units accountable to standards of excellence in outreach / service.

Despite these limitations, the review does pull together a large number of promising definitions, key characteristics, and indicators that clarify some subtle concepts and provide promising avenues of thought for those faculty and staff who are interested in measurement issues. The results of the review are organized by question and presented in three major sections:

1. Definitions of Outreach / Service
2. Assessing the Quality of Outreach Service
3. Synthesis and Implications

Much of the data are presented in tables that list key definitions, characteristics, or measures by sources. (A full biography can be found in the appendix.) The narrative text accompanying the tables summarizes and reflects on the information cited in the tables to the extent possible. For many readers, however, the best use of this report is a springboard for discussion, rather than a formula or prescription for action. Throughout the report, the term "outreach" and "public service" are used somewhat synonymously for the sake of convenience, although important distinctions between these terms are amply documented in section 1. The need to consciously work through the definition for a particular institution or usage should be considered step one for readers who are involved with the assessment of quality.

Connie C. Schmitz

April, 1999

Findings from the Literature

1. Definitions

How is outreach defined in the literature and in practice?

"Although very few studies have been conducted on faculty service, almost every study done has provided similar but differing definitions of faculty service" (Barrett, 1997, p. 3).

No unified body of research literature exists on the definition or measurement of public service / outreach. This literature review uncovered a fairly eclectic selection of articles. From a measurement perspective, clear definition of the construct is definitely lacking. The variety of terms encountered through this review include: "outreach," "university outreach," "academic outreach," "professional outreach," "public service," "community service," "professional service," "faculty professional service," "public scholarship," and "outreach scholarship." There are subtle differences in meaning across these terms, and among authors using the same terms. In documenting faculty activities, some institutions and research scholars use a "default" definition

of service, as a "catchall designed to reflect activities deemed of value, but which are not easily classified as either teaching or research" (Ditts, Haber, and Bialik, 1994, p.79). The better definitions of outreach / service focus on a subset of activities that can be tied to a professional or scholarly base. These definitions explicitly distinguish *public* service from "service to the institution," "service to the discipline," "private community service" (i.e., service that does not draw upon a faculty or staff member's area of expertise), and "moonlight consulting" (i.e., work that provides personal remuneration to faculty members, but does not serve an institutional mission or departmental priority).

Many recent definitions grow out of the groundbreaking work of Boyer (1990), Lynton (1995), Rice (1996), and Glassick, et al. (1997), in their discussions of the nature of scholarship. By engaging the professorate in a national debate about scholarship and the need to broaden conceptualizations of what faculties do and how they are rewarded, these authors have paved the way for greater recognition of public service. They have effectively created a new construct that raises the level of prestige or "academic worthiness" of outreach. About half of all the materials reviewed cited Boyer or Lynton, or both. With the backing of the Carnegie Foundation on Teaching and the AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, this work seems to be having a profound effect in higher education. For example, the Carnegie Foundation's survey (Glassick, et al., 1997, p. 12) of chief academic officers at all of the country's four-year colleges and universities in the fall of 1994 found that "more than 80 percent of them either had recently re-examined their systems of faculty roles and rewards or planned to do so." This survey also found that:

- 86% of respondents said their institutions were working to redefine faculty roles
- 66% said they were striking a balance between institutional mission and faculty rewards
- 78% said they were improving the balance of time and effort that faculty spend on various tasks
- 78% said they were broadening the definition of scholarship
- 54% said that applied scholarship was being clearly distinguished from citizenship
- 64% said that the role of faculty as campus citizens was being clarified
- 38% said that new methods of evaluating "applied scholarship" had been developed.

Although they use slightly different terms, several large institutions (i.e., Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin, University of North Carolina, and University of Illinois) have arrived at similar definitions of faculty service and have developed cogent guides for evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion. The core, common ideas of these (and other thoughtful) definitions are expressed well by the University of North Carolina and University of Illinois. By their definition, the core concepts of public service / outreach:

- Contribute to the public welfare or the common good,
- Call upon the faculty member's academic / professional expertise, and
- Directly address or respond to real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.

While the above definition marks progress in clarifying a measurable construct, it is still hard to say what different kinds of activities fit—or don't really fit—the construct. Examples of "typical" public service / outreach can be readily found, but they have not been organized into a coherent, logical catalogue of activities, nor examined for their "fit" with definitions. Perhaps this is because, as stated in the Report of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Public Service Roundtable (Lynton, 1995, p. 82), "public service in its truest sense is a concept that can inform, transcend, and cut across all three of the basic components of the University's traditional mission statement." Once scholarship is redefined, the hitherto considered "second class" processes of "integrating, applying, and disseminating knowledge" become integral to what any researcher does during the process of "discovering new knowledge." It is certainly part of what dedicated

teaching faculty does, whether they teach regular day students on campus, or non-traditional students off campus through continuing education, extension or distance education. As expressed by a colleague at the University of Minnesota, "outreach at some point becomes invisible, because it is everywhere—it is bound up in all that an institution does" (D. Hendel, private communication, 5-11-98).

The best list of generic activities encountered in this review was one organized by the University of Wisconsin (see Table 1). They listed types of activities according to a simple framework of *Outreach Teaching, Outreach Research, and Outreach Service*. Like Michigan State University's, the UW definition of outreach is based on an expanded view of scholarship that is "conducted in all areas of the university mission, and involves the creation, integration, transfer, and application of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences."

Alternatively, outreach / service activities might be framed in terms of the end users or beneficiaries (D. Hendel, private communication, 5-11-98). Brown (1997) provides one example of a listing of outreach audiences that was based on a survey of 1,500 faculty members at Virginia Tech. Respondents were asked to identify "who they served." They responded with the following:

- 69% identified government agencies
- 62% identified adult education
- 54% identified the business sector
- 50% identified K-12 programs
- 36% identified agriculture and natural resources
- 22% identified families

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
Michigan State University (1993) – Fear "University Outreach"	A form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service; involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for direct benefit of external audiences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Generating knowledge</u>: clinical intervention studies • <u>Transmitting knowledge</u>: continuing professional education • <u>Applying knowledge</u>: technical assistance • <u>Preserving knowledge</u>: creating electronically accessible data bases
Checkoway (1991) "Public Service"	Develops knowledge for the welfare of society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied research • Consultation, technical assistance • Instruction • Products

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical work
--	--	---

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
NASULGC (1985) Elman & Smock "Public Service"	Work that draws upon one's professional expertise or academic knowledge for the welfare of society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates new knowledge • Trains others in the discipline or area of expertise • Aggregates and interprets knowledge so as to make it understandable and useful, or • Disseminates knowledge to the appropriate user or audience
University of Minnesota (1995-98) Hendel "Outreach/Public Service"	"University interactions with society" has become one of the 14 critical measures being tracked. It is a broadly stated measure designed to capture the quality and impact of the university's external relationships, via "outreach and public service," "responsiveness to market demand," and "responsiveness to compelling state needs."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships and collaborations with external constituencies • University services, expertise, and information provided to external constituencies through specific research, clinical services, consulting and technical assistance, training • Practitioner-oriented and applied academic programs • Physical links / relationships with surrounding communities
Oregon State University (1996) Weisner "Scholarship"	Creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discovery of new knowledge • Development of new technologies,

		<p>methods, materials, and uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding • Artistry that creates new insights and interpretations
Change Magazine, e.g., Arches (199?) "Service Mission"	How a university meets its service mission through a variety of means	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service learning • Community partnerships • Faculty professional service
Glassick (1997) "Scholarship"	<p>A "new paradigm" of scholarship that has four separate, yet interlocking parts:</p> <p><i>Discovery</i> of knowledge <i>Integration</i> of knowledge <i>Application</i> of knowledge <i>Scholarship</i> of teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Discovery</u> - pursuit of knowledge for its own sake; honest inquiry; creative pursuit of truth • <u>Integration</u> - overcome fragmentation of the disciplines; make connections between fields of thought; put findings into context; through synthesis and reinterpretation, bring new insights to original research • <u>Application</u> - responsible application of knowledge to consequential problems; respond to issues of the day; use the wisdom of practice to inform theory • <u>Teaching</u> - initiate students into the values of the academy, enable them to comprehend and participate in the larger culture; raise new scholars

