

Identifying and Managing University Assets:
A Campus Study of Portland State University

John Rueter and Talya Bauer

Between 1994 and 1996, Portland State University (PSU) expanded the definition of scholarship used to assess and reward faculty. Three conditions facilitated this change. The first related to PSU's urban history, culture and values. This context allowed faculty to approach their teaching, learning, and community engagement in scholarly ways. The second condition involved external forces, which challenged PSU faculty to identify and use their intangible assets in the scholarship of teaching, integration, and application. The third condition was, and continues to be, university leadership. Leadership at PSU encourages the faculty to engage in institutional reflection and strategic planning from a scholarly perspective. In the mid-1990s, the synergy among these three conditions prompted PSU to broaden notions of scholarship to include, more centrally, an emphasis on teaching.

This paper examines the current status of this broadened definition of scholarship within PSU's academic culture. To do so, the authors interviewed 28 faculty, staff members, and administrators and analyzed documents, such as the university's promotion and tenure guidelines, to understand the process and structures that promote a broader view of scholarship across campus. The analysis suggests that PSU has made progress in the use of expanded forms of scholarship to both identify and manage the intellectual assets of the institution. It also suggests that PSU is still in the process of implementation and now faces a second generation of challenges.

Introduction

When academic leaders cite examples of institutions at the forefront of implementing Ernest Boyer's (1990) framework for expanded scholarship, they often point to PSU. With a motto of "Let Knowledge Serve the City" and more than five years experience implementing a broadened definition of scholarship, PSU serves as a model for many urban universities – particularly in encouraging and assessing teaching and engagement under a scholarship rubric. The current study is an opportunity to reflect critically on the university's experience with regard to scholarship, past and present.

A Snapshot of Portland State University

Portland State University straddles a tree-filled mall in downtown Portland, only six blocks from city hall. The Carnegie Foundation currently classifies PSU as a Doctoral-Granting University II. In 1946, legislative action formed the university to provide educational access to the growing metropolitan population. In fall 2000 the university's headcount showed 12,246 full-time students and 4,995 part-time students; however, because of student turnover between terms, it is estimated that over 36,000 individuals take classes at PSU during a calendar year. Only 11 percent of PSU students live in campus housing. PSU receives state funding through the Oregon University System, which includes four small, regional universities and two larger, higher profile universities (Oregon State University and the University of Oregon). There has been recent growth in the student population at PSU, and a major shift toward hiring fixed-term (one- or two-year contracts) and part-time faculty, with such appointments increasing by 136 percent between 1995 and 2001. These changes in faculty composition

indicate a movement away from using tenured and tenure-track faculty to meet student credit hour demand.

Looking Back: A Brief History to 1990

In 1990, PSU defined itself with the new descriptor of “urban university.” Many current faculty remember this move to define PSU’s urban mission and the fanfare over launching the motto, "Let Knowledge Serve the City." However, PSU first set its urban course much earlier. Between 1949 and 1955, PSU came about when the flooded-out Vanport Extension Center moved from below the dikes on the Columbia River to downtown Portland and became the college (Dodds, 2000). In this historical account, there is no record of the extension center or the nascent university having a mission statement, except that the emerging institution was committed to teaching and access. Political support for this mission led to state legislation that created Portland State College.

There are two historical periods prior to 1990 that are critical to the development of faculty roles and rewards at PSU: (a) the activist 1960s; and, (b) the financial and administrative crisis of the late 1980s. Events during these two periods created a culture that would later be responsive to changes in faculty roles and rewards.

In the 1960s, PSU faculty participated in the growing citizen and political activism of the era. There was a general cultural transition from materialist to post-materialist values (Inglehart, 1990, 1997) and a shift in priorities from economic development to quality of life. These tradeoffs transformed “basic norms governing politics, work, religion, family, and sexual behavior” (Inglehart, 1997, p. 8). This cultural shift began in the cities and continues as a cultural divide between urban and rural

communities (Inglehart, 1997, p. 111). Faculty recruited to PSU in the 1960s elected to work in an environment that aligned with their values of service and access. Many sought to work at PSU, where a balance of teaching, research, and service existed, rather than an institution that focused more rigidly and narrowly on the traditional model of discipline-based research (e.g., traditional land-grant universities in “college towns”). The faculty hired during this period eventually became campus leaders and helped shape PSU's culture through what might be described as “elite-directed participation” (Inglehart 1990, p. 336). This type of leadership originated among the general faculty who had no formal, upper-level administrative appointments. Instead, they created ad hoc mechanisms to apply their particular skills and values to resolve specific problems and effect change on campus.

