WILEY

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Recognition and promotion of faculty work: Practices emerging at the intersection between faculty development and educational renewal

Christel Lutz

University College Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

Correspondence
Christel Lutz, University College Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands.
Email: c.i.lutz@uu.nl

Abstract
How can we change the conversation about faculty work? Informed by recent changes in higher education in the Netherlands, this chapter highlights three areas that are at the intersection between faculty development and educational renewal as salient for supporting mid-career faculty—addressing first the emerging opportunities and responsibilities for individual faculty members, then for teams, and finally for institutional leaders.

INTRODUCTION

> "In the end, inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive." (Boyer, 1990, p. 24)

A few years ago, the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) attracted international attention with its position paper, "Room for Everyone's Talent: Towards a New Balance in the Recognition and Rewards for Academics," which called for a change in how faculty work is recognized and rewarded (Matthews, 2019; VSNU, 2019). It joined many higher education institutions globally in signing the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, 2019), marking the need to shift from a focus on research output to approaches incentivizing team-based and open science. It is clear that traditional promotion metrics which primarily emphasize research output are increasingly at odds with modern demands placed on the university and its faculty members, in which education and impact are equally, if not more, important. And so, some 30 years after Boyer famously argued that opening up the university would require rewarding diverse forms of scholarship (Boyer, 1990), change is happening. Institutions are re-envisioning promotion and evaluation processes that focus on quality over quantity, and on contributions to shared missions over individual research output. This involves rethinking the way in which

institutions are governed as well as the way in which strategic missions are co-created by all those involved in doing the work, with crucial roles for senior staff (i.e., mid-career faculty).

In this chapter I discuss the consequences of these transitions for faculty development. As we face similar challenges across vastly different institutions and across nations—arguably accelerated by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic—it is time to re-think our faculty development models and take advantage of the diversity in our experiences (Baker & Lutz, 2021). What are the opportunities afforded by changes in promotion metrics, and what are the obstacles and pitfalls encountered? How are universities transformed when "publish or perish" is no longer the singular yardstick used to measure impact, and how do we avoid simply adding new boxes for faculty members to tick? And, crucially: How can faculty leaders be enabled to translate changing (inter)national policy into practice and innovate how faculty work is recognized and promoted? Seen through the lens of a human resources alignment framework (Baker et al., 2016), these local leaders are tasked with bringing departmental priorities into alignment with national and institutional imperatives and with individual faculty members' needs. It is at the intersection of these forces that faculty development initiatives must take place if they are to improve the lives and careers of faculty members and the quality of their work as educators and scholars.

Written from the perspective of a mid-career faculty member and faculty developer who navigates these balances herself, this chapter explores ways in which we can change the conversation and support faculty members in charting their institutional contributions and academic careers. To that end, I deliberately centralize our role as educators. On a daily basis, I witness the energy and ideas our engagement with students can bring. Highlighting the importance of the excitement that is generated by a sincere interest in one another, bell hooks is right to claim that "the classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academe" (hooks, 1994, p. 12). For many of us, the classroom is also the space where we first discover the relevancy of our experience to others, as it was for hooks: "long before a public ever recognized me as a thinker or writer, I was recognized in the classroom by students – seen by them as a teacher who worked hard to create a dynamic learning experience for all of us" (p. 11).

It is this, the academic's substantive learning that takes place in their teaching, which we must prioritize as we support faculty work. Anna Neumann warns us that we may otherwise inadvertently fail to deliver on Boyer's mission for the university, such as in "schemes that focus more on professors' acquisition of tenure and promotion than on the crafting of jobs and careers anchored in scholarly learning" or when we develop teacher-training programs that inadvertently "reify distinctions between research and teaching" (Neumann, 2009, p. 38). In other words, rather than imposing new policies top-down, faculty developers must work to align considerations that apply to individual faculty members with those that apply to their institutions. I therefore highlight three areas that are at the intersection between faculty development and educational renewal as salient for supporting mid-career faculty—addressing first the emerging opportunities and responsibilities for individual faculty members (the micro level), then for teaching communities (the meso level), and finally for institutions (the macro level).