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
<p>Rosen (1997) "Public Scholarship"</p>	<p>The public scholar views the work to be done as "public work," meaning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work is shared with others outside the professional domain of academic inquiry • The quest to know originates in some problem or challenge that could usefully be called "public" business • Others with whom one is inquiring are not limited to experts, policy professionals, academics, or government officials seeking technical advice, but include all manner of people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhoods trying to build their capacity to work together and achieve common aims • Parents, teachers, administrators, students, and concerned citizens wondering why the latest "fix" failed to solve the problems of their schools
<p>Urban Community Service at AASU & NASULGC Institutions: A Report on Conditions and Activities (1995) "Community Service"</p>	<p>Service that is related to learning and is consistent with institutional missions and guided by decisions regarding community services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Service • Information Analysis and Sharing • Health Service Provision • Real Estate Management • Infrastructure Development • Economic Development • Homelessness
<p>Ramaly (1996) "Professional Outreach"</p>	<p>"The strategy of the urban university is to become an 'engaged campus' (Edgerton, 1994), to place the entire institution on a community base, and to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reorganized campus that creates a "community base" for research and teaching. • Does not confine

	develop academic program and research designs that meaningfully connect research, undergraduate education, professional education, and continuing professional education or professional outreach together."	community involvement or outreach to either one or two specific academic programs (e.g., "urban studies"), or managed by separate outreach arms, centers, or institutes, or to cooperative extension, or continuing education units off campus.
Singleton (1997) "Faculty Professional Service" "Academic Outreach"	Work that is based on the faculty member's knowledge and expertise that contributes to the outreach mission of the institution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups of faculty and staff working together on service initiatives in the community • Centers or institutes with a specific outreach mission • Institutional partnerships, such as with a K-12 system or municipality

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
Lynton (1995) "Professional Service"	Views professional service as a collective responsibility, integral to the entire institutional mission. "Utilization of a university as an intellectual resource for its immediate as well as broader constituencies." Involves the application of the individual's [faculty/staff] professional expertise to problems and tasks outside the campus. Requires thorough and up-to-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory, action research • Service learning • Technology transfer • Technical assistance • Policy analysis • Program evaluation • Organizational development • Community development • Program development • Professional

	<p>date knowledge of a discipline, professional field, methods; and represents application of such expertise. Performed for the direct benefit of an external audience</p>	<p>development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert testimony • Public information
<p>University of North Carolina (1994) "Public Service"</p>	<p>"In its truest sense," public service is a concept that can inform, transcend, and cut across all three of the basic components of the University's traditional mission statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to public welfare or common good • Relies on professional or academic expertise of faculty, staff, and students • Responds to practical problems, issues, interests, concerns or society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing education • Lifelong learning opportunities • Access to library, educational facilities, and cultural resources • Direct services, especially for members of the public with limited financial resources • Action-oriented teaching in the form of clinical education, service internships, or practica • Action-oriented research focused on responding to vexing public problems • Research dissemination and consultation which shares professional expertise, technology, and evaluation capabilities • Leadership which keeps higher education in the state at the cutting edge, or otherwise benefits society

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
Mawby (1997)	"The term 'public service' has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperative

<p>"Public Service"</p> <p>"Outreach Scholarship"</p>	<p>come to evoke many images; it is better understood by citing familiar examples than by defining a core idea."</p> <p>"Linking the intellectual resources of institutions of higher education with communities and their needs in mutually beneficial ways."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension service • General extension • Lifelong learning • Community development • Continuing education • Distance learning
<p>University of Wisconsin (1995)</p> <p>"Outreach Scholarship"</p>	<p>Scholarship that is conducted in all areas of the university mission; involves the creation, integration, transfer, and application of knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Outreach Teaching</u>, e.g., credit and non-credit continuing education courses, seminars, workshops, exhibits, and performance to off-campus or non-traditional audiences. Innovative use of emerging instructional technologies; creates access for people at a distance. • <u>Outreach Research</u>, e.g., applied research, technical assistance, demonstration projects, and program evaluation for external audiences. • <u>Outreach Service</u>, e.g., extends specific expertise to serve society at large; participation on advisory boards, technology transfer, policy analysis and consulting; all of the above should be based on academic programs and for the advancement of a department's unit's mission.

--	--	--

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
University of Illinois (1993) "Public Service"	Activity that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to the public welfare or the common good; • Calls upon faculty member's academic / professional expertise; • Directly addresses or responds to real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns. 	Activity that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides services through a University clinic, hospital, or lab • Makes research understandable, usable (technology transfer) • Provides public policy analysis for governments • Tests concepts and processes in real-world situations • Involves serving as an expert witness • Provides presentations / performances for the public • Extension education • Applied research • Evaluation of programs, policies, personnel • Public forums, seminars, conferences, <p style="margin-left: 40px;">institutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in government meetings, federal review panels • Economic and community development activities • Collaborative

		<p>partnerships / endeavors with schools, industry, civic agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testify before legislative / congressional committees • Consulting and technical assistance • Conduct specific research • Serve as experts for the press or other media • Write for popular, non-academic publications /audiences
--	--	--

Table 1: Terms Used, Definitions and Examples

Source / Term Used	Definition	Examples
Schon (1995) "The new scholarship"	Reflections on the three new forms of scholarship described by Boyer (1990) and Glassick, et al. (1997): Scholarship of integration, application, and teaching	<p>"The new categories of scholarly activity must take the form of action research. [...]"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If <u>teaching</u> is to be seen as a form of scholarship, then the practice of teaching must be seen as giving rise to new forms of knowledge • If <u>community outreach</u> is to be seen a form of scholarship, then it is the practice of reaching out and providing service to a community that must be seen as raising important issues whose investigation may lead to generalizations of prospective relevance

		<p>and actionability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we speak of a scholarship of <u>integration</u>—the synthesis of findings into larger, more comprehensive understandings—then we are inevitably concerned with designing • The scholarship of <u>application</u> means the generation of knowledge for, and from, action"
--	--	--

Table 2: Forms of "Service" that Should *Not* Be Considered Part of the Definition

Source / Term	Forms of Service to Exclude from the Definition
Checkoway (1991)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Professional service," e.g., participation in and service to the profession / discipline • "University service," e.g., membership on campus committees
Lynton (1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional citizenship," e.g., committee work, student advising, and other forms of participation in institutional operations • "Disciplinary citizenship" • "Private Service" or "Civic contributions," e.g., jury duty, volunteering for religious efforts or nonprofits in ways that do not involve professional expertise and university mission / goals • Student recruitment efforts
University of Illinois (1993)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services for regularly enrolled students • Institutional service • Disciplinary service • "Private" community service • "One-way outreach" that does not entail reciprocal nature of the interaction between the faculty and the public • Continuing education that primarily serves the university's teaching mission, such as offering graduate programs off campus; location itself is not a distinguishing feature of "outreach

	<p>teaching"—it must meet all three public-service criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid consulting that does not meet all three public-service mission criteria, AND reflects department and university priorities. While remuneration itself is not a distinguishing characteristic, the main point of public-service consulting is service, not remuneration
Ditts, Haber, & Bialik (1994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only those professional activities that bring recognition to an institution and serve its educational missions directly should be counted as "service" (as distinguished from "overload consulting")
Rosen (1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Public" scholarship does not mean "politicized," it is neither a "scold nor a servant of the polity." • A public scholar is someone who is in the business of inquiry: "trying to learn something that is hard to learn without investigation, patience, and a commitment to truth-telling, including the hard truths that polities and politicians may wish to avoid."