In the 1980s, PSU experienced internal politics and financial and student enrollment constraints that also influenced the large-scale changes of the 1990s. In the early 1980s, several budget restrictions forced the administration to focus on cutbacks rather than enrollment growth. Retrenchment was a very real threat; there was a several-month period when each issue of *PSU Currently* (a weekly internal newsletter) had a budget update. Concurrent with this internal campus distress, there was tension between PSU and the Oregon University System (OUS). In 1986, the OUS appointed a PSU president whom the faculty did not support. This lack of support was aggravated by irregularities in the budget, and it eventually led to a vote of no confidence by the faculty and resignation by the president. This episode inspired the faculty to support a process of shared governance centered in the Faculty Senate and in the faculty union, the American Association of University Professors. The removal of the president both demonstrated

the power of organized faculty governance and illustrated the much less predictable, but important, process of emergent faculty leadership. During the period of this dispute, PSU continued to hire faculty with excellent intellectual resources and a strong sense of shared governance. However, during the late 1980s, PSU was essentially leaderless and lacking a common vision and direction.

These two periods significantly influenced current faculty roles and rewards. The same stress factors of budget and competition persist to varying degrees, and the culture of innovation that developed to handle these stresses remains. These incidents demonstrated to PSU faculty and administration that they would need to be innovative, take risks, and exercise self-reliance and independence. This has been evident in times when PSU was buffeted by the state budget or the state university system. The external disturbances required innovation, not simply adaptation. Within the institution, faculty have accepted some of this risk while trying to solve problems and find ways to work with limited resources. Distributed risk is part of a classical entrepreneurial approach to management and change. Faculty at PSU were, and continue to be, involved in change-oriented activity without the potential for financial reward or, in many cases, even recognition.

Revision of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

In 1990, PSU's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) released a report on expanded forms of scholarship, based on Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990). Faculty across campus became aware of the CLAS report and interest spread about faculty roles and rewards as framed by Boyer. In fall 1994, the university formed a committee to rewrite the promotion and tenure guidelines.

The committee included members appointed by the provost (as recommended by deans and chairs), as well as two representatives from the local American Association of University Professors. The committee worked for two academic years on their proposal, which was brought before the University Senate in June 1996. There was easy agreement on most items, which described the processes by which departmental and college promotion and tenure committees would revise their guidelines to include an expanded definition of scholarship. In a discussion that presaged PSU's current situation, some senators worried that promotion and tenure committees would lack specific language to describe what the university termed "scholarship of community outreach". The most contentious issue recorded in the senate discussion was debate about the "scholarly agenda" – specifically, whether it should be a required, rather than an optional, part of a faculty member's file and whether the faculty could modify it unilaterally. After extensive debate, including a special session, the university senate adopted new guidelines in 1996. After this, departments and programs were required to modify their governance guidelines and processes for promotion and tenure review and evaluation, and they were required to explicitly state how they would review different forms of scholarship.

The Portland State University Campus Study

Seven years later, all faculty hires and promotions adhere to the promotion and tenure standards found within these guidelines. The current study provided an opportunity to reflect on the processes that led to the adoption of these guidelines and take those lessons forward. PSU received an AAHE grant to address how multiple forms of scholarship are rewarded on campuses across the country. The PSU proposal and subsequent campus

study focused on the gradual cultural shift that has occurred as PSU integrated the expanded definition of scholarship into the many layers of academic culture, including different disciplines, the formal and the informal reward systems, and strategic planning processes. The authors identified three major questions:

- Did PSU experience a culture shift as it redefined scholarship? If so, what were some of the concrete outcomes of this culture shift?
- What internal forces and conditions led to this culture shift?
- What external forces and conditions led to this culture shift?

In order to better understand these questions and their answers, we examined historical documents and conducted interviews with PSU faculty, staff, and administrators. Much of the historical information for this project was obtained from published sources, the PSU campus newsletter, and other internal documents. These sources were used to determine the critical factors that led PSU to broaden the definition of scholarship used to assess and reward faculty. The authors then interviewed a total of 28 people. The Human Subjects Research Review Committee waived review of the interview protocol, and all interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes. There were eight interviews of upper administrators, including the president, provost, two vice provosts, and six deans. There were four interviews of middle administrators, including two associate deans who are directly involved in the promotion and tenure process at the college level. There were 14 faculty interviewed from five of the seven colleges, including four from CLAS, the largest college. Five of these faculty had either been involved in revising or teaching in PSU's general education program. Finally, there were two interviews with staff who had been involved in the process of creating the new

guidelines. The interview questions elicited participant views about (a) scholarship, (b) PSU's change process, (c) the PSU promotion and tenure guidelines and their implementation, (d) how expanded definitions of scholarship have impacted academic culture, (e) the documentation that is used to assess scholarship, (f) the university's external reputation, and (g) community partnerships.