MICRO LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS: RECOGNIZING FACULTY IMPACT

Against the backdrop of evolving policies to recognize and value faculty work, institutional leaders and faculty developers have a difficult task in translating changing frameworks into local practices, guidelines and performance criteria. Based on previous research (with core contributions from the editors and authors of this volume), we can expect that the impact of these transitions will be experienced primarily by mid-career academics. Compared to

early career academics, mid-career faculty face fewer external milestones and can define new opportunities and directions for the next stretch of their career (Baker & Manning, 2021). At the same time, the mid-career stage comes with increased institutional responsibilities, including the important task of guiding young academics. This means that mid-career faculty, especially those in leadership positions, are positioned to transform their own future career opportunities as well as those of their younger colleagues by creating new ways to recognize faculty work at their own institution. But how and where to begin?

The Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) to date has been signed by more than 2300 organizations and institutions in 148 countries. Its central recommendation to eliminate the use of journal impact factors to assess individual scientists has spurred much innovation and discussion, and the DORA website provides a wealth of recent case studies and other resources to explore (DORA, 2019). For example, Utrecht University (UU) has laid down its ambitions to change how it assesses its employees in its Open Science Program, signifying a broader commitment to open and cooperative research and public engagement (Woolston, 2021). Departmental leaders are invited to develop strategies for evaluating faculty work that are relevant to their context. For example, in my institution, a small liberal arts college that is part of UU, conversations have centered on our educational mission as liberal arts faculty and on the work that grows out of the integration of teaching and scholarship (Ruscio, 2013). Such conversations shine light on the critical, diverse, and often undervalued work that those faculty members with high teaching and mentoring loads are engaged in, and confirm the need for promotion metrics and faculty development models that are inclusive of this work (see also Baker & Lutz, 2021).

The need to make visible an individual's contributions beyond their publication record is also driving the rethinking of the academic CV. The Dutch Research Council signed the DORA and has been piloting the use of a narrative CV format since 2019. Increasingly, international funding agencies (e.g., the Swiss National Science Foundation and the UK Royal Society) are experimenting with narrative CVs—see Curry et al. (2020) or the DORA website for a recent overview. Besides a limited output section that may include other than only peer-reviewed scholarly outputs, these new CV formats typically invite researchers to describe their contributions to knowledge creation, to the development of individuals, to the wider research community, and to society at large. The use of narrative CVs encourages more holistic definitions of academic success and allows for meaningful descriptions of career shifts or pivotal experiences, which will hopefully contribute to building more diverse faculty communities and inclusive universities (Baker & Lutz, 2021; Davies et al., 2021).

Using the narrative CV

Not all academics are aware of evolving policies that may soon change the manner in which their work and impact is assessed. Especially faculty members who have not recently applied for funding or for a new position may not have had reason to study, for example, the guidelines for a narrative CV. Given little time or encouragement to reflect on their professional aims, many faculty members may not necessarily be explicitly aware of their impact as scholars. Worse yet, given traditional promotion metrics, mid-career faculty members especially may well believe that their work, beyond their peer-reviewed publications, "doesn't really count anyway".

Inspired by Vicki Baker's work (Baker, 2020), we have organized workshops at my institution to encourage faculty members to make visible their own current and potential impact. Such reflections seem most easily prompted by reflecting first on one's impact on students, then colleagues, institution, academic field, and society (in that order), rather than

by working backwards from traditional notions of research output. Similarly, it is far more stimulating to examine together the emerging practices elsewhere (e.g., another institution's instructions for a narrative CV) than to work backwards from existing promotion metrics that currently actually apply to participants.

Finally: such sessions, if organized in an open and collaborative manner, will also bring valuable insights to institutional leaders charged with rethinking strategies for evaluating faculty work. If we understand where our faculty members' impact is, we can proactively work to change local recognition and reward structures—see Benedictus and Miedema (2016) for an example describing how the promotion criteria at a university medical center were redefined collaboratively with the faculty members who would be judged by those standards.

MESO LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS: FACULTY-LED EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

An inclusive perspective on faculty work also includes an understanding of the importance of diverse teams that bring together complementary talents and expertise. Academics ought to be recognized not just for their individual performance "but also for their contribution, based on their own expertise and competences, to the team, department, consortium, institution or organization of which they are a part" (VSNU, 2019). This entails, of course, more than mere recognition. To moderate competitive forces that can also exist amongst scholars, local leaders (e.g., deans of faculty or department heads) and faculty developers must actively encourage and support team work (Foss et al., 2009; Hernaus et al., 2019). In this section, I address emerging practices that encourage collaborations that revolve around educational missions shared by teams.

