



UNIVERSITY
OF WOLLONGONG
AUSTRALIA

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health - Papers

Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health

2013

Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature

Kylie Smith

University of Wollongong, kyliesm@uow.edu.au

Fabienne Else

University of Wollongong, fabienne@uow.edu.au

Patrick A. Crookes

University of Wollongong, pcrookes@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

Smith, K. M., Else, F. & Crookes, P. A. (2014). Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 33 (4), 836-847.

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature

Abstract

Universities in Australia are becoming increasingly concerned with their reputation as 'engaged' institutions. Yet there is significant confusion about what this idea of 'engagement' means and no clear way of measuring or reporting it. In part, this is because of the nature of engagement itself which is dependent on local context, partnerships and communities. This presents a difficulty for academic staff undertaking engaged work within institutions and stresses the need for institutions to develop internal processes that clearly articulate definitions of engagement, set out performance expectations and provide processes for the reward and recognition of the scholarship of engagement. In a sector increasingly concerned with the outputs of research as measurable by publication bibliometrics and grant income, the sometimes difficult to measure outcomes of engaged work can become relegated and dismissed. As part of a project to articulate performance expectations in the area of the scholarship of engagement for academic promotion at University of Wollongong, researchers undertook an extensive international literature review to learn what had been done in this area previously and to identify issues of concern. This paper sets out the findings from this review, considers the implications of engaged scholarship for academic promotion and suggests some possible ways forward for institutions and staff working in this area.

Keywords

Academic identity, career development, community engagement, higher education policy

Disciplines

Medicine and Health Sciences | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Publication Details

Smith, K. M., Else, F. & Crookes, P. A. (2014). Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 33 (4), 836-847.

Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature

Dr Kylie M Smith^{a*}, Fabienne Else^a, Professor Patrick A. Crookes^a

^aFaculty of Health and Behavioural Science, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia.

Abstract:

Universities in Australia are becoming increasingly concerned with their reputation as 'engaged' institutions. Yet there is significant confusion about what this idea of 'engagement' means and no clear way of measuring or reporting it. In part this is because of the nature of engagement itself, that it is dependent on local context, partnerships and communities. This presents a difficulty for academic staff undertaking engaged work within institutions however, and stresses the need for institutions to develop internal processes that clearly articulate definitions of engagement, set out performance expectations and provide processes for the reward and recognition of the scholarship of engagement. In a sector increasingly concerned with the outputs of research as measurable by publication bibliometrics and grant income, the sometimes difficult to measure outcomes of engaged work can become relegated and dismissed. As part of a project to articulate performance expectations in the area of the scholarship of engagement for academic promotion at the University of Wollongong, researchers undertook an extensive international literature review to learn what had been done in this area previously and to identify issues of concern. This paper sets out the findings from this review, considers the implications of engaged scholarship for academic promotion, and suggest some possible ways forward for institutions and staff working in this area.

* Corresponding Author: Email kyliesm@uow.edu.au

Engagement and academic promotion: a review of the literature

Introduction

The role and place of 'engagement' within Australian university activities is an area of increasing interest and concern. 'Community engaged scholarship' (CES), as it is known in the US, has been important in the North American tertiary sector for some time and systems are well established for the tracking, measuring and benchmarking of activities at the institutional and sector level. This is not yet entirely the case in Australia, where CES is not a common term and institutions and individuals struggle with issues of definition, evidence, reward and recognition. During a process of overhauling promotion criteria and performance expectations at the University of Wollongong, it became obvious that 'engagement' was a concept ill-understood by most staff and many managers, causing serious problems for its integration into career development and promotion documentation and processes.

As part of this promotions project, the project team undertook an extensive literature review in order to map out current thinking in the area of engagement that might take it beyond the concept of 'community service' and into the realm of 'scholarship'. Our aim was to explore possible options and models for documenting, celebrating and recognising 'engaged' work within universities. In the process, we noticed a pattern in the literature, which had plenty to say about definitions and theories of engagement, processes of conducting engaged research, teaching and service, and systems for evaluating engagement within projects and across institutions; but very little to say about tracking, measuring, rewarding or recognising an individual's level of engagement. In this article, we set out the main themes of the existing literature and argue that the current focus on project or institutional levels of engagement neglect the fact that academic work within universities is actually conducted by individuals, who are driven by a variety of motivations to conduct engagement work, not the least of which is the desire for successful reward and recognition through career progression. Without clearly articulated performance expectations, promotion criteria and measurement tools that value and recognise engagement, staff will continue to 'chose' not to do it. At the same time, as the social and political imperative to improve university-community engagement increases, institutions will struggle to achieve meaningful outcomes without a culture of reward and recognition for engaged scholarship.