Findings

The findings support the hypothesis that internal and external conditions led to a cultural shift as well as a changed perspective on what scholarship is and how it must be supported. One key condition for this shift was an external call for academic accountability and the other was an internal demand for general education reform. University leaders used these situations to shape a discussion on general education that focused on scholarship rather than governance and to garner support for structures that encouraged multiple forms of scholarly work. Outcomes from the cultural shift toward acknowledging multiple forms of scholarship include the perception among interviewees that PSU has had a positive change in its promotion and tenure guidelines, an increase in the range of acceptable products that can be used as evidence of scholarship, and external recognition of campus efforts and progress.

Internal and External Forces and Opportunities

In the early 1990s, PSU faculty and administrators initiated a change process that resulted in PSU broadening the definition of acceptable scholarship for evaluating faculty work. This project was undertaken in the context of two other important calls for reform that ultimately shaped the direction of scholarship at PSU. First, in the early 1990s, there was external pressure from politicians to be accountable to stakeholders for faculty

workload and activities and university expenditures. Second, there was general dissatisfaction with the general education program among the faculty and a feeling that it needed to be revised.

Calls for Accountability

In 1989, the Oregon governor formed a commission to address the improvement of doctoral education in Portland and called for increased faculty workload accountability (Dodds, 2000). Leaders at PSU translated this call for greater accountability for faculty time to an internal dialogue about whether faculty priorities were congruent with institutional priorities. This discussion allowed faculty and administrators to preemptively reformulate questions about accountability into questions about how expanded notions of scholarship could align faculty work and institutional responsibility.

General Education Reform

In the early 1990s, PSU faced a significant problem of student attrition between the freshman and sophomore years. The president and provost initiated campus-wide discussions in order to address this problem, inviting interested faculty to join in the discussion and study national trends in general education reform. This resulted in a volunteer faculty cohort reading higher education retention literature, conducting site visits to other institutions, and attending higher education conferences. These faculty became known as the General Education Working Group. The group's reform process was grounded in PSU's scholarly approach to organizational change and general education reform (White, 1994). At the same time as this group was meeting, the PSU president determined that the new general education model would have a strong service-learning (community-based learning) component. The president believed that PSU's

location was ideal for seamlessly connecting the city to the university. The emphasis on teaching, curricular reform, retention, service-learning pedagogy, and the scholarly approach to change shaped the conversations that resulted in PSU's redefinition of scholarship.

Portland State University Leaders

During the early 1990s, administrative leadership was crucial for setting new direction, vision, and institutional focus. These leaders supported a scholarly approach for engaging faculty in addressing their roles and responsibilities. Whereas previous administrations had thought of PSU faculty as “dusty eggheads that needed to be led into the twenty-first century” (Dodds, 2000, p. 453), the administration of the early 1990s actually fostered a discussion about vision, goals, scholarship, and faculty support. A common theme among those interviewed for this project (and discussed in more detail in the next section) was that this kind of inclusive leadership was crucial to the change process.

A key part of the strategy was a deliberate formation of structures that used and transferred knowledge within the institution. This transfer of knowledge is much more than the sharing of information. Sveiby (1997) refers to Polanyi's definition of knowledge as being public but also highly personal. Individuals construct knowledge for themselves, and increasing one's knowledge leads to the “capacity to act” (Sveiby 1977). By employing a scholarly approach to developing the general education program, PSU demonstrated the capacity for this kind of transfer of knowledge. Current PSU leaders employ similar strategies to address specific initiatives as well as broader strategic planning and institutional vision.

The leaders of the early 1990s engaged faculty across campus in scholarly discussions about faculty worth, and what scholarship had meant and would mean at PSU. Administrators encouraged and financially supported faculty interested in higher education trends to attend national higher education conferences. They intended these faculty to bring national conversations back to PSU, and faculty did. New directions within PSU emerged from many of these national and local discussions. From the larger PSU faculty, several individuals emerged who became campus leaders, helping to move PSU to greater clarity and sophistication in relation to curricular design, general education, faculty governance, scholarship, faculty support, community-based learning, assessment, and the redesign of promotion and tenure. This collection of faculty and administrative talent in one place propelled PSU forward during its culture shift around a redefinition of scholarship.