Educational programs are being re-envisioned to meet evolving societal demands and the needs of increasingly diverse students. As established experts and experienced scholars, mid-career faculty members are vital to these transitions. Moreover, they are likely to benefit from taking on these responsibilities. In-depth longitudinal studies have shown that recently tenured faculty members engage most passionately with their own field of expertise in the context of their teaching tasks (Neumann, 2009). Teaching, even more so than research, provides a rich location for their own *scholarly learning* (p. 117), as it brings energy and opportunities which counteract the "congealing of thought that highly published professorial careers typically require" (Neumann, 2009, p. 119). Other work has shown that mid-career faculty members who admit to experiencing feelings of stagnation welcome the opportunity to socialize with colleagues and may look to focus on their teaching responsibilities for their own growth (Kanuka & Anuik, 2021). How can our faculty development programming capitalize on the drive and expertise these faculty members bring to their teaching communities?

There is a growing body of knowledge on the type of educational practices that have positive impact on the learning and motivation of students, and the proposal here is that this work can also inspire how we encourage team work. Central to these practices is the shared engagement of teachers and students. Kuh (2008) lists a number of high-impact practices, such as writing-intensive courses, collaborative projects (e.g., community engagement or service learning), or undergraduate research experiences. Similarly, Bovill and her colleagues bring a wide range of approaches that position students as partners in the co-creation of courses or curricula (see Bovill, 2020; Bovill & Woolmer, 2018). The inclusive and democratic nature of these type of projects require moving our focus away from outcomes and assessment toward collaborative learning processes (Bovill & Woolmer, 2018).

And clearly, in the context of our current discussion about the demarginalization of certain types of faculty work, we should not limit ourselves to studying the impact on students alone. In order to deliver on the full potential of high-impact teaching practices, faculty developers must understand their impact on faculty members as well: what do these experiences mean to them, and how do these collaborations boost scholarship?

There is much to gain from taking this perspective. In one of the very few studies that focused explicitly on academics' scholarly learning, Terosky and Gonzalez (2016) studied faculty members at a liberal arts college. In their high-impact work with students and community partners, these faculty members engaged in expanding and constructing disciplinary knowledge, for example through the engagement with faculty colleagues from different academic disciplines. Clearly, both students as well as their teachers engaged as learners in these teams. Moreover, this work promoted feelings of vitality and renewal, a finding that is echoed in other work (O'Meara et al., 2011; Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2017).

At most institutions currently, high-impact educational practices are neither available to all students (Kuh, 2008; Bovill, 2020), nor are they practiced by all faculty members. Centralizing the faculty experience may be the only way to make true on the promise of transforming the life of each of our students instead of merely that of a lucky few. Faculty leaders must provide institutional support for high-impact teaching practices and allow the scholarly work that takes place in these teams to be leveraged for scholarship as well as for educational renewal. This means investing in ways to support and recognize collaborative teaching teams and the faculty members who shepherd them.

Activating teaching communities

To encourage the valuable collaborative work of our faculty members, whether as members of interdisciplinary research projects or in their work with non-academic partners, we need to find more ways to allow for synergy between the work that faculty members are engaged in both inside and out of the classroom. Faculty developers and educational program directors together can invite faculty teams to work on the innovation of their teaching practices and on the renewal of the curriculum and the educational mission. At my institution, for example, we are currently exploring ways to collaboratively learn about inclusive practices (Lutz et al., 2021). Moreover, using a yearly call for course proposals, we are using new methods to stimulate co-teaching, the linking of courses, and community-engaged learning. We are discovering that such invitations stir new conversations and bring energy and coherence to the local teaching community. From a faculty development perspective, it has been exciting to see that new networks of opportunity and funding (e.g., for community engaged scholarship and teaching) have opened up to individual faculty members as a result of this work.

MACRO LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS: OPEN SCIENCE AND OPEN EDUCATION

Changes in the way faculty work is recognized go along with a broader change in culture that facilitates information sharing and collaboration. Open Science creates new ways to do research and to disseminate findings, and offers pathways for diverse types of scholarship, such as community engaged research (LERU, 2018; Allen & Mehler, 2019). And, crucially, it involves new teaching practices. By providing a natural platform for public engagement, Open Science changes how science is discussed, and with whom.