Search method and results

Since the early 1990's a broad base of literature has emerged on the topic of engagement, both nationally and internationally. In order to ensure that our literature review covered a wide-range of sources incorporating both local and international perspectives, a broad range of databases were searched. We used ScienceDirect, Proquest, Academic OneFile and Informit, and the wider internet was also searched through the use of Google Scholar. All searches were conducted using a mix of the key terms 'Scholarship', 'Engagement', 'Evaluation', 'Promotion', 'Measurement', 'Boyer', 'Research', 'Health' and 'Community' and Boolean search operators. From this search two hundred and ninety five results were found related to the subject. Using the information provided in the abstracts, the list of sources was then reduced to ninety related articles. Of these, sixty-six sources were found to be relevant and were utilized for the literature review. The majority of the articles that were discarded after reviewing the initial search mainly revolved around how to form successful community partnerships and how to manage service learning from a university-community perspective. While these articles were highly related to engagement as a form of scholarship or academic activity, they were not evaluation, assessment or policy focused and had too broad a scope to be helpful in this particular literature review. The journal articles, conference papers, reports and web-based resources that were utilised in the review contained a wide range of information, approaches and perspectives, both national and international, qualitative and quantitative, relating to the subject of the scholarship of engagement with a focus on methods of measuring, evaluating and reporting.

Through a process of searching, reading, summarising and reviewing, several main themes started to emerge around the scholarship of engagement, and it was through these that the ultimate format of the review began to take shape. The first theme that emerged was the historical origins of the scholarship of engagement and its evolution into a central aspect of academic work. The next theme to arise was the problem of defining engagement in the contemporary university. Issues surrounding the definition of the scholarship of engagement have abounded since its infancy and a universal agreement on any single definition is yet to be decided, although there are a number of preferred options emerging. The third theme to emerge was that there is (as of yet) no set format for measuring, assessing and evaluating the scholarship of engagement within an institutional or individual context. The fact that there is little to no information on how an individual should format or measure their engagement activities for career advancement became particularly obvious at this point and as such was

highlighted as a point for further exploration. This lack of available measurement tools has, it can be argued, led to a lack of advancement and encouragement of engaged scholars within tertiary institutions. Following on from this problem, the next theme that emerged was the problems that surround the recognition and rewarding of excellence in engaged scholarship. It soon became apparent that many of the issues that plague engaged scholars relate to a culture of scepticism within higher education institutions which did not see 'engaged work' as important or scholarly, which then led to a lack of ability to effectively measure and track their engagement activities and as such provide accepted and academically legitimate evidence to their peers.

The following review explores each of these themes in turn, with particular reference to the relevance of the literature for developing clear information and resources for institutions and staff seeking to have their engaged work recognised and rewarded.

History and Definition of the Scholarship of Engagement

After the publication of Ernest L. Boyer's Carnegie Report "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate" (Boyer 1990) the traditional ways of thinking about academic scholarship came under increased scrutiny and in his subsequent article, "The Scholarship of Engagement" (Boyer 1996), Boyer illustrated a new paradigm of scholarship, in which the application of knowledge played a key role. Since these publications, the scholarship of engagement has become its own recognised field of academic scholarship within the tertiary sector, although Boyer argued that engagement work as a university-community practice had existed long before this recognition, and only a hundred years ago was considered the central mission of higher learning (Boyer 1996).

Since his death in 1996, Boyer's work has continued to be used by engaged scholars as a basis for arguing that engagement should be regarded as an academic scholarship integral to research or teaching. It is often not seen as a method of scholarship because it tends to get relegated to 'community service'; something that is done after the 'real' work of research or teaching is completed and often not producing easily measurable academic outputs such as journal articles. Yet for Boyer, the 'scholarship of application' as he initially called it, was a key aspect of academic life, without which neither the scholarships of discovery or teaching had any meaning (Boyer 1990). This difficulty is exacerbated by the general lack of understanding as to what the scholarship of engagement is.