Unique Cultural Characteristics of Portland State University

In their analysis of the campus interviews, the authors identified two commonly held beliefs about the culture of PSU in 1990s – the first was a dedication to student learning, scholarship, and innovation, and the second was a readiness for change. The personal commitment to scholarship described by all the interviewees was profound to the point where it can be considered a core value of the institution. Many interviewees described PSU as an innovative or entrepreneurial institution where people can try new approaches to issues. Interviewees also described the situation leading up to the reform of the 1990s; they described the campus community as “fed up,” with people starting to “wake up” or “grow up.” Other interviewees described the reform efforts as being an attempt to legitimize or validate the type of work they were already doing.

The culture at PSU is one of the key conditions that supports the adoption and acceptance of expanded forms of scholarship. Other authors describe this culture in different ways. Shulock and Ketcheson (2000) describe PSU as being “action-oriented.” They use this cultural attribute to explain why PSU undertakes many high-risk projects. Ramaley (2000) notes that innovative academic projects often must function within a double standard of proof that requires a higher standard for new projects than for those representing the status quo. Recently, Tetreault and Ketcheson (2002) claim that PSU has an “urban” culture, where “*urban* is an idea, a philosophy, an approach, rather than a strictly geographic or sociological term”. In addition, Tetreault and Ketcheson describe how the PSU administration previously positioned institutional transformation as scholarly work, and they refer to this approach as an “epistemology of practice”. These recent definitions are likely to be useful in building on the urban history and culture of PSU without limiting the future vision to a geographical region.

Support Structures for Multiple Forms of Scholarship

Concurrent with significant campus changes, in 1995 the president and provost created the Center for Academic Excellence to support all faculty engaged in teaching, learning, and scholarship. Its mission is to “promote and support academic excellence in teaching, assessment, and community-university partnerships by enhancing faculty scholarship, improving student learning outcomes, and contributing to the Portland metropolitan community” (CITE). Such coordination of a wide range of activities that support teaching and learning aims to simultaneously improve learning outcomes of PSU students and enhance faculty scholarship. The following list outlines some of the

scholarship support available to faculty and graduate students since 1995 and continuing today:

- Community-based learning activities designed to support faculty in developing ongoing and reciprocal relationships with community organizations, businesses, and corporations, and to enhance faculty scholarship in community-based learning and capstone courses.
- Campus Carnegie Conversations, a series of monthly, two-hour discussions offering faculty a venue in which to publicly address issues of teaching and learning. The series is part of the Carnegie Foundation's National Series on Teaching and Learning.
- The Scholarship of Teaching Resource Team. This is a group of faculty and graduate students who meet monthly to support one another in the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of engagement. This culminates in a campus-wide publication of the participants' scholarly work and reflection.
- Scholarly Work in Progress (SWIP). These sessions encourage any faculty member or graduate student to share their "work in progress," get feedback from others, and hear about research support from experts on campus.
- The Engaged Department. CAE provided financial assistance to departments selected to participate in an effort to increase community activities and scholarship of community engagement.

Concrete Outcomes from a Redefinition of Scholarship

Trying to find concrete outcomes from something as intangible as a cultural shift is difficult. An institution and its faculty can espouse values that serve as part of a vision more than as any concrete indicators of change. To address the degree of change in the

culture, the authors interviewed individuals about how their personal opinions had changed and how they believed institutional procedures had changed.

Culture Shift: Turning Intellectual Changes into Community Values

The historical research on PSU and the interview data help address whether or not there was a cultural shift toward a new set of commonly held values regarding expanded forms of scholarship. A cultural shift would mean that there was evidence that this shift in values had been woven into the institutional fabric. There was a wide variation in the interviewees' responses to the question of whether there had indeed been a cultural shift. The answers ranged from the that “the adoption of the new guidelines required a shift in the administration [and] would require continued care in recruiting new administrators to fit into that culture,” to the view that “there had been no cultural shift because faculty are essentially being evaluated in the same way as before.” Table 1 provides interviewee quotes and paraphrases that support a positive shift, no shift, or a negative shift in the culture. Of the 28 interviewees, 12 (43 percent) provided statements that indicate a positive shift toward values that support a broader definition of scholarship, 3 (11 percent) provided statements that indicate no shift occurred, 4 (14 percent) provided statements that indicate a negative shift, and 9 (32 percent) did not indicate a direction. Several of those who did not indicate a direction were recent employees of PSU, and they therefore didn't have a sense of culture change.