Regarding the opening of higher education, Catherine Cronin invites institutions to go beyond a resource-based approach to Open Education (emphasizing the use of open, free, or shared scientific and educational resources) to an approach that relies on critical pedagogy (hooks, 1994). Advocates of critical Open Education practices seek to further social justice by empowering individuals and groups to change the structures themselves. Similar to the practices discussed in the previous section, this includes collaborations across the boundaries of institutions, open co-creation of knowledge, and the integration of informal learning practices and networks (Cronin, 2020). Describing emerging scholarly practices across several higher education programs, Cronin cautions that this "openness is contextual, but it is also personal and continually negotiated" (p. 8). It means, in other words, that policy decisions regarding Open Education cannot simply be passed on from national or institutional levels to lower levels. What matters in one (disciplinary) context or department may have little to no meaning to another team.

It will be interesting to see how faculty leaders will give meaning to the Open Science and Open Education agendas in their local context. The challenge will be to do so without reifying unnecessary distinctions between research and education. In line with the DORA, VSNU, my own university, and many other international institutions have connected the two missions. But in order to bring Open Science and Open Education agendas into alignment with the needs of individual faculty members (and with the changing performance metrics used to assess their work), their managers must keep in mind those colleagues whose scholarship and educational practices are extensions of one another, for example in the high-impact and collaborative educational practices mentioned above. These colleagues need support to chart new pathways—including new sources of funding.

Funding educational innovation

In order for the urgent transitions discussed in this chapter to succeed, governance structures that support close ties between research and education are vital at all organizational layers, including the at the level of institutional leadership and funding. In recent decades universities worldwide have increasingly tended to the scholarship of teaching and learning in efforts to create more of a "parity of esteem" between research and teaching (Cashmore et al., 2011). This has resulted in a rise of teaching-focused promotion pathways (Skelton, 2003), and increased investment in teaching centers and in educational leadership and innovation (Fung & Gordon, 2016; Hum et al., 2015). To further stimulate the co-creation of education, the Dutch government recently introduced the Comenius Program. Mirroring influential research grants, this program offers competitive teaching grants for innovative projects proposed by educators at different stages of their careers (Dekker et al., 2020). National and institutional programs like this are necessary to support faculty development and educational innovation.

THE FUTURE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

To respond to societal demands placed on the modern university, we must empower faculty members and place their experience front and center in our considerations. It is their scholarly learning that is "animating and humanizing higher education's mission of knowledge production for the social good" (Neumann, 2009, p. 15). Claiming a pivotal role for educational renewal and for mid-career faculty members, I explored ways in which we can thoughtfully support the synergy between scholarship and teaching, by first

addressing what is required for individual faculty members, then for teaching teams, and then for institutions.

As argued elsewhere (Baker & Lutz, 2021), I regard our work in faculty development as a form of community engaged research itself. Recent pandemic work and life conditions have led many of us to reflect on the value of our work from new vantage points and with new and inspiring conversation partners. I look forward to the faculty development initiatives and collaborations that our global conversation can bring to our respective institutions and colleagues.

REFERENCES

Allen, C., & Mehler, D. M. A. (2019). Open science challenges, benefits and tips in early career and beyond. *PLoS Biology, 17*(5), e3000246. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000246

Baker, V. L. (2020). *Charting your path to full: A guide for women associate professors.* Rutgers University Press.

Baker, V. L., & Lutz, C. (2021). Faculty development post COVID-19: A cross-Atlantic conversation and call to action. *The Journal of the Professoriate, 1*(12), 55–79.

Baker, V. L., & Manning, C. (2021). A mid-career faculty agenda: A review of four decades of research and practice. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, 36*, 419–484.

Baker, V. L., Pifer, M. J., & Lunsford, L. G. (2016). Faculty challenges across rank in liberal arts colleges: A human resources perspective. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(1), 23–30.

Benedictus, R., & Miedema, F. (2016). Fewer numbers, better science. *Nature, 538*, 453–455.

Bovill, C. (2020). Co-creation in learning and teaching: The case for a whole-class approach in higher education. *Higher Education, 79*, 1023–1037.

Bovill, C., & Woolmer, C. (2018). How conceptualisations of curriculum in higher education influence student-staff co-creation in and of the curriculum. *Higher Education, 78*, 407–422.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Wiley & Sons.