How do concepts and definitions of public service vary across campuses?

"It is important that each campus generate its own language for describing the characteristics of professional service as a scholarly activity and the set of measures for its evaluation."

- Lynton, 1995, p. 54

The literature review was not extensive enough to permit an empirically based answer to this question. Concepts and definitions of public service vary so much within (not just between) institutional categories of higher education, and even within campuses (especially for large, multi-mission systems), that the answer to this question is evolving as we speak.

More readily answered is how the meaning of public service has changed over time, and how the pendulum of interest in (and dedication to) the service mission has swung back and forth during this century. This report will not try to recapitulate this history, as it has been done so well by many of the authors reviewed (e.g., Mawby, 1997; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Peters, 1997; Jordan, 1997; and Schon, 1995). Until this decade's revival of interest in professional or scholarly service, "service" was an all-encompassing term and included activities that current authors wish now to separate out (see Table 2). Nonetheless, many of these other, "non-preferred" types of activities are considered "the norm," or at least acceptable forms of service on a great majority of campuses.

Evidence suggests that given the diversity of institutions and the heterogeneity of purposes within large institutions, the extent and manner in which colleges, universities, and individual faculty and staff meet the service mission is going to vary widely. Diamond's work with defining "scholarship" across the disciplines (Diamond & Adam, *The Disciplines Speak*, 1995, p. 11) encountered disciplinary differences that led to the recognition that "no single definition or conceptualization of 'scholarship' will be agreed to across disciplines, and to try to establish such a definition could be counterproductive." Individualized job descriptions for faculty (e.g., Oregon State University) and collective planning at the unit level for resource allocation and assignment of service responsibilities represent ways to accommodate variation in an intentional and strategic way.

Evidence also still suggests that institutions and faculty want very much to be part of any change process (in fact, to own it), especially if the change addresses institutional missions and realignment of campus priorities, professional duties, and reward systems.

What's a useful working definition?

The answer to this question depends on the kind of activities one wishes to promote. Some terms seem to relate more to assessment of service at the individual faculty level, as opposed to unit or institutional level. Some terms are more restrictive in application or focus, others more inclusive. Some terms seem to evoke particular political or disciplinary associations.

Outreach appears to have the clearest tradition of use at land-grant institutions and was associated with agricultural and cooperative extension units. In some settings, however, outreach also refers to activities schools engage in to recruit students, especially non-traditional students whom the institution needs to "seek out" in order to "bring into" the institution. Outreach appears to be used also a bit more frequently in connection with institutes, centers, and other organizational sub-entities. It seems to describe the mission of entities, rather than the work of individual faculty or staff, unless the term is being used to denote an *outreach worker*. In other words, the term may be associated with delivery structure or mechanism, not just types of activity. If this observation is correct, outreach would be an advantageous term to stimulate collective external efforts, but not as appropriate in sending the message that the obligation to engage in outreach does not apply just to agricultural extension services.

The term *public service* was most frequently used in articles that talked about the traditional missions of faculty (i.e., research, teaching, and service). It appeared to be the most inclusive term, the most difficult to rein in. For example, in the University of North Carolina Guide the authors states, "Public service is not self-defining; [it] means a variety of different things within diverse academic disciplines, and among varied external constituencies" (p. 81 in Lynton's 1995 monograph). The UNC Roundtable determined that "it is critical to adopt a shared conceptual framework or working definition to guide and focus the ongoing discussions . . . [and that] public service should not be so broadly defined that every undertaking associated with the university falls within its ambit."

The terms *professional service* or *public scholarship* were used most frequently by authors discussing the need to redefine scholarship, correct the imbalance between missions in the faculty reward system, or revive the *public* nature of the service (see Lynton, 1995; Rosen, 1997; Peters, 1997). In contrast to *outreach*, it was used more frequently in discussing what individual faculty members do, rather than units. It seems to be the most exclusive of the terms used, the one most closely aligned with a structured, consultative, inquiry process (i.e., applied research). For example, Lynton wishes the term to be limited to "projects of a substantial nature" that are "the antithesis of rote or routine" and involve "originality and invention." The flavor of this definition can be seen even more clearly in Table 3, which shows the characteristics of *quality outreach*. The portfolio approach to evaluating professional service (which Lynton promotes), for example, builds on the familiar tenure and promotion packet. Again, this evaluation approach

seems most useful for assessing service at the individual faculty level. Perhaps portfolios for departments and schools, however, can be composed of individual faculty / staff accomplishments.

The political connotations of the various terms and their definitions also come into play. For example, writing a decade ago, Montgomery, et al. (1989, p. 2) stated, "Little weight is given on campus to service activities, yet the closer [the] work approaches a scholarly activity the greater it is valued. The implication therefore emerges that using the title *public service* raises a negative connotation—regardless of the activity therein encompassed." This suggests that using a term such as *outreach scholarship* might be beneficial.

Professional outreach, the term used by Judith Ramaley at Portland State University, reflects the same construct that the universities of North Carolina and Illinois call *public service*, the University of Wisconsin calls *outreach scholarship*, and Michigan State University calls *university outreach*. This term would appear to be a bit more inclusive than *public scholarship*, but more intentional and academically based than "public service."

2. Assessment of Quality of Outreach/Service

What constitutes "good" outreach?

The dialogue of voices addressing the topic of "quality" speak mostly at the theoretical / conceptual level and flow from the writings of Boyer, Rice, and Glassick, et al. The literature offers very little in terms of empirical research on outreach assessment, probably because before something can be measured, it must be able to be defined in fairly precise ways, and the construct of outreach is still emerging from its cocoon.

Very little overlap was found in the materials generated by the literature search process between the measurement / indicator literature on one hand, and the literature on outreach, public service, the nature of scholarship, and the "changing landscape in higher education" on the other. In other words, it appears that the measurement and assessment people have not been talking to the scholars of higher education and vice versa. The outcomes assessment movement of the last couple of decades has focused principally on teaching and learning (mostly at the undergraduate level). More recently these measurement folks have been caught up with resource management issues and indicators of fiscal efficiency for strategic planning and accountability purposes.

The gap between assessment specialists and higher education scholars is most apparent when assessment of outreach / service is considered at the department or institutional levels. Assessment of individual faculty scholarship has made, by comparison, much more progress, due largely again to the work of Boyer, Lynton, Rice, Diamond, and Glassick, among others. Institutions are responding. For example, Rice reports in "Making a Place for the New American Scholar" (1996) that AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards had assembled more than 175 campus documents "aimed at broadening the dominant conception of scholarly work and delineating what is to be rewarded." Lynton's work laid much of the foundation for defining professional service in such a way that it could be assessed through faculty portfolios. A recent book with Amy Driscoll, entitled *Making Outreach Visible: A Workbook on Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*, reproduces prototype portfolios of actual faculty outreach activities. The book includes chapters on lessons learned, good practices, administrator perspectives, and campus action agendas. Glassick, et al. (p. 39), also made reference to "the portfolio literature" and how it has "deepened understanding about how the scholarship of teaching especially might be captured in material form. Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan suggest more than four dozen items to consider for submission as part of a teaching portfolio."

Table 3 lists the characteristics of "good" outreach / service by author. Most of these characteristics reflect what individual faculty does vs. what faculty / staff does collectively. Some of the common, re-occurring themes (e.g., Diamond & Adam, Glassick, et al.) present in these characteristics include the following:

- Emphasis on rooting the work in a disciplinary base.
- Self-reflection and critique on the part of the faculty / staff member conducting outreach.
- A concept of outreach as a two-way flow of information and benefits, i.e., knowledge comes from the "outside in" as well as goes from the "inside out."
- Maintaining the "same standards of quality" (Glassick 1997) that apply to any scholarly activity, i.e., the work:
 - Has clear goals
 - Shows adequate preparation
 - Uses appropriate methods
 - Yields important results
 - Is effectively communicated
 - Is accompanied by reflective critique

Perhaps the University of Wisconsin offered the most concise list of quality characteristics. Their "14 characteristics of quality" subsume the six generic standards supplied by Glassick, et al., but also go beyond it.

