MEMO

FROM: Faculty Roles and Rewards Subcommittee, Carnegie Task Force
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
RE: 2014-2015 charges for APAFT

As you know WSU has received recognition by the Carnegie Foundation as a Community Engaged Institution. This classification is significant as only 311 institutions carry it and WSU is in the process of reapplying for the status. Brenda Kowalewski is leading the reapplication process and among the subcommittees working on the document is the *Faculty Roles and Rewards Subcommittee*. Our charge is to review the institutional rewards for community engaged teaching, research, and service, which involved us analyzing and discussing whether faculty community engaged practices are being sufficiently recognized and rewarded in tenure and promotion documents.

 The attached document is product of that analysis and discussion. It highlights two types of tensions we see in the institution regarding these issues. The first tension exists between the current practices of many faculty members and much of the tenure and promotion documentation we have reviewed. The scope of teaching, scholarly/creative, and service activities described in 8-11 as central to promotion are not particularly in synch with how many faculty members engage in those activities.

Some tenure documents, notably S&BS, A&H and Education are better in this regard. They recognize, encourage, and value community-engaged teaching, research, and service activities. But, this creates the second tension which is the more immediate concern. Despite being discussed in tenure documents, PPM 8-11 is notably silent about community engaged teaching, service, and scholarly/creativity activities. A faculty member coming up for tenure and promotion needs to know that activities recognized, encouraged, and valued in one document, are similarly addressed in the other.

We acknowledge that tenure and promotion are different decisions necessitating different documents with distinct criteria and that 8-11 criteria for promotion may well be different than criteria for tenure in college tenure documents. We further appreciate that colleges may not similarly embrace all forms of community-engaged activities in their tenure document and that 8-11 would need to recognize that fact as well. But we think that 8-11 needs to be reexamined to in light of absence of language which is popping up in tenure documents which may create confusion for both candidates for tenure and promotion and departmental and college committees reviewing those candidates.

We ask faculty senate executive to charge APAFT to look into and assess these tensions as they are related to 8-11 and to determine whether there is a way to reduce them. The document the subcommittee prepared proposes language for such reductions and we further ask that APAFT review our language as part of their charge. The hope is NOT to add community engagement as a requirement for promotion in 8-11, but to find language for 8-11 that would prove more consistent with actual faculty practices and various tenure documents.