Some authors have argued that this confusion is caused by an inconsistency between institutions and academics as to the meaning of “engagement” (Stanton 2008; Cuthill and Brown 2010; Holland, Scott et al. 2010). While it may not be possible to come up with one universal definition of engagement that suits all institutions, there are several definitions of engagement that have been supported or created by well-known engaged academics (Maurana, Wolff et al. 2001; Wise, Retzleff et al. 2002; Duke 2003; Holland 2005; Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance 2008). Two definitions have emerged as particularly popular within Australian institutions and could be viewed as useful for individuals involved in community engagement work, especially in relation to career building and establishing academic legitimacy.

The first was created by The Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA) and is of particular relevance to an Australian institutional context. AUCEA’s definition of engagement, upon which it bases its own work, is set out as such:

‘University-community engagement is a specific method for academic research and teaching that necessarily involves external communities (business, industry, schools, governments, non-governmental organisations, associations, indigenous and ethnic communities, and the general public) in collaborative activities that address community needs and opportunities while also enriching the teaching, learning and research objectives of the university’ (Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance 2008).

Being relatively broad, AUCEA’s definition is helpful for those scholars aiming to embed their engagement activities within research, teaching and learning outcomes, an approach that is considered to be more successful and sustainable for the promotion of engaged scholars to the wider academic community than attempting to approach engagement as a solitary and disjointed scholarship (Holland 2009).

The second definition was created by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the United States and is widely used as part of their Elective Classification on Community Engagement. A more succinct approach than that of AUCEA, the Carnegie Foundation defines engagement as such:

‘Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and

resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity'(Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2006).

The Carnegie definition has been supported by Holland and Ramaley (Holland and Ramaley 2008) as the most widely used definition currently available. Although this definition's breadth may seem to make it more easily applicable, it does not define engagement for the individual as a clear entity or measurable form of scholarship. As with most other definitions currently available, it was created to suit the Carnegie Foundation's own institutional needs (which is the awarding of 'engaged' classifications to whole institutions) (Le Clus 2011) and therefore cannot be applied universally. Institutions may adopt the Carnegie definition as a guiding principle for engaged scholarship work, but the AUCEA definition may be more practical at the individual staff member level.

O'Meara and Sandmann et al (O'Meara, Sandmann et al. 2010) have stated that 'The field would benefit from standardizing the definition of engagement and embedding it across studies in future research' (2010, p. 91). This lack of standardisation in the definition of engagement has made engagement activities, which already suffer due to their inherently different forms of scholarly outputs, even more difficult to measure, evidence and ultimately reward. This also means that there is no one single system for tracking, measuring and reporting engagement, and that where such systems do exist, they most commonly reflect an institution's needs in tracking and reporting, rather than an individual staff member's.

Institutional Systems

Reviewing the literature in this area soon revealed that the current landscape of measurement schemes for engagement are so varied and uniquely shaped for different institutions that they provide little guidance for an individual seeking to measure their own endeavours and offer no means for providing portability of outcomes from one institution to another. Measurement schemes for the individual are few and far between, often providing little reference to specific structuring, formatting and evidencing academic excellence and only referring to the importance of such measurement and evaluation as a practice in principle. Meanwhile the emphasis on reporting and marketing of engagement at an institutional level now occurs to a degree that has perhaps become more problematic than productive (Hart and Northmore 2011). So long as institutions measure and report engagement at the 'big picture' level and not at the individual, it will be difficult for staff to see how or why they should undertake or report on their own engagement work, or how their scholarly work fits with institutional

conceptions of 'engagement'. There are a number of references in the literature to institution or sector wide measuring and reporting systems. In this section, we review them for their strengths and limitations, with an eye to their adaptability for individual career development strategies.

While the Carnegie Engagement Elective Classification (a voluntary comparative scheme for universities involved in engagement work in the United States) has been widely accepted by American universities and has been viewed by some as a starting point for the development of any similar schemes (Hart and Northmore 2011), it remains a system structured uniquely for American universities to compare their engagement endeavours and levels of commitment, a factor which may make the system inaccessible to a wider international audience (Hart, Northmore et al. 2007). Although this is the largest ranging of the institutional assessment methods, many others have been formulated internationally.