Public scholarship as defined by Rosen is not easy to describe since it requires an array of technical skills that are not taught in most graduate settings in addition to personal attributes that have to be developed "on the job." If the criteria that Lynton, Glassick, Rosen, and others describe were to be actually applied today to outreach activities, it would substantially "raise the bar" for many faculty and staff who are currently committed to "service." For example, the notion of service involving a "two-way flow of information" between external publics, extension-based liaison faculty / staff, and discipline-based faculty may not be met in many current operations.

Throughout the academy, a lot of technical assistance, applied research, and university-community partnerships go unevaluated. There has generally been no incentive for institutions to build systems for self-reflection and critique (unless an outside funder requires it). Given that routine, system-wide evaluation takes time and resources, it often gets eliminated or shortchanged.

Ironically, much of what discipline-based faculty actually do would get re-classified as outreach if this expanded definition of scholarship were to be adopted—something they probably would not like, in that they have labored so hard to get their work considered "discovery of new knowledge" (when it more often fits the categories of "integration" or "application"). It might also upset faculty who have successfully specialized in order to publish and achieve tenure (see Schon for a description of the difficult career choices young faculty have to make between "rigor or relevance," i.e., the "high ground" or the "swampy lowlands").

On many campuses it is probably safe to say that much attention is paid by discipline-based faculty to the projects or products generated by outreach-focused faculty / staff. The need to root outreach scholarship in professional and disciplinary base(s), and to tie this work to institutional and department priorities, has some major implications for how institutions organize their work force. It has implications for tying tenure lines of extension faculty to home departments, for

example. It has implications for physical co-location of faculty and new patterns of communication and interchange, if research is supposed to inform practice and vice versa.

Table 3: Characteristics of "Good" Outreach

Source / Term	Characteristics
Michigan State University (1993) "University Outreach"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity that is rooted in scholarship, in primary research of source or core disciplines • Activity that is conducted with an eye for "reflective practice" (i.e., one conducts research, or evaluates, one's own outreach activity) • Activity that meets the needs of external audiences • Activity that satisfies standards of scholarship as expressed by professional peers • Activity that produces tangible products and processes • Activity that yields positive, measurable outcomes and few negative consequences for clients.
Glassick, Huber & Maeroff (1997) "Scholarship"	Six standards that apply to all scholarship, whether the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, or dissemination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has clear goals • Shows adequate preparation • Uses appropriate methods • Yields important results • Is effectively communicated • Is accompanied by reflective critique
Rosen (1997) "Public Scholarship"	Success of public scholarship depends on the researchers' ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use their skills to name and frame problems so that others can 'own' them; • Translate among civic dialects and find a shared language that all can profitably speak; • Provide a conceptual clarity to the discussion that excludes no one while adding to the intellectual capital all can draw upon; • Share their deep understanding of the roots of public problems in a manner that speaks to everyday experiences without trivializing the difficulties; • Exercise their civic imaginations in a way that nourishes the 'possibility of Possibility' without which no public can labor for long; • Undertake all of these tasks with a decent respect

	for the views and interests of others with whom they disagree.
Singleton (1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "If institutions are going to free scarce resources for faculty professional service, the academic value of the work needs to be made very clear"
"Faculty Professional Service"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach is of high quality when it is linked to teaching, research, and the institutional / department mission.
Lynton (1995) "Professional Service"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Distinct projects provide the primary measure of a scholar's work within the context of that scholar's activities over time." • The activity treats knowledge as a dynamic and exciting entity, not an inert commodity. • Professional service is <i>not</i> a one-way flow of information and technical assistance to external clients; instead, it is a <i>two-way</i> communication that provides substantial opportunities for discovery and fresh insights. • The service can be identified in terms of a substantial "project."

Table 3: Characteristics of "Good" Outreach (continued)

Source / Term	Characteristics
"Professional Service"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activity is not rote or routine, but has an element of discovery and originality. • Scholar learns from the activity and shares learning with others. • Scholar identifies and responds to the singular aspects of a situation. • Scholar makes reasoned choice of goals that are consistent with, but go beyond the literal or original wishes of the clients. • Scholar chooses methods that fit the object and are consistent with available resources. • Scholar reflects of his/her work (both processes and outcomes).
University of	"Outreach scholarship is regarded to be of high quality"

<p>Wisconsin (1995) "Outreach Scholarship"</p>	<p>when there is evidence that it has resulted in significant outcomes."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficial impact • Attributable (in part) to application of relevant and up-to-date research knowledge to real world needs, problems, issues, aspirations, or concerns • Is tied to the mission and policies of the University and each department <p><u>14 characteristics of "quality"</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue is of significant concern, worthy of effort • Draws upon faculty member's disciplinary / professional expertise and thereby requires significant intellectual contribution • Relates to department mission • Has ties to a research base; uses both scholarly and community assessments, builds on previous work, uses basic and applied theory • Activities represent potential new interpretations / applications • Clearly focused, intended educational outcomes • Clear strategy for reaching desired outcomes • Evaluation plan for documenting outcomes • Potential to generate new research questions or render a body of knowledge more knowable • Potential impact on public policy, professional practice • An integrated body of work • Shows balance among outreach activities • Uses delivery methods that maximize impact • Has a multiplier effect
<p>University of Illinois (1993) "Public Service"</p>	<p><u>Criteria for judging public service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of work • Impact • Dissemination as expressed through scholarship • Interaction with a community of scholars • Integration with research, teaching, and public service
<p>Diamond & Adam (1995) "Scholarship"</p>	<p><u>Six features</u> that satisfy the "scholarly, professional, or creative dimensions associated with promotion, tenure, and merit recognition":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity requires a high-level of discipline-related expertise • Activity breaks news ground, is innovative

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity can be replicated or elaborated • The work and its results can be documented • The work and its results can be peer-reviewed • The activity has significance or impact
--	--

How is "quality of outreach" measured at the individual **faculty** member level?

How is "quality of outreach" measured at the **department / unit / institutional** level?

Tables 4 and 5 list the methods reported in the documents reviewed for this report. In some cases, it was difficult to tell whether the ideas and measures listed were in actual use or simply at the suggestion stage.

Faculty-Level Assessment

As stated earlier, scholars have made greater progress in figuring out how to systematically assess public service at the individual faculty level than at the institutional level. As Table 4 shows, there are many concrete ideas and indicators listed for faculty assessment.

The key concepts described for faculty assessment appear to be:

- Getting feedback from students, clients, or other presumed beneficiaries of service;
- Critique by peers;
- Evidence of end products, actual use of services, and results of usage; and
- Evidence of dissemination and adoption of products / services by "unintended" audiences, i.e., groups for whom the service was not initially designed, but for whom the product has value.

The Carnegie Foundation's National Survey on the Re-examination of Faculty Roles and Rewards (1994, as reported in Glassick, et al.) suggests that many non-traditional forms of evidence (i.e., not just publication counts) are already routinely considered by many institutions during reviews of faculty teaching and research (see tables in Appendix B). Less than one-third of these institutions, however, reported using externally documented evidence of the value or impact of applied scholarship.

As fine as portfolios and dossiers are as approaches for measurement, the implications of adopting them systematically and thoroughly are considerable. It takes time, effort, and money to actually gather the documentation described. It also takes time for peers and others to provide the assessments requested.