There were more interviewees who thought that there had been a positive cultural shift versus none at all; these people were now using new definitions of scholarship in hiring and faculty development activities. For the positive group, the perception that there had been a cultural shift, whether or not they could prove it, allowed them to feel

comfortable using the ideas associated with a wider definition of scholarship. With regard to respondents who indicated no shift in culture, it is possible they held pessimistic views about the likelihood of cultural shift, were general resistant to change, or had not been on campus long enough to be able to ascertain a shift if any had occurred.

Respondents who indicated a negative direction actually represented a group of people who held high expectations about the redefinition of scholarship that have not yet been met, but they were generally positive about the redefinition itself. This group interpreted recent activities as a move backward from what they saw as the full potential of a redefinition of scholarship.

Shifts in Acceptable Products of Scholarship

Evidence from document analysis and interviews suggests there has been an expansion in the accepted products of scholarship complementing the expansion in definition of scholarship (to include teaching and community activities). However, the breadth of what is accepted as evidence of scholarship continues to vary by school or college across the campus. For example, scholarship products in some schools include different types of intellectual properties. Also, some faculty and administrators question traditional definitions of “peer review.” For example, one school at PSU considers the identification of the impact of scholarship on users as potentially more valuable than the evaluation of products by peers in traditional discipline-based journals. At the same time, some faculty and administrators at PSU consider the current assessment of impact incomplete and want to find ways to judge “key contributions to the art” that would include “evaluation of users’ experiences with the product.”

The following emerged in the interviews as examples of “traditional products” and newly recognized scholarship products that are used today to evaluate scholarship at PSU: (a) traditional or disciplinary products, including peer-reviewed publications, peer-reviewed presentations, or projects that are grant funded; (b) documentation demonstrating that a scholar has used his/her expertise to develop interdisciplinary curriculum plans or help shape department curriculum; (c) newly recognized products, including patents or software design where the scholarly value may be measured by the impact on end-users rather than traditional peer review; and (d) new types of measures that address quality and significance of faculty work that are independent of the form (these might include the value of the process of collaboration, significant community activities, or making a university resource into a community resource; the scholarly value of these activities may have to be judged by the promotion and tenure committee directly, rather than relying on external peer review).

Every PSU school and college has made the transition to the more inclusive and broader definition of scholarship. However, the products that are acceptable as evidence for scholarship vary. Traditional forms of scholarship are products that would be recognized within the discipline and have been widely accepted as indicators of intellectual contribution. The traditional forms in one discipline may not be recognized or understood by other disciplines. Although the schools have embraced the broader definition of scholarship, some schools seem to be more interested than others in looking for different types of evidence to use in evaluation. For example, there is interest in the College of Engineering and Computer Sciences to look for new products of scholarship that build in the evaluation of the impact on the user. For example, a software product

that was produced by faculty might have built-in mechanisms for user evaluation that would be considered evidence of the value and quality of the faculty's contribution to the field. This type of evidence could be used in addition to peer review.

Several interviewees suggested ways in which the schools and colleges could help promote new definitions of what contributes to faculty scholarship. For example, the Graduate School of Education includes faculty contributions to curriculum development as scholarship. This contribution can be evaluated through built-in assessment. Some interviews also suggested that some schools have attended to the "burden of proof" issue for new forms and products of scholarship. Many interviewees stated that candidates need to justify and document new products, that is, that the burden of proof lies with them.

Several schools have tried to ease the potential risk of pursuing expanded forms of scholarship. For example, the Graduate School of Education pays attention to the entire promotion and tenure process, from recruitment through promotion. They also engage the candidate's promotion and tenure committee in faculty development. The Graduate College of Engineering and Computer Science has senior faculty who are developing sample products that can be prototypes for non-tenured faculty to use in their own promotion and tenure portfolios. The School of Fine and Performing Arts challenges the promotion and tenure committee to attempt to judge the future creative potential of candidates. While the majority of the schools do not espouse these novel interpretations of scholarly products or the new processes for implementing the guidelines, these examples represent development in the direction of expanding the definition of scholarship.

Variations in the Definition of Scholarship

The most striking outcome that emerged from the interviews was that different and highly personal definitions of scholarship exist. When asked for a definition, each interviewee constructed a definition on the spot. Not one of the 28 interviewees relied on a stock definition. The most common components of a definition included “creating new knowledge,” “dissemination to peers through publication or other product,” and “contributing to a body of knowledge.”

The interviewees’ responses are organized along a continuum divided into four levels (see Table 2). Level 1 represents people with a traditional focus on the discipline. Level 2 includes people who hold an expanded view of scholarship but would probably look for traditional, peer-reviewed products. Level 3 people are open to new products, but probably ones that are peer reviewed. Level 4 people feel that scholarship is a process that should be judged on quality. Rather than being judged for their own value, here, products serve as a means to help evaluators understand the underlying value of the process.