Barbara Holland's 1997 matrix (Holland 1997) and Furco's rubric (Furco 2002) are two institutional self-assessment tools created to help institutions measure certain aspects of their engagement agendas, with a focus on commitment to institutionalization and service-learning. Although they are both effective tools, like the Carnegie classification, they focus on assessment from an institutional level. Barbara Holland has also discussed the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) database at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) (Holland 2001). Holland asserts that both databases could be useful in creating a common method for reporting engagement data and statistics, and would allow a greater ease of access to the relevant data (2011 p 12). The main limit for the individual with systems such as this is that they require initial set-up and resourcing by the university, an approach that requires a high commitment to engagement institutionally.

The Comprehensive Assessment of the Scholarship of Engagement (CASE) method and Urban University Portfolio Project (UUPP) (Bringle, Hatcher et al. 2001) are two other systems that have been developed in the United States with some success. The CASE system is a highly comprehensive assessment process which 'leads a campus through a variety of activities in order to gain a clearer perspective for planning, program development, and strategic planning' in the area of engagement (Bringle, Hatcher et al. 2001 p 91). The activities involve creating a working group of faculty, students and stakeholders to compile a

portfolio which includes various forms of evidence such as supporting information and student surveys as well as engaging with a system of 'cells' (key tasks relating to engagement implementation). The authors make it clear how worthwhile the CASE assessment structure is for an institution, its staff, students and the community, however it is acknowledged that this 'worthwhile' endeavour requires a high commitment of staff time (p 92) and a commitment from an institution to see the project through to completion. Another project, The Urban University Portfolio Project, brought together several leading urban public universities in America to develop 'a new medium for quality assurance in institutions of higher learning: electronic institutional portfolios that demonstrate effectiveness to various groups of stakeholders' (Bringle, Hatcher et al. 2001 p 93). The obvious downside with such an extensive project is that it is set up exclusively for institutions and requires significant resources beyond those available to the individual engaged scholar.

A different approach to these systems was taken by the University of Minnesota when it created its Task Force on Civic Engagement (Le Clus 2011). After undertaking a specific research project for the Kellogg Foundation, the Task Force made a series of recommendations including establishing a Council on Public Engagement (COPE), expanding community partnerships for research and teaching projects, enhancing institutional incentives and developing assessment and evaluation tools (Le Clus 2011 p 39). While acknowledging that a systematic process of assessment is needed to ensure effective community engagement and use of engagement resources, the university's website currently acknowledges that they have not yet come up with an effective tool or approach (Le Clus, 2011).

Some United Kingdom approaches to the issues surrounding measuring engagement include the University of Bradford's REAP approach and the University of Brighton's Community University Partnership Programme (Hart and Northmore 2011). The REAP approach is a qualitative tool based on four principles: Reciprocity, Externalities, Access and Partnerships (Le Clus 2011, p 23) and is used to provide a framework for measuring achievement in engagement as well as allowing greater involvement by engagement partners who are encouraged to become part of the assessment process. While Hart and Northmore (2011) point out the REAP approach as highly useful, they also note some limitations including the difficulty of collecting baseline data and a failure to measure economic impact. Another model, The Community University Partnership Programme (CUPP) was developed at the

University of Brighton to assess community-university partnerships. CUPP was subjected to a three stage external evaluation, a process that revealed it is ‘vital to collect basic statistics from the start’ (Hart and Northmore 2011, p 53). This is an important lesson for staff involved in engagement activities – the need to build into the projects proper evaluation and evidence gathering mechanisms before commencement.

Some Australian approaches have also met with limited success, including the Strategic Framework Structure (Garlick and Langworthy 2006). According to Garlick and Langworthy, this includes special measurements surrounding aspects of a project, such as: shared purpose and a result oriented approach, evidence of trust and quality relationships, collaborative leadership, effective communication, quality of process, mutual and sustainable benefits and progressive monitoring and evaluation. These principles draw strongly from Boyer’s (1996) six standards of excellence (to be discussed below). While the individual might be able to utilise some of these principles from a measurement perspective, the model lacks evidence and process specifics.

The University of Southern Queensland recently utilised a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach (Wadsworth 1998; Arden, Cooper et al. 2007), as a means of measuring engagement practices by ‘involving community partners as co-researchers’, ‘focussing on formative evaluation through a cycle of action and reflection action’ by the parties involved, ‘being cognizant and respectful of the roles and perspectives of insiders (community) and outsiders (researchers)’, approaching the process as one that is meant to ‘build capacity of community members as well as researchers’ and using the ‘researcher as a “broker” to build “bridging and linking ties” between the community and the university’ (Arden and Cooper et al. 2007, p. 20). Although a successful approach in a general institutional sense, this system does not apply itself to an individual measurement and tracking context.