Table 4: Dimensions of Public Service / Outreach at the Faculty Level and Examples of Measures / Indicators

Source	Dimension	Measures / Indicators
Michigan State University (1993)	<p>"University Outreach:"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmitting Knowledge (outreach teaching) • Generating / Applying / Preserving Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of academic credit hours • Student evaluations • Client satisfaction • Amount of external funds generated • Number of grants obtained • Percent of salary on state support • Number of patents and copyrights • Number of publications in peer- reviewed journals
Oregon State University (1996)	<p>"Scholarship" Redefined scholarship and performance assessment. As a Research 1 institution, OSU still recognizes service as a less important area, but writes an actual "job/position description" for each faculty and staff member, and tailors expectations and forms of scholarship for different people.</p>	<p>Developed a matrix of types of scholarship and outcomes assessment measures for each type.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of achievement focuses on "what was accomplished and how" (substance rather than form, accomplishments rather than sheer number of activities) • Probable use of portfolio approach • Addition of "team effort" as an important consideration for faculty rewards
Lynton (1995)	<p>"Professional Service"</p>	<p>Documentation of projects / sustained activity. "These multiple objectives can be met only by an interrelated combination of pertinent work samples and products, together with a narrative explication of</p>

		them—an assemblage, usually described as a 'dossier' or 'portfolio.'"
University of Wisconsin (1995)	"Outreach Scholarship"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Products, such as publications, videotapes, computer programs, program materials, newspaper articles, exhibits, shows, concerts, reports, etc. • Client feedback • Peer critiques • Number of (peer-reviewed, competitive) grants and contracts awarded to develop / deliver outreach services • Requests from others outside of the state to access, use, or learn from the outreach work • Use by others of instruments, tools, procedures developed • Number of patents, copyrighted materials

Table 4: Dimensions of Public Service / Outreach at the Faculty Level and Examples of Measures / Indicators

Source	Dimension	Measures / Indicators
University of Illinois (1993)	"Public Service"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honors, awards, other forms of special recognition • Election to office or an important undertaking • Invitations to talk outside of the state on the public service topic • Presentations, publications • Evaluative statements from clients and peers on the impact of the

		<p>public service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of grants / contracts awarded to fund the development and delivery of public service innovations • Requests to present, teach, consult • Adoption by other of instruments and processes developed
<p>Montgomery (1989)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Cooperative Extension and all other faculty Dimensions to evaluate: "excellence and professionalism"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation by peers, department heads, advisory committees, confidential letters from county advisors and projects leaders • Evaluation by participants or clients • Demand for workshops, classes, or services, e.g., number of sites; enrollment per site; enrollments over time; requests for the activity by new groups; requests for copies of reports or research results, and breadth of distribution of a service both in the home state and in other states • Quality measures of publications, e.g., contribution to knowledge, appraisal of its relevance to critical issues, usefulness, stature of publication outlet • Number of publications

Institutional Level Assessment

The three entries on Table 5 illustrate different kinds of experiences with, or knowledge of, measuring quality at the unit or institutional level, as profiled below:

1. The University of Minnesota experience (Hendel, 1997; Whiteside, et al., 1997) illustrates how one institution embarked on a multi-year task to build a comprehensive system of critical measures in order to serve its own needs for improvement, local management and decision making, as well as communication with external publics. The area of public service was nested, after much discussion, within a broader concern for "University Relationships with Society." This measure is still in process, under development and facing logistical challenges with uniform measurement and implementation, due to the large size and decentralized nature of the multiple campuses. Nonetheless, the principals involved feel the commitment to gathering qualitative as well as quantitative data, and to lodging responsibility for documentation at the unit level have been key to their progress. While the definition of service is quite broad, measurement is lodged at the unit level.
2. The Illinois State Board of Higher Education (1992) represents an alternate approach, and one inaugurated by oversight bodies, to develop statewide guidelines for making "productivity improvements" in five key areas: (1) instruction, (2) research and public service, (3) overall academic functions, (4) administrative functions, and (5) state policies affecting higher education. As described in their document, "While the guidelines are presented in a statewide context, systems and campuses will ultimately be responsible for making specific productivity improvement decisions" (p.1). As with instructional units, "Productivity improvement decisions about public service and research units should be based on findings from multiple indicators that focus on the general subjects of capacity, quality, and costs" (p. 11). This work is best applied to the assessment of "research and public service *units*."
3. Botrill and Borden (1994) conducted a comprehensive review of the performance indicator literature as part of a *New Directions for Institutional Research* issue on the history, successes, and challenges of developing indicators in higher education. They catalogued approximately 250 indicators in about 30 categories (e.g., "Admissions," "Curriculum," "Faculty," "Finances," "Teaching and Learning"). Table 5 excerpts the categories relevant to the assessment of outreach / service. Indicators are also classified according to "input," "process," and "outcome." In terms of unit of analysis, the indicators range from the individual to organizational sub-entities to the entire academic enterprise.

These illustrations point to a number of challenges that arise in considering the task of assessing outreach / service. As alluded to earlier, the object being evaluated is large, amorphous, and not easy to define when one is talking about outreach / service as an institutional responsibility or expression. The measurement challenge is to try to tease out what is specifically intended, coordinated, and strategic about an institution's public- service efforts. Should the total contribution an institution makes through its libraries, arts and cultural and sporting events, consumer services through hospitals and hotels, publishers and bookstores, medical and other newsletters, web sites, information hot lines, and clearinghouse functions be assessed? Or should the areas most aligned with the scholarship of integration, application, and dissemination be teased out? Some of the articles reviewed pondered these and other challenges. For example, a national survey by AASCU and NASULGU of their members in 1995 found that "nearly 87percent of responding institutions report having one or more special purpose institutes, centers, or offices through which they deliver community service." The challenge to measurement is how to capture the "net effect of these centers of activity, combined with individual efforts in literally hundreds of collaborative efforts to improve educational opportunity, the social welfare of families and communities, and the quality of life of millions of people."

As stated by Checkoway (1991) and others, the solution to be avoided is a bean-counting mentality, in which an institutional measure of service is arrived at by inventorying all that individual faculty, do in a massive catalogue or database and "counting it up." Not only would this lead to an incredible amount of work, it would result in a mass of data not easily communicated to audiences and lacking in a frame of reference that permits interpretation. It would also allow an unfiltered definition of service / outreach to continue. As the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) at the University of Massachusetts in Boston discovered from a survey of colleges and universities in New England (Gamson, 1997, p. 12), "many college and university people are engaged in civic life, but their involvement tends to be privatized, invisible, isolated, uncoordinated, and not strategic."

Another repeated theme in the literature is the need for institutions to go through the process of building their own accountability systems, rather than importing concepts, measures, and indicators from the outside. *The implication of this is that standardized indicators of quality public service / outreach are not necessarily feasible or desirable.* Although some promising indicators do exist (see Table 6, Section IV), they may serve best when considered as useful suggestions or models for institutions who are working on putting together their own system.

Table 5: Dimensions of Public Service / Outreach at the Institutional Level and Examples of Measures / Indicators

Source	Dimension	Measures / Indicators
University of Minnesota (1995-98)	<p>"University Interactions with Society" – one of 14 critical measures; represents three previously separate categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public service / outreach • Responsiveness to compelling state needs • Responsiveness to market demands <p>Three themes being measured:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Access</u> by the public to education (especially opportunities for non- traditional learning), and to the University's expertise, and to the University's graduates who carry this expertise into the workforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public opinion polls • Satisfaction of external users, with "users" identified at the unit level (rather than central administration), because units know their constituencies best • Selective inventory of outreach activities / contributions <p>Not a single form or measurement tool to record / document / assess quality of outreach, but "standardized expectations" across all units and "cultures." Agreement to avoid "bean counting" and massive record keeping. Interest in qualitative as well as quantitative approaches.</p>

	<p>and communities;</p> <p>2. <u>Quality of interaction</u> between the university and external constituencies, including partnerships, collaborations, services, and other kinds of external contact and interaction;</p> <p>3. <u>Impact or Results of Outreach</u> (economic, educational, environmental, health, social, or cultural uses), including impacts of graduates who fill needs in the job market, serve communities, create new organizations or jobs, or provide leadership.</p>	
--	--	--

Table 5: Dimensions of Public Service / Outreach at the Institutional Level and Examples of Measures / Indicators