The interviewees were not asked to respond by these categories. Rather, the categories emerged from the interviews. The difference between Level 3 and Level 4 is that Level 3 still deals with products, whereas a Level 4 definition would open up the possibility of looking at the impact of an activity. The more restrictive end of this hierarchy would be more widely accepted, easier to judge fairly, and transportable to other institutions. The less restrictive definitions are more difficult to evaluate, and less transportable outside of the institution.

These data indicate that the definition of scholarship that is used by 12 out of the 28 interviewees (43 percent) is consistent with developing new products for scholarship (even though only two schools were using this definition of scholarship at the time the study was conducted). This suggests that there are obstacles to a broader acceptance of new products of scholarship. Among the interviewees, the persons with the highest-ranking appointments identified with Level 3 in the scholarship matrix most often. The two Level 1 definitions, which might be considered the most conservative, were provided by faculty, not administrators. This is particularly interesting because many other faculty interviewed consider the administration to hold more conservative views. In the context of progressing beyond scholarship to valuing and managing all the intangible assets of a university, the Level 4 definition is the most permissive and would attribute scholarship value to the most activities. Level 4 looks at the attributes of a scholar in action – or the process rather than the product. As Sveiby (1998) posited, “If we measure the new with the tools of the old, we will not ‘see’ the new” (p. 220). Portland State University needs to consider creating and testing new methods for understanding creative faculty work that focus on examining the work directly rather than relying on peer review. Peer review, by definition, relies on an established community of scholars. Some valuable assets are created outside of these established communities and thus would not be measurable.

The interviews also revealed that PSU needs a common definition for the term *scholarship of teaching*. As one high-level administrator said, “there is still confusion over being a good teacher versus a reflective teacher.” In the context of evaluation, this person would recognize the high value of good teaching but would only consider it scholarship if it were reflective and published. Several comments from faculty and staff

indicate that scholarship of teaching and learning maybe evaluated using a fundamentally different process than is used to evaluate traditional research. Whereas traditional research is mostly evaluated on the products, such as publications, the evaluation of the scholarship of teaching may rely on evaluation of processes.

External Validation of an Expanded Definition of Scholarship

The national, external community recognizes the significant changes undertaken at PSU. In 1997, PSU received the National Pew Leadership for Education Reform award; the *Journal of General Education* devoted an entire monograph to the PSU general education reform; hundreds of campuses have made site visits to PSU; many campuses have adopted forms of PSU's general education program; Kellogg invited PSU to become part of a 26-campus consortium addressing the Urban University of the 21st Century; in 2002 PSU received one of the Hesburgh certificates of merit from TIAA-CREF, and the 2002 *U.S. News and World Report* ranked PSU as one of the top 10 schools for student learning communities, service learning, and senior capstones. These awards and recognition confirm what PSU has to offer to the national discussion.

Lessons Learned – Looking Back before Leaping Forward

Major conclusions.

This paper has four main conclusions. First, PSU went through a transition that led to growth through scholarship, not governance. The university applied a scholarly approach to its own internal change process and brought a new vision and implementation of scholarship, general education, and community-partnership into being. This act can be seen as an act of institutional *cognition*. Varela, Thompson, and Rosh (1999) define cognition as “embodied action” (p. 172) or an enactment that results in a

new version “from a background of understanding” (p. 149). Maturana and Varela's (1992) definition states that cognition is “an ongoing bringing forth of a world through the process of living itself” (p. 11). Interpreting the activities that led to the expanded definition of scholarship as an example of institutional cognition is important because cognition requires more than thought; it requires action. At the same time that faculty were involved in discussion of their roles, they were also creating and implementing general education reform. This sparked new conversations about faculty involvement in teaching and service, which in turn influenced concurrent conversations about the definition of scholarship.

Second, the expanded forms of scholarship helped PSU faculty and administration identify intangible assets. In applying the rigorous approaches associated with scholarship to projects at PSU, the university was able to leverage valuable assets and make them more effective in meeting institutional goals. With the broadened locus of scholarship, more value was placed on activities already undertaken by PSU faculty –PSU simply found a way to acknowledge its intangible assets. Though faculty did not have a common name for it, many were already involved in the scholarship of teaching, classroom research, and the scholarship of engagement. For example, there were many faculty, departments, and schools that had built networks of professional collaborations in the Portland metropolitan area, but these efforts were not identified as being related to scholarship. Making these intangible assets visible also allowed them to be better managed. PSU is continuing to improve in this area through efforts to more effectively assess the impact of these assets on all stakeholders.