An attempt at providing sector-wide measurements of engaged scholarship was made through the AUCEA Benchmarking Pilot, which aimed to create a benchmarking framework which would ‘assist universities and their community partners to improve their contribution to society and the environment through mutual knowledge exchange, learning and enterprising action’ (Garlick and Langworthy 2008, p1). The pilot framework was tested on 12 AUCEA member universities and comprised an institutional questionnaire, a partner perceptions survey and a “good practice” template. The attempt at benchmarking revealed however, that

each university operates within its own context; location, community and core business differences meaning that it was not possible to set targets, measures or benchmarks that could easily be applied across the sector. These differences make it even more important that institutions develop specific systems to track and measure the activities and outcomes of individual staff in their own particular context.

Measuring and Reporting for Individuals

While references to measuring the work of the individual engaged scholar are relatively limited, there have been some attempts made at creating performance expectations for such scholars. One of the first was originally laid out by Ernest L. Boyer (Boyer 1996) and has appeared in slightly altered forms since (Glassick 2000; Maurana, Wolff et al. 2001; Reynolds 2009). In his original article, Boyer (1996) sets out six standards of excellence which may be considered in assessing standards of performance. These common themes which emerged from a wide study by the Carnegie Foundation were:

‘First, did the scholar have clearly stated goals? Second, did the scholar follow well-defined and appropriate procedures? Third, did the scholar have adequate resources and use them in effective ways? Fourth, did the scholar communicate effectively to others? Fifth, did the scholarly effort lead to significant results? And sixth, did the scholar engage in reflective self-critique?’(p. 135)

Boyer’s questions, while helpful, were in many ways indicative of future literature to emerge on measuring engaged scholars – relatively vague. These six standards of excellence were not developed with engagement specifically in mind, and were designed only as a starting point, an acknowledgement of some of the most serious aspects of assessment and evaluation that need to be considered in the measurement of scholarship more broadly. Although he later discussed the idea of a portfolio for use as evidence he did not provide specificity, instead inviting the listener to ‘think of your own list’ and only provided some very brief examples (Boyer 1996, p 136).

Since then scholars such as Barbara Holland have acknowledged the importance of measuring the individuals work for reasons such as academic legitimacy, image and reputation and accountability (Holland 2001). However there is a significant difference in the comprehensive tools made available to engaged individuals as opposed to institutions. One of the few tools that may be considered helpful to such academics was created by Barbara Holland during her time at Portland State University. This assessment model was developed

using a 'goal-variable-indicator-method' (Holland 2001) meaning there are four components to be considered. That is: a 'Goal: What do we want to know? Variable: What will we look for? Indicator: What will be measured? Method: How will it be measured?'(p. 55). Holland discusses some examples of the various components of the model, for instance a goal could be 'social responsibility' with intentions regarding future service to be measured through indicators such as surveys, interviews, focus groups and journals (p. 56). This form of evaluation is broad, but could be helpful for an individual looking to establish an evidence framework that would demonstrate their scholarly activities in the area of engagement. An individual would be able to employ measurement tools mentioned by Holland such as surveys, interviews, focus groups, observations, vital analysis, and outputs such as curriculum and syllabus development and journal articles as evidence. Importantly, this type of evaluation signals to staff that the focus of 'engagement' is 'scholarship' – that 'engagement' is a way of conducting research, teaching and governance activities that are firmly embedded in reciprocal partnerships, rather than community voluntarism, as engagement is sometimes understood.

Both Boyer and Holland are good examples of the direction in which thinking about engaged scholarship measurement and tracking could be headed. Although their approaches may not seem particularly specific, they have both avoided an important pitfall inherent to systems designed to measure engagement activities. It is important in any academic measurement framework, but especially in the case of a scholarship as broad in its application and activities as engagement, to avoid the 'tick-the-box' mentality. Guiding principles need to be set before any work can happen, as do questions about what sort of things an institution considers quality or excellence. Adams et al. (Adams, Badenhorst et al. 2005) discussed this issue in an article that reported the outcomes of a recent performance indicator process that was undertaken at RMIT University. Despite the working party's best efforts, the university ultimately adopted what the authors regarded as a largely checklist approach, an outcome which they regarded as falling far short of what was needed. However they felt this may have been because attempting to "quantify largely intangible goals is fundamentally problematic" (Adams, Badenhorst et al. 2005, p 5). Even so, it is important to avoid a 'check list of outputs' approach, as this can act to restrict the activities of engaged scholars, rather than encouraging them (Rudd 2007) and may fail to take into account important aspects like 'vision, entrepreneurship, creativity, determination and passion, contextuality, technical know-how, networking, communication, acceptability, replicability, flexibility of approaches,