Source	Dimension	Measures / Indicators
Guidelines for Productivity Improvements – Illinois Board of Higher Education (1992)	<p>"Public Service Units," e.g., community education, public broadcasting, cooperative extension, centers for economic development, institutes providing services to teachers and schools, and other As with instructional units, productivity improvement decisions about public service and research units should be based on findings from multiple indicators that focus on</p>	<p>Program review process includes examination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which state-appropriated funds are matched by external funds, i.e., the ratio of non-appropriated expenditures to appropriated expenditures • Extent to which capacity of units (e.g., faculty expertise, equipment, facilities)

	<p><u>capacity, quality, and cost.</u></p>	<p>meets public demand for activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which faculty and staff contribute to the development and application of knowledge and delivery of services. • Extent to which units are central vs. peripheral to institutions' missions, and whose contributions to instruction and service to students do not service institutional, regional, or statewide priorities.
<p>Botrill & Borden (1994)</p>	<p>Literature review of performance indicators included the following dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Needs • Continuing Education • Research • Service • Special Populations 	<p><u>Community Needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community members' judgements of college career preparation programs • Number of outside groups using college facilities • Educational and cultural facilities for adults from the region • Cultural activities for outsiders (number, duration, participation rates) • Recreational activities for outsiders (number, duration, participation) • Commercial use of infrastructural facilities (laboratories, library) <p><u>Continuing Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of contract education • Quantity, quality, duration, participation of continuing

		<p>educational activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsoring agency perceptions of adequacy of customized training programs
--	--	---

Table 5: Dimensions of Public Service / Outreach at the Institutional Level and Examples of Measures / Indicators

Source	Dimension	Measures / Indicators
Botrill & Borden (1994)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of continuing education courses, programs, and service on community • Community awareness of continuing education and community service programs <p><u>Research</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usefulness of research results for trade and industry • Social merit of research: contribution of social welfare • Research on behalf of government, companies, societies • Circulation of scientific results for the population <p><u>Service</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student levels of public service • Public service opportunities • Relations with external organizations • Articulation of continuing education and community service

		<p>students to other college programs</p> <p><u>Special Populations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs and services for re-entry and non traditional students • Numbers of non-traditional, transfer, and international students • Enrollment level of special populations • Success level of special populations • Special population progress rates • Support services for special- needs students • Ability of continuing education programs, courses, and services to meet the needs of various groups in the community, including the young, old, different economic classes, and unemployed
--	--	---

If any promising indicators of outreach effectiveness already exist, what are they?

What are the characteristics distinguish "leading" institutions in outreach?

The field is drawing closer to identifying some of the characteristics of institutions that are leading the way in terms of quality outreach, but we still lack many successful accounts of actually documenting / measuring / assessing outreach quality at a systems level." Table 6 summarizes the quality indicators suggested in the literature; Table 7 catalogues an ad hoc listing of quality characteristics. Even if these indicators and characteristics were embraced tomorrow by an institution, there would be a likely gap in implementation methodology in terms of accessing data systems, or in developing and using new data collection systems to capture the relevant information. Thus, the state of the art is still rough.

Table 6: Suggested Indicators of Quality Institutions in the Area of Public Service

Source	Indicators
<p>Oregon State University Weisner (1996)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of Extension faculty (agents and specialists) tenured in colleges and departments, rather than in Extension <p>This indicator would show the degree to which this work force is integrated into the rest of the university, rather than marginalized. Having extension faculty connected to departments also shows concern for their ongoing professional development in core or source knowledge. It also shows concern for ensuring that discipline-based faculty have some means for "reality testing" and getting "refreshed from the outside" by colleagues who spent more time off campus than on.</p>
<p>Urban Community Service at AASCU & NASULGC Institutions – 1995 Survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which community service is recognized / rewarded • Percent time allotted to faculty, and other forms of institutional support • Degree to which students participate in service learning projects; extent to which student participation is voluntary, substantially supported, or required for degree completion • Existence of effective vehicles for communicating with services audiences, including needs assessment and dissemination • Number of requests from the community for university / college assistance • Percent of resources allocated for community service activities • Percent of faculty's "service time" that is allocated to professional public service, as opposed to service to the institution, or to the discipline, or to "private" service
<p>Barrett, Green, et al. (1997)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An institution's or department's financial allotment for service, calculated as a percent of dollars allotted for research <p>This indicator is based on a typical finding on the relative percentages of time and dollars spent on the three missions of teaching, research, and service. This study found, for example, at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), faculty spend on average 40% of their time on research, 40% on teaching, and 20% on service. "However, the budgetary allocation for service in the 1996-97 academic year was less than 9% of that budgeted for research."</p>

Table 7: Other Potential Characteristics of Quality Institutions

Source	Characteristics
Michigan State University (1993)	<p>Recommendations for the "ideal" scenario: Institutions would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt new concept and definitions of outreach and revise tenure and promotion forms to include the new definition • Create measurement and evaluation systems to track, assess, and adjust the amount of outreach performed • Involve multiple parties in planning, but place responsibility at the unit level • Create explicit and written guidelines for evaluating faculty performance in outreach • Stimulate, support, and recognize outreach at all levels • Enhance access to university knowledge resources • Strengthen outreach through university-wide leadership
Ramaly, based on work by B. A. Holland (1995)	<p>In discussing the change process in institutions, Ramaly reprints an interesting "pyramid" based on the work of Holland: "Typical Arenas of Change in Higher Education." The pyramid posits a scale, from least common to most common forms of change.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Least: Faculty roles and rewards Curriculum philosophy and program Academic organization Administrative restructuring Most: Institutional missions and goals</p> <p>Ramaly stated, "The distinctive characteristic of the case of the change process at Portland State University is that all levels of this pyramid are addressed almost simultaneously." One implication of this work, in terms of a possible "quality" characteristic, is that change happens at the "top of the pyramid" in leading institutions, not just at the bottom.</p>
Lynton (1995)	<p>Professional service "is not a philanthropic activity"; it must be built into the budget. It can't be done on overload; it "must be explicitly factored into that institution's long- and short-range planning, as well as into its resource allocation process." It must show up as part of an institution's operating budget; part of an individual faculty member's grant or contract or fees.</p>
Montgomery (1989)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redefine how scholarly effort fits into the service and extension • Differentiate between professional public service and discipline-related and institution- related service • Advocate excellence and professionalism in the

	performance of all faculty
--	----------------------------

Table 7: Other Potential Characteristics of Quality Institutions

Source	Characteristics
Arnold (1997)	<p>Several themes emerged from "case history examples" cited by participants in the MSU-sponsored, Kellogg Foundation funded "Capstone Symposium on University Outreach" (1995). These "themes suggested to me not only goals but characteristics of institutions that are "leading in the right direction."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies and efforts to link university outreach activities more closely to teaching and research • Assigning outreach responsibilities more widely within the university, rather than viewing it as the purview of only selected academic disciplines and programs • Assignment of leadership responsibility for outreach programs to academic units • Common strategy elements, including an institutional inventory of outreach activities and development of unit-level plans for outreach • Revisions in promotion and tenure guidelines and modification of other faculty reward systems to strengthen the recognition of outcomes and impacts of outreach (and teaching) functions • Designating administrative leadership responsibility and, in some instances, administrative restructuring for the institutional outreach mission and function
	<p><u>Other ideas extracted from Jordan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectation that all undergraduate students participate in a service learning project with an external public or private sector organization • Administrative role: having persons with designated responsibility for helping facilitate connections between academic units and external constituents

3. Synthesis and Implications

Although the methodological "state-of-the-art" for assessing the quality of outreach / service remains rough, it reflects an ambivalence about the service mission that needs to be corrected. What the literature does tell us can perhaps be best understood if one is reminded of the current context for outreach / service. The context is, as Mawby states (1997), one of institutional "imbalance of missions."