Cashmore, A., Cane, C., & Cane, R. (2011). *Rebalancing promotion in the HE sector: Is teaching excellence being rewarded?* Higher Education Academy. https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/hea_reward_publication_rebalancingpromotion_0.pdf

Cronin, C. (2020). Open education: Walking a critical path. In D. Conrad, & P. Prinsloo (Eds.), *Open(ing) education: Theory and practice.* Brill.

Curry, S., de Rijcke, S., Hatch, A., Pillay, D., van der Weijden, I., & Wilsdon, J. (2020). *The changing role of funders in responsible research assessment: Progress, obstacles & the way ahead.* RoRI Working Paper No. 3., November 2020. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.13227914

Davies, S. W., Putnam, H. M., Ainsworth, T., Baum, J. K., Bove, C. B., Crosby, S. C., Côté, I. M., Duplouy, A., Fulweiler, R. W., Griffin, A. J., Hanley, T. C., Hill, T., Humanes, A., Mangubhai, S., Metaxas, A., Parker, L. M., Rivera, H. E., Silbiger, N. J., Smith, N. S., … Bates, A. E. (2021). Promoting inclusive metrics of success and impact to dismantle a discriminatory reward system in science. *PLoS Biology, 19*(6), e3001282. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001282

Dekker, T., Korsten, G., & Glunk, U. (2020). Policies for realising responsive, engaging, active, and tailored education with students: Some suggestions for stimulating educational reform in the EHEA. CREATES Erasmus+Strategic Partnership. https://europe-creates.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CREATES-Policy-paper.pdf

DORA. (2019). Improving how research is assessed. https://sfdora.org/

Foss, N. J., Minbaeva, D. B., Pedersen, T., & Reinholt, M. (2009). Encouraging knowledge sharing among employees: How job design matters. *Human Resource Management, 48*(6), 871–893.

Fung, D., & Gordon, C. (2016). *Rewarding educators and education leaders in research-intensive universities.* Higher Education Academy. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/74247

Hernaus, T., Matej, C., Catherine, C., Poloski Vokic, N., & Miha Škerlavaj, M. (2019). Evasive knowledge hiding in academia: When competitive individuals are asked to collaborate. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 23*(4), 1367–3270.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* Routledge.

Hum, G., Amundsen, C., & Emmioglu, E. (2015). Evaluating a teaching development grants program: Our framework, process, initial findings, and reflections. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 46*, 29–38. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X15000176

Kanuka, H., & Anuik, J. (2021). The post-tenure apex: Unrewarding, unproductive, unhappy. Is continuing learning a remedy for mid-career misery? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies, 2*(1), 6–27.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Association of American Colleges and Universities.

LERU (2018). *Open science and its role in universities: A roadmap for cultural change*. Advice Paper, May. https://www.leru.org/files/LERU-AP24-Open-Science-full-paper.pdf

Lutz, C., Untaru, L., & van Goch, M. (2021). Developing a shared syllabus template as a living document of inclusive practices in a teaching and learning community. *7th International Conference on Higher Education Advances*, 481.

Matthews, D. (2019). *Dutch end "one-sided" research focus and hope world follows*. Times Higher Education. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/dutch-end-one-sided-research-focus-and-hope-world-follows

Neumann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83–96.

Ruscio, K. P. (2013). What does it mean to be a teacher-scholar? *Peer Review*, *15*(3), 27–28.

Skelton, A. (2003). Promoting "teaching excellence" through fellowship schemes: Three important issues to consider. *Medical Education*, *37*(3), 188–189.

Terosky, A. L., & Gonzales, L. D. (2016). Scholarly learning as vocation: A study of community and broad access liberal arts college faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, *41*, 105–120.

VSNU (2019), November 13. Room for everyone's talent: Towards a new balance in the recognition and rewards of academics. https://www.vsnu.nl/recognitionandrewards/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Position-paper-Room-for-everyone%E2%80%99s-talent.pdf

Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2017). Faculty development for advancing community engagement in higher education: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(2), 131–166.

Woolston, C. (2021). Impact factor abandoned by Dutch university in hiring and promotion decisions. *Nature*, *595*, 462.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Christel Lutz is director of education at University College Utrecht and senior fellow, Centre for Academic Teaching, Utrecht University, the Netherlands.