persistence, and tenacity during adversity’(Rudd 2007, p 77). In a higher education setting that is becoming increasingly dominated by quantitative measures of ‘outputs’ as opposed to the more nebulous ‘impacts’ of engagement work, it is increasingly important to ensure individuals who do this significant work are not overlooked. Thinking outside the realm of check lists of outputs, while difficult in the age of ERA, is imperative if the scholarship of engagement is to flourish.

Issues for Recognition and Reward

While measuring engagement is a relatively new concept at most universities in Australia, many institutions are making concerted efforts to document their attempts at measuring their commitment to scholarly engagement activities on an institutional level. Many articles (both Australian and overseas) have discussed various theories and techniques of measuring engagement from a university wide, faculty size or group-level approach. As of yet, very few however, have made the leap to concentrating on the engaged individual and their journey to effectively and efficiently track and measure their engagement activities, usually for evidencing promotional endeavours. Therefore, while engagement is increasingly recognised by the academic community as scholarly work, few are yet sure how to evidence their own engagement work in a recognized scholarly format. While it may be believed that measurement on an individual level should remain an individual’s prerogative and responsibility, some have acknowledged the importance of recognised scholarly measurement in a tertiary sector that is increasingly concerned with academic legitimacy and process (Holland 2001; Macfarlane 2007; Hart and Northmore 2011).

Attempts to develop systematic approaches towards rewarding and recognising engagement work in tertiary institutions may be hampered by prevailing academic cultural attitudes, where engagement is poorly understood and thus often seen as outside the ‘real’ work of scholars (Ward 2003). In fact, it is considered by some as ‘largely outside of the core work and mission of the University and/or unnecessary’ (Cuthill & Brown 2010, p. 132). It is still the case that engaged scholars are also not valued equally as academics peers to those involved in more traditionally entrenched forms of scholarship (Duke and Moss 2009) with recent research undertaken in the United States showing that while the majority of staff in a university may consider public service or engagement activities to be ideally valued by colleagues or the institution, less than half that amount believed it is materially valued in the reappointment, promotion and tenure process (Jaeger and Thornton 2006). These common

perceptions by staff of the low value of engagement work often leads to scholarly work going either unpublished or being reclassified as 'research' or 'teaching' due to a belief that such categories are more recognised and rewarded. This then has the circular effect of making engagement less visible, and therefore harder to have recognised and rewarded. This is further exacerbated when senior managers at research universities are sceptical of engagement work and consider it as an additional activity which should not interfere with the 'real work' of the university (Cuthill and Brown 2010).

Several academics have acknowledged that excellence in the scholarship of engagement is not as easy to display as excellence in research or teaching (McDowell 2001; Jaeger and Thornton 2006). Its outcomes and value can not necessarily be shown through grants income and journal articles. Its impact and worth often lies in the beneficial influence it has on the community and university through various initiatives and partnerships fostered over time. Therefore, further attempts and a greater degree of focus needs to be given to creating successful measurement and tracking mechanisms which do not focus merely at an institutional level, but at an individual level of community engagement work. Some positive steps have been taken towards this recently, in the form of the TaME (Tracking and Measuring Engagement) literature reviews (Le Clus 2011) and workshops (Le Clus, Butrous et al. 2012) that AUCEA has been conducting over the last 12 months. A white paper on this issue from AUCEA, with recommendations for institutions wishing to develop tracking and measuring systems, is due in July 2012.

Conclusion

While research quality measurement exercises are designed to provide comparative analyses of performance within disciplines across the tertiary sector, the main method for recognising and rewarding excellent scholarly work within a university remains the academic promotion (or tenure) system. These two forms of measurement are often at odds with each other, and the emphasis on bibliometric measures of performance as encouraged by ERA and the REF threaten to further diminish engagement work. Our main aim with this literature review then, was to find out what sort of systems may already be in place to encourage engagement work through career development, facilitate staff recording and reporting and overtly recognise engagement through promotion processes. Despite the difficulties of creating such a measurement tool or format that can be employed by engaged scholars, it is work that needs to be pursued.