The relative imbalance of teaching, research, and public service / outreach within the university and in its relationships with the larger society must be addressed if continuing public support is to be warranted. The benefits of superb specialization in various fields of concentration are awesome and must continue to be encouraged and rewarded. At the same time, it is increasingly apparent that none of the comprehensive issues confronting society can be addressed effectively by any one specialty. Leadership must be exercised in mobilizing and integrating the expertise and talent of various fields of study in addressing significant societal concerns. It is to this end that the outreach dimension of the university is concentrated. The academy's response to its institutional crisis in serving the society that created and sustains it must be dramatic, comprehensive, and focused. Time is of the essence.

- Mawby, "Boldness For Our Times," 1997, p. 372

This imbalance is seen—and felt—most keenly by faculty and staff in terms of resources. A survey of 290 member institutions associated with AASCU or NASULGC ("Urban Community Service at AASCU and NASULGC Institutions: A Report on Conditions and Activities," 1995, p. 4) confirmed the obvious barriers to providing community service are not the "structure and cooperation necessary for collaboration with city officials, school officials, and business and industry," nor is it lack of "commitment of university leaders or trustees." Rather, "respondents noted *faculty support conditions* as a chief barrier to meeting community service missions" (e.g., lack of adequate resources / time for faculty to respond to societal needs and lack of recognition of community service as a scholarly activity). This points to the need for increased faculty / staff support and recognition as starting points, but not end points, in the drive to increase the quality of outreach.

If the problem is one of missions being out of balance and resources out of alignment, then the solution calls for re-balancing the mission, reintegrating professional service / outreach within the core of the institution, and readjusting resource allocations. Findings suggest that quality institutions are indicated by the decisions made and actions taken that reflect a view of outreach as an intrinsic part of the academy, not an adjunct to it. The "quality institution" would show concern for the mechanisms by which it integrates the service mission, and therefore the persons who contribute to it, with teaching and research.

What drives current outreach activity? Three different sources of influence top the list: faculty / staff member interests; community needs and requests; and availability of external dollars. Findings also indicate a strategic use of dollars as these factors are considered within a broader context of the strategic plan. Response by institutions should also be based on institutional goals, objectives, and the actual capacity it has to provide the kind of consultation, support, or educational programming desired.

- Outreach activities should not be driven in total neither by consumer special interests, nor by faculty / staff interest. Rather, as many authors have declared, outreach activities should reflect a genuine give-and-take relationship. An institution needs to proactively maintain open lines of communication with its publics in order to be informed of, and responsive to, community needs. At the same time, it uses this information to help shape programmatic thrusts, it also educates community as to the capacities—and the limitations—of the institution and its faculty / staff to address special interests.
- Part of the negative perception that some communities have of educational institutions (especially research universities) is that the institutional response to community needs is primarily entrepreneurial, i.e., driven just by the availability of external funds to "partner with the community." Although it's appropriate to acknowledge the need for incentives and self-interest as necessary for sustaining any organization, the extent to which faculty / staff simply "follow the dollars" is a problem in terms of maintaining integrity of outreach activities.

In summary, the ideal institutional response to outreach / service is strategic; activities should serve a legitimate public interest, with "public" not confined to mean just business and industry.

The findings also echo a concern for institutions holding themselves accountable to an outreach mission by understanding what impact their work has on the intended publics. This goes beyond the public relations by-product that occurs when an institution disseminates its "good works" and "research findings" and in other ways publicizes its accomplishments. A "quality institution" is one that routinely collects feedback from key leaders and informants representing target audiences.

Ultimately the "quality institution" is one that considers outreach not just an individual faculty or staff member's work to be recorded and assessed on annual activity reports, but a collective mission. This said, however, one of the most critical building blocks for re-balancing the missions is to adopt a broader definition of scholarship and adjust faculty roles and rewards to reflect this. In doing so, the definition would also distinguish "professional outreach" (as it is defined by Ramaley and other institutions noted earlier) from unintended meanings (e.g., service to the institution, service to the professional field, and non-related service to the community).

To conclude, the signing of a leading institution (based on the writing of Ramaley and others) would appear to include the following:

- Campus dialogue occurring on the nature of faculty work, scholarship, and the expression of public service at the institutional mission, collegiate unit / department, and individual faculty / staff level.
- Clearer definition of public service, i.e., what it entails vs. excludes.
- Reconsideration and re-balancing of missions, with the goal of making departments, colleges, and the institution as a whole accountable for responding to societal needs.
- Re-balancing and integration of professional public service reflected in the faculty reward system and in the budget.
- Greater emphasis on collaborative and collective work within a department to accomplish the service mission.
- Greater recognition and job protection for academic staff whose primary role is in public scholarship / outreach.
- Endorsement and ownership of above by key faculty.
- A strategic plan for moving from current status to desired status.

An operational plan for evaluation, especially one that incorporates a routine mechanism for getting feedback from external constituencies; the plan should also include methods for documenting and assessing strategic outreach activities at the collegiate / department level.

Appendix A

Note to Readers:

The reprinted excerpt below is an example of how one institution operationalized a definition of "quality outreach" within the context of a public health practice role. In this example, the School of Public Health considered the role of practice as distinct from institutional service, or service to the discipline, but similar in others ways to the construct, "public service." This view of service both extends scholarship and refreshed it through direct, two-way interactions with communities. The criteria and examples offered here for public health practice followed a format used in the previous sections for research and teaching.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Manual

School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Adopted October 1, 1994.

V. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

C. Public Health Practice

As presently construed, for the purposes of promotion and tenure, public health practice has the following connotations:

- A Faculty member works with a national, state, or local health agency, or directly with a community, to help solve some current public health problem;
- Or a faculty member works in another setting, e.g., international, health care, or worksite;
- Often the role of the faculty member is one of collaboration with health agencies and communities, rather than the more traditional role of "principal investigator";
- The results of the work are directly and immediately applicable, as compared to the more "distant" application of research findings;
- Practice usually involves helping health agencies assess public health problems or plan, implement, or evaluate public health programs;
- Practice often involves helping communities or health agencies assess public health problems, assure the delivery of public health services, or develop public health policies;
- Practice often involves the faculty member in direct contact with communities or populations that are the clients, recipients, or beneficiaries of public health programs or services;
- The program planning, implementing and evaluating process is often long-term and time intensive;
- The "scholarly" product of practice is in the form of technical reports, presentations to professional meetings, and/or "program" type publications in the more traditional research journals;
- Practice often has an advocacy component;
- There is a linkage between a faculty member's practice experiences and the teaching of public health graduate students; such linkage may be in the classroom or it may be in supervised field experiences, or other similar types of experiences in which graduate students work with or under the supervision of the practice faculty member;

- There can be a research component to practice: practice oriented research is defined by communities/agencies and deals with immediate problems; the practitioner/researcher collaborates with communities/agencies, and the research is jointly owned;
- There can be a service component to practice: practice oriented service is community and/or health agency based, is long-term, and helps communities and/or agencies define, and/or solve immediate public health problems.

For promotion and tenure purposes, public health practice must be deemed to be "scholarly." That is, the practice must be shown to have effected not only a given policy, community, agency, or program, but it must also be shown that the practice has in some way contributed to advancing the state of the art of public health practice itself.

Evidence of accomplishment in public health practice should be provided for one or more major projects. As rank increases, it is expected that both the quantity and quality of practice will also increase.

Competence in public health practice can be demonstrated by providing the following types of materials and information at time of promotion and tenure:

1. Description of public health practice activities.
2. For each practice project, the nature and duration of the project, and the role-played by the faculty member.
3. Documentation that the practice contributions have had important effects on policy, and/or on a community, agency, or program.
4. Evidence that the practice activities involved or resulted in the creation or development of new public health or similar systems for the improvement of the public's health.
5. Evidence that the public health practice activities have contributed to the teaching activities of the faculty member and/or the department; for instance, that teaching is directed at practice issues such as assessing public health problems, assuring the delivery of public health services, or developing public health policies.
6. Evidence that teaching contributions include linking classroom activities and other teaching activities with public health agencies.
7. Evidence that new knowledge, methods, or policies derived from the candidate's public health practice have diffused to other communities, or health agencies.
8. Evidence that new practice ideas, policies, programs, methods, etc., have been disseminated through publications. In addition to articles in refereed journals, "publication" can mean producing technical reports that are used by public health agencies and/or communities to help them assess public health problems, assure the delivery of public health services, or develop public health policies.