Third, PSU is still undergoing the transformative process of expanding the definition of scholarship. There is a range of acceptance across the institution regarding the expanded forms of scholarship. Some schools are committed to using traditional products and processes in their faculty evaluation, whereas others are developing new products of scholarship and even new definitions of the impact of scholarship.

Finally, PSU departments, colleges, and the university itself are all involved in projects that may provide PSU and other institutions the ability to better understand scholarly impacts. This, in turn, should lead to deeper and broader understanding of traditional scholarship, the scholarship of teaching, and the scholarship of engagement.

Implications for Other Campuses

There are four characteristics of PSU's change process that may be useful for other campuses as they attempt to broaden the definition of scholarship used in institutional policy and practice.

Increased open dialogue.

Throughout our deliberations, PSU faculty and administrators joined in national conversations about scholarship sponsored by AAHE, the Carnegie Foundation, and others. This allowed campus constituents to be exposed to new ideas. In addition, campus leaders worked to ensure that campus-wide, faculty, deans, and administrators had opportunities to discuss and consider promotion and tenure changes. Thus, when it came to a vote there was almost universal buy-in. Cultural shifts can occur when there are enough people in responsible positions to affect that change. In Inglehart's (1990) mobilization model, the general public participates in change even though they hold no formal leadership roles. According to Inglehart, this elite group will increase in

institutions due to generational shifts and the normal promotion of people into positions with more responsibility. Within PSU, there were many senior faculty who participated in the promotion and tenure policy changes even though they weren't administrators. These senior faculty, many of whom had been hired during the activist 1960s, understood the importance of this shift in the definition of scholarship. They had the skills to affect change in the curriculum because of their past experiences at PSU. Ramaley (2000) claims that if only one-third of the faculty agree that an idea is legitimate, there can be “substantive changes in the intellectual environment and values of an institution” (p. 9). Portland State University benefited twice from this change: first, from the actual change in the guidelines, and, second, from developing an institutionally embedded process for change. This second benefit is an asset that has led to a more adaptable institution.

Support new learning.

During our change process, the campus created its Center for Academic Excellence. This center provided, and continues to provide, support for scholarly activities as well as a venue for producing scholarship. Having a campus “home” that supports these conversations and their ultimate implementation is key to success.

Take risks.

Another aspect that seems crucial in the process that redefined scholarship at PSU is that the transition contained an element of risk. In order to create a new situation, risks have to be taken. Obviously, the nature of the risks are will vary by institution, but risk-taking as a process is crucial to innovation in faculty roles and rewards.

Reward innovation.

One of the main reasons the campus expanded its definition of scholarship was to be able to confer faculty rewards in different areas. During the process of moving toward these new definitions, the president and provost demonstrated the institution's commitment to rewarding innovation by supporting faculty activities that generated new ideas, such as teaching with technology or creating new general education curricula and courses. It was important that the administration found ways to support activities that were new or on the cutting edge of a discipline. This support helped innovative faculty to thrive and helped their more hesitant colleagues develop and adopt innovations as well. It was a tangible means of spreading the reform.

All of the characteristics are portable. Any institution that wants to engage in a discussion about broadening their promotion and tenure guidelines to include a broader definition of scholarship would likely be able to bring in the national discussion, engage participation from all levels, and support innovation from the highest levels.

Current Status and Future Questions

Portland State University is now asking hard questions as it enters the second generation of reform. Should faculty in departments that have not embraced the broader definition be encouraged to take part in teaching and engagement scholarship? Will this effort to broaden the forms of scholarship still be relevant if universities rely more heavily on fixed-term and adjunct faculty? Are there rigorous enough standards for evaluating newer forms of scholarship? Has PSU lost anything in terms of faculty turnover, prestige, or ranking due to its reforms? These questions and their answers are both testing and invigorating our academic culture and its ability to sustain multiple forms of scholarly work.

Author Note

John Rueter, Environmental Science Program; Talya N. Butler, School of Business, Portland State University.

The authors would like to acknowledge project support from AAHE and personal support and encouragement from Devorah Lieberman.