Beyond the difficulties and variety of approaches, the literature review has revealed that certain aspects of successful strategies are starting to emerge and these are building important trends on which future measuring and tracking frameworks for the individual can be built. Firstly, it is clear that for an individual's engagement work to be recognised and valued in an institution, there must be a clear definition of 'community engaged scholarship' or 'engagement' in place. There will not be effective recognition and reward of this method of scholarship until it is clearly defined for both the individual scholar and their wider institution. While both the definitions mentioned in this article (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2006; Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance 2008) would be effective definitions to put in place, any definition that revolves around these core themes of community partnerships, mutual benefit and scholarly objectives would be a positive starting point for an institution building an engagement culture. Secondly, it must be acknowledged that the needs and experiences of every institution and community are unique and as such a universal engagement measurement scheme for individuals is unlikely to come to fruition anytime in the near future. But this fact should not stop individuals and institutions from formulating their own measurement and evaluation tools and learning from the successes and mistakes of others, both nationally and internationally. There is a growing field of literature on implementing engagement measurement strategies and these should be utilised as important lessons in the level of effectiveness of different approaches at institutions with varying focuses. Thirdly, it is vital that any measurement scheme, whether aimed at the individual level or based on a wider institutional scale, should collect vital information and data from the very start. Mechanisms of proper evaluation and evidence gathering need to be explicitly laid out at the beginning of any engagement activity and would be most effective if they directly corresponded with the institutions promotional documentation and criteria. This corresponding format would foster within the institutional culture a greater respect for engagement as it would increase academic legitimacy and accountability (Holland 2001). Finally, it is essential that any measurement scheme aimed at the individual (or institution) avoids the 'tick-the-box' or 'checklist' mentality. Formatting a measurement scheme in this way is harmful to the engagement scholarship (Rudd 2007) as it restricts the creativity and innovative approaches that are inherent in this unique scholarship and ignores the variety of work that is produced by it. While it may be helpful to mention certain possible forms of outputs and evidence, such as Barbara Holland did in her 'goal-variable-indicator-method' (Holland 2001), it is important that any evidential suggestions are

flexible and non-binding in order to provide a framework that is conducive with the nature of the scholarship.

If tertiary institutions wish to have any kind of effective engagement agenda, and to continue to develop partnerships that foster the reciprocal benefits of research and the development of evidence based practice, they need to be able to attract staff that are able to see pursuing engaged work as a genuine career path, that is both recognised and rewarded at the same level as its traditional research and teaching parallels. This literature review has set out the work being done in this area both nationally and internationally and has identified some of the problems and issues that may be encountered. Importantly, the literature reveals that more needs to be done to develop both institution and individual level reporting and documenting systems, and that without these, engagement can not become fully embedded as university core business.

Adams, R., A. Badenhorst, et al. (2005). The value of performance indicators in supporting a community engagement agenda at RMIT. 2005 Australian Universities Quality Forum: Engaging Communities. Sydney, AUQA Occasional Publications. **5**: 1-7.

Arden, C., T. Cooper, et al. (2007). "Evaluating Community Engagement: Lessons for an Australian Regional University." The Australasian Journal of University Community Engagement **2**(1): 18-27.

Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (2008). Universities and Community Engagement: Position Paper 2008-2010, Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton NJ, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). "From Scholarship Reconsidered to Scholarship Assessed." Quest **48**: 129-139.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). "The scholarship of engagement." The Journal of Public Service and Outreach **1**(1): 11-20.

Bringle, R. G., J. Hatcher, et al. (2001). "Planning and Assessing to Improve Campus - Community Engagement." Metropolitan Universities **12**(3): 89-99.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006). Community engagement classification. Palo Alto, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cuthill, M. and A. Brown (2010). "Sceptics, Utilitarians and Missionaries: Senior manager's perceptions of engagement in a research intensive Australian university." The Australasian Journal of University Community Engagement **5**(2): 126-146.

Duke, C. (2003). "Staying Engaged." Education Review / Campus Review: 21-22.

Duke, J. and C. Moss (2009). "Re-visiting scholarly community engagement in the contemporary research assessment environments of Australasian universities." Contemporary Nurse **32**(1): 30-41.