The equivalent of peer review of such technical reports is evidence of their impact (e.g., letters indicating that a technical report was used to help assess public health problems, assure the delivery of public health services, or develop public health policies).

9. Receiving honors or awards in recognition of outstanding contributions to public health practice.
10. Invitations by other institutions or health agencies to help plan, organize or review public health practice activities.
11. Appointments to national commissions, committees, boards, etc., related to public health practice.
12. Grants and contracts received to fund public health practice activities.

Appendix B

Portions of this work are repeated from or closely follow text first published in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, by Ernest L. Boyer, copyright 1990 by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Table 3.1. Regarding <i>Teaching</i>, Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation Are Generally Used at Your Institution for Purposes of Promotion and Tenure?			
	CURRENTLY IN GENERAL USE	NOT IN GENERAL USE BUT UNDER CONSIDERATION	NOT IN GENERAL USE AND NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME
a. Systematic student evaluations of classroom teaching	98 %	2 %	0 %
b. Self-evaluation or personal statement	82	12	5
c. Peer review of syllabi, examinations , and other teaching materials	62	29	8
d. Peer review of classroom teaching	58	33	9
e. Evidence of continuing student interest (i.e., majors, course enrollment)	34	26	37
f. Alumni opinions	31	29	38
g. Student evaluations of advising	24	42	31
h. Evidence	24	41	33

of student achievement			
i. Evidence of the impact of teaching on research	15	29	51
j. Evidence of the impact of teaching on applied scholarship	14	29	51

Source: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

Table 3.2. Regarding Research, Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation Are Generally Used in Faculty Evaluation at Your Institution?

	CURRENTLY IN GENERAL USE	NOT IN GENERAL USE BUT UNDER CONSIDERATION	NOT IN GENERAL USE AND NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME
a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement	77 %	9 %	11 %
b. Securing judgments by colleagues <i>within</i> the institution	73	11	15
c. Counting numbers of publications and presentations , weighted by type	54	8	37
d. Asking reviewers to use specific qualitative criteria in their evaluations	44	16	37
e. Evidence	42	26	27

of a research project's impact on teaching			
f. Securing judgments by <i>outside</i> scholars	39	17	43
g. Evidence of student participation in a research project	37	23	35
h. Evidence of a research project's impact on applied scholarship	34	22	37

Source: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

Table 3.3. Regarding *Applied Scholarship (Outreach)*, Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation Are Generally Used at Your Institution for Purposes of Promotion and Tenure?

	CURRENTLY IN GENERAL USE	NOT IN GENERAL USE BUT UNDER CONSIDERATION	NOT IN GENERAL USE AND NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME
a. Self-evaluation or personal statement	74 %	10 %	13 %
b. Client or user evaluation	35	23	38
c. Evidence of student participation in a project	32	26	37
d. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on teaching	30	26	38

e. Evaluations of the project by specialists	23	22	50
f. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on future research	20	24	48
<i>Source:</i> The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994			

Appendix C

The Literature Search Process

Search Strategies: Order of Key Words Used Number of Records Identified

A. Higher Education 210,660

Higher Education + Outreach 1,030

Higher Education + Outreach + Evaluation 2,19

Higher Education + Outreach + Quality Indicators 2

B. Higher Education + Outreach + Institutional Effectiveness 23

C. Higher Education + Public Service 2,402

Higher Education + Public Service + Evaluation 416

Higher Education + Public Service + Assessment 230

Higher Education + Public Service + Assessment + Quality Indicators 3

D. Higher Education + Outreach + Faculty Rewards 8

Higher Education + Outreach + Faculty Rewards + Measuring 0

E. Higher Education + Institutional Effectiveness 1,958

Higher Education + Institutional Effectiveness + Public Service 53

Higher Education + Institutional Effectiveness + Outreach 23

Higher Education + Institutional Effectiveness + Professional Service 24

Higher Education + Institutional Effectiveness + Public Service +

Performance Indicators 1

F. Higher Education + Professional Service + Quality Indicators 134

Bibliography

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

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.

Ansley, F. & Gaventa, J. (1997). Researching for Democracy & Democratizing Research. *Change* (Jan/Feb) 46-53.

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

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.

Banta, T.W., & Borden, V.M.H. (1994, Summer). Performance Indicators for Accountability and Improvement. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. No. 82, 95-119. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

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.

Board of Trustees. (1993). *A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Borden, M.H.V. & Banta, T.W. (1994). Using performance indicators to guide strategic decision making. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. No. 82. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Borden, V.M.H., & Bottrill, K.V. (1994, Summer). Performance Indicators: History, Definitions, and Methods. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. No. 82, 5-21. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bottrill, K. V. & Borden, V. M. H. (1994). Appendix: Examples from the Literature. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 82, 107-119. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered; Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundations for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 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.
- Checkoway, B. (1991). Unanswered Questions about Public Service in the Public Research University. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 5 (3), 219-225.
- 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.
- 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.
- Dooris, M.J., & Teeter, D.J. (1994, Summer). Total Quality Management Perspective on Assessing Institutional Performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 82, 51-62. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 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.
- 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.
- Fear, F.A. (1996). *Transformation and Transition: Outreach at Michigan State University*. National Extension Leadership Development (NELD) Forum, Washington, D.C.
- Fear, F.A., Sandmann, L.R., & Lelle, M.A. (1997). *First Generation Outcomes of the Outreach Movement: Many Voices, Multiple Paths*. Paper presented at the 21st Century Campus Culture. Washington, D.C.
- Gamson, Z.F. (1997). Editorial. *Change* (Jan/Feb), 11-14.
- Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Halliburton, D. (1997). John Dewey: A Voice that Still Speaks to Us. *Change* (Jan/Feb), 24-29.
- 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.

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.

Lelle, M. A. & Fear, F. A. (1998). A Legacy Rediscovered: Public Service at Private Colleges. Unpublished paper submitted for publication to the Journal of Public Service and Outreach.

Local Government Center. (1990). *Working with Grassroots Government: A Report from the Local Government*. Bozeman, MT, Montana State University.

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

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.). In press.

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.). In press.

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.

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.

Office of Planning and Analysis (Hendel, D.). (1996). *University 2000: Critical Measures: Third Phase*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota..

Peters, S.J. (1997). Public Scholarship and the Land-Grant Idea. *Higher Education Exchange*, 50-57. Kettering Foundation.

Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993, October). *University Outreach at Michigan State University: Extending Knowledge to Serve Society*. East Lansing, MI. Michigan State University.

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

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

Rosen, J. (1997). Public Scholars: In Search of a Usable Present - A Reply to Alan Wolfe. *Higher Education Exchange*, 44-49. Kettering Foundation.

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

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

Taylor, B.E., Meyerson, S.W. & Massey, W.F. (1993). *Strategic Indicators for Higher Education: Improving Performance*. Princeton, N.J., Peterson's Guides.

Walleri, R.D., Moss, M.K. (Eds.) (1995). Evaluating and Responding to College Guidebooks and Rankings. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 88, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Weiser, C.J. (1996). *The Value System of a University - Rethinking Scholarship*. Corvallis, OR. Oregon State University.

Whiteside, J., Hendel, D., Dundar, H., & Kvavik, R. (1997). *Closing the Loop: Performance Assessment and Institutional Change*. Paper prepared for presentation at the 1997 AIR Annual Forum, Orlando, Florida.

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