References

- America's Best Colleges, 2003 Edition. (DATE). *U.S. News and World Report*, XX(X).
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Dodds, G. B. (2000). *The college that would not die: The first fifty years of Portland State University, 1946-1996*. Portland, OR: Oregon Historical Society Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Culture, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Maturana, H. R., & Fancisco, V. (1992). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Ramaley, J. A. (2000). Embracing civic responsibility. *AAHE Bulletin*, 52(7), 9.
- Shulock, N. B., & Ketcheson, K. (2000). Two approaches to assessing the metropolitan university mission. *Metropolitan Universities* 10(4), 63-72.
- Sveiby, K. (1997). *The new organizational wealth: managing and measuring knowledge-based assets*. Location: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Sveiby, K. (1998). *Measuring intangibles and intellectual capital – An emerging first standard*. Retrieved August 18, 2003, from

<http://www.sveiby.com/articles/EmergingStandard.html>.

Tetreault, M. & Ketcheson, K. (2002). Creating a shared understanding of institutional knowledge through an electronic institutional portfolio. *Metropolitan Universities*, 13(3), 40-49.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosh, E. (1999). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

White, C. R. (1994). A model for comprehensive reform in general education: Portland State University. *Journal of General Education*, 43(3), 168-229.

Table 1. A Cultural Shift in Regard to Scholarship. The following selected quotes or paraphrases were drawn from interview questions that asked if there had been a culture shift at the institution since the adoption of the new P&T guidelines.

Direction	Example quote or paraphrase
Positive	<p>“traditional researchers and scholars have bought into accepting these guidelines” for alternative forms</p> <p>there was a shift but it wasn't caused by the guidelines, the guidelines allowed the shift to take place</p> <p>the shift was a permanent commitment, we can't go back “it's like adopting a child”</p> <p>more people are willing to listen and consider other areas and outside expertise</p> <p>people are willing to articulate their positions</p> <p>definite shift and will need to take this into account when we recruit new leaders</p> <p>there has been more discussion of scholarship and careers, the institution has matured</p> <p>the shift has allowed some faculty to make university resources into community resources</p> <p>the university was “willing to turn itself inside out” and the positive change has remained</p>
No shift	<p>“I don't think it significantly changed the way faculty are evaluated “</p> <p>it is too soon to see a shift, some people are still being evaluated under older guidelines</p> <p>it's been too soon, need to wait until the new faculty start serving on the promotion and tenure committees</p>
Negative or retrograde	<p>Our “culture is sort of swinging back toward the traditional model,” not making steps toward peer review of nontraditional forms, the availability of new forms of scholarship “may be a mirage”</p> <p>we have “lost sight of the guidelines” and Deans have fallen back on traditional criteria</p> <p>some people are stepping back from the issues that drove this progress (not just PSU) and new faculty are focusing on tenure in their disciplines</p>

Table 2. Categorization of the Definitions of Scholarship. This table lists the number of interviewees whose responses clustered within each of the four scholarship categories listed above. Percentages are given in parentheses. Selected examples are provided.

Level of focus of scholarship	Number of respondents	Example statements for this level
1 - Disciplinary focus	2 (7%)	Generation of new knowledge and extension of existing knowledge in one's professional/academic domain
2 – Expanded locus	8 (29%)	Includes scholarship of teaching, service and research. The locus of that research has changed
3 – New products	12 (43%)	Investigation or inquiry about an identifiable phenomenon using appropriate methods and situated in a community of discourse Engagement of faculty expertise in the generation of new knowledge or application to new areas, dissemination and peer review New perspectives of creation of new products and testing those data with peers and relevant users of those data
4 – Impact	2 (7%)	Actions taken by people to contribute to the development of knowledge for the benefit of the discipline or a body of people who can use it. The characteristics of a reflective practitioner who reflects on the process of teaching, discovering or applying knowledge and all done as a public act
Respondents who did not fit into this scheme	4 (14%)	

Appendix 1: Timeline

This paper addresses the adoption of promotion and tenure guidelines during the period from 1990 to the present (2002). The focus of the analysis of Portland State's administration is from the time President Ramaley was inaugurated (October 1998) through the time when she left and up until the hiring of our current provost, Mary Kay Tetreault (May 1999). The series of events showed that it took President Ramaley several years to affect administrative changes at PSU and thus it would be too early to critically examine the leadership role and programs of Provost Tetreault to the same degree. Some critical dates in the timeline are as follows:

10/1990	University planning underway
10/1990	New P&T guidelines released that broaden the definition of scholarship and apply to fixed term faculty
10/28/1990	President Ramaley inaugurated
10/28/1990	PSU adopts a new motto, "Let Knowledge Serve the City"
11/05/1990	Ballot measure 5 passes, severely cutting tax revenue in Oregon
05/11/1992	Michael Reardon named Provost
09/15/1994	New general education program launches first set of courses
05/08/1995	Draft of new P&T guidelines released
06/11/1997	Daniel Bernstine named President
05/17/1999	Mary Kay Tetreault named Provost