Furco, A. (2002). Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning. Revised 2002. Service Learning Research & Development Center, University of California, Berkeley, Campus Compact at Brown University.

Garlick, S. and A. Langworthy (2006). Assessing University Community Engagement: Discussion paper prepared for the AUCEA Benchmarking Project. Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance Inc. University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown.

Garlick, S. and A. Langworthy (2008). "Benchmarking university community engagement: Developing a national approach in Australia." Higher Education Management and Policy **20**(2): 1-12.

Glassick, C. E. (2000). "Boyer's expanded definitions of scholarship, the standards for assessing scholarship and the elusiveness of the scholarship of teaching." Academic Medicine **75**(9): 877-880.

Hart, A. and S. Northmore (2011). "Auditing and Evaluating University-Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK Case Study." Higher Education Quarterly **65**(1): 34-58.

Hart, A., S. Northmore, et al. (2007). Briefing Paper: Auditing, Benchmarking and Evaluating Public Engagement. The National Co-Ordinating Centre for Public Engagement. United Kingdom.

Holland, B. (1997). "Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors." Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning: 30-41.

Holland, B. and J. Ramaley (2008). Creating a Supportive Environment for Community-University Engagement: Conceptual Frameworks. Engaging Communities: Proceedings of the 31st HERDSA Annual Conference. Rotorua: 11-25.

Holland, B., G. Scott, et al. (2010). Rationale and Model for an Online System for Tracking an Assessing Community Engagement. 2010 AUCEA National Conference: Communities Participation and Partnership.

Holland, B. A. (2001). "A Comprehensive Model for Assessing Service-Learning and Community-University Partnerships." New Directions for Higher Education **114**: 51-60.

Holland, B. A. (2001). "Exploring the Challenge of Documenting and Measuring Civic Engagement Endeavors of Colleges and Universities: Purposes, Issues, Ideas." Campus Compact: Advanced Institute on Classifications for Civic Engagement: 1-28.

Holland, B. A. (2005). Scholarship and mission in the 21st century: The role of engagement. Australian Universities Quality Agency Forum, Sydney, Australia.

Holland, B. A. (2009). "Will It Last? Evidence of Institutionalization at Carnegie Classified Community Engagement Institutions." New Directions for Higher Education **147**: 85-98.

Jaeger, A. J. and C. H. Thornton (2006). "Neither Honor nor Compensation : Faculty and Public Service." Educational Policy **20**: 345-366.

Le Clus, M. (2011). TaME Tracking and Measuring Engagement: A Review of the Literature, Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (AUCEA): 1-47.

Le Clus, M., N. Butrous, et al. (2012). TaME Workshop, Southern Cross University.

Macfarlane, B. (2007). "Defining and Rewarding Academic Citizenship: the implications for university promotions policy." Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management **29**(3): 261-273.

Maurana, C. A., M. Wolff, et al. (2001). "Working with Our Communities: Moving from Service to Scholarship in the Health Professions." Education for Health **14**(2): 207-220.

McDowell, G. R. (2001). Land-grant universities and extension into the 21st century: Renegotiating or abandoning a social contract. Ames, Iowa State University Press.

O'Meara, K. A., L. R. Sandmann, et al. (2010). "Studying the Professional Lives and Work of Faculty Involved in Community Engagement." Innovative Higher Education **36**: 83-96.

Reynolds, P. (2009). "Community Engagement: What's the Difference between Service Learning, Community Service, and Community-Based Research?" Journal of Physical Therapy Education **23**(2): 3-9.

Rudd, C. J. (2007). "Community engagement: A partnership approach to measurement, evaluation and benchmarking processes." The Australasian Journal of University Community Engagement **2**(1): 73-87.

Stanton, T. K. (2008). "New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities." Education, Citizenship and Social Justice **3**(1): 19-42.

Wadsworth, Y. (1998). "What is participatory action research?" Action Research International Paper 2, from <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/ari/p-ywadsworth98.html>.

Ward, K. (2003). "Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement. ERIC Digest." ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Retrieved 14/7/2011, 2011, from <http://www.ericdigests.org/2004-3/faculty.html>.

Wise, G., D. Retzleff, et al. (2002). "Adapting Scholarship Reconsidered and Scholarship Assessed to Evaluate University of Wisconsin-Extension Outreach Faculty for Tenure and Promotion." Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement **7**(3): 5-17.