THE VOLCKER ALLIANCE
Working for Effective Government

Tenure and Promotion at Schools of Public Affairs

APRIL 2017

WORKING PAPER

Don Besom, art director; Michele Arboit, copy editor.

PREFACE

As part of its mission to address the challenge of effective execution of public policy and to help rebuild public trust in government, the Volcker Alliance has worked to build productive partnerships with other organizations that share its goals. One such constituency is professional schools of public policy and administration, which have a long history of preparing young people for careers in public service and fostering relevant research to enhance practice. In the fall of 2015, the Volcker Alliance invited the deans of a number of public affairs schools to New York to discuss concrete opportunities to promote effective government directly or enhance schools' collective capacity to do so. This project is the result of one such suggestion.

Some attendees at the Alliance's gathering of public affairs deans observed that there may be tension between ensuring scholarly rigor within the academy and promoting strong engagement with the practice of public administration. Some attendees went further, voicing concern that a growing focus on the former is undercutting the latter. All agreed that tenure and promotion considerations, as perhaps the strongest professional incentive structure within public affairs academics, can play a significant part in determining how faculty and schools balance these mandates.

Given its position as an objective observer interested in preparing people for careers in public service, and at the suggestion of deans attending our New York meeting, the Volcker Alliance team decided to pursue a data collection and analysis effort to better understand the application of tenure and promotion practices at schools of public affairs and administration. The project charges were to

1. summarize the landscape of tenure and promotion standards, guidelines, and processes, and identify areas of commonality and divergence; and
2. explore how schools balance consideration of scholarship, teaching, and service.

The Alliance hopes that this project will be valuable to all educational institutions that prepare students for careers in public service, especially those exploring modifications or periodic updates to tenure and promotion standards. Working with institutions that prepare people for public service is just one of the ways the Alliance seeks to enhance the effectiveness of government.

The Volcker Alliance believes that public affairs schools play an important role in strengthening the nation's public service through their research, teaching, and service missions. Engagement beyond the academy can be helpful to realizing that role and fulfilling schools' essentially public mission. Finally, while the Alliance does not presume the expertise to prescribe a set of tenure and promotion practices, it hopes this study will assist schools in determining how to best meet their public service missions when designing their internal faculty incentive structures. This study seeks to lay the groundwork for continued collaboration on a variety of issues in the years ahead.

CONTENTS

SECTION I: Project Approach

The Volcker Alliance's first priority was to assemble an advisory group of public affairs faculty members who routinely engage with tenure and promotion considerations for guidance and support. They generously agreed to provide advice on research approach and to review the methodology and findings as they were developed. The advisory members are

- KIRSTEN GRONBJERG, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University;
- MICHAEL NICHOL, Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California;
- MARK ROM, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University; and
- ALLAN STAM, Dean, Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy, University of Virginia.

The advisory team provided general guidance on how to structure data collection to ensure that findings were impactful, relevant, and reflective of the core issues in tenure and promotion. They suggested that the study utilize an area of fieldwide agreement by building the analysis around approaches to evaluating research, teaching, and service. Further, they recommended that the team not simply examine the documents that describe tenure and promotion guidelines but also seek to understand the unwritten considerations involved in such decisions.

In addition, advisers agreed that interviews should be primarily qualitative, in order to tease out nuance and provide rich, detailed findings. They agreed that the project should engage as wide a range of participating schools as was reasonable, including schools of public policy, public administration, public management, and combinations thereof. (This report uses the term "schools of public affairs" as a shorthand for all these institutions.)

Finally, they advised that the project should consider the role played by school identity and mission in tenure and promotion guidelines.

With this input, the Volcker Alliance team developed a set of interview questions for the selected community of public affairs schools. The interview was tested with three of the members of the advisory team (with respect to their own institutions) to ensure that it reflected the most critical questions and would be useful from a school's perspective. In addition, the Alliance obtained feedback from junior colleagues of two of the advisory members to ensure that the interview questions aligned with the experiences of those who had recently undergone the tenure process. With the advisory team's help, the Alliance finalized an interview comprising five sections, each with three to six questions. These sections—Process and Execution, Research, Teaching, Service, and Normative Attitudes—form the structure of the report. The full interview guide is available in the appendix.

Concurrent with the development of the interview, the Alliance asked the deans and directors of fifty leading programs to be involved in primary research. Some declined because of time constraints or because tenure and promotion decisions are not made within their programs. Thirty-three deans and directors accepted, and the Alliance conducted a total of thirty-four interviews (two tenure-granting departments at Texas A&M's Bush School were both keen to participate). Many deans and directors agreed to participate themselves, while others referred the Alliance to the most relevant faculty member—usually a current or former tenure review committee chair. A full list of participating institutions is available in the Acknowledgements section.

Over the summer and fall of 2016, the Alliance completed these interviews, which took between sixty and ninety minutes each. The project team then analyzed the data, grouped responses to provide a quantitative element, and assembled this report. The findings are presented in as straightforward a manner as possible, and the team hopes readers will find them valuable. Some quotations have been edited for clarity.

Finally, the Volcker Alliance recognizes that tenure and promotion are complex and sensitive considerations, and that the public affairs community is best situated to discuss them normatively. This study seeks to convey the insights and opinions of its respondents rather than prescribe any practices or policies for tenure and promotion. In addition, views on tenure and promotion vary greatly across the public affairs community. While the respondent pool did have areas of substantial agreement, these findings are not necessarily representative of the entire field.

SECTION II: Process and Evaluation Categories for Tenure and Promotion

The Alliance began each interview by asking respondents to explain the tenure and promotion guidelines at their school and answer a set of general questions concerning the process for assembling the components of a dossier and approving a case.

In this section, public affairs faculty provided insights into

- how their school sets tenure and promotion guidelines;
- the relationship between approving tenure and promotion cases within their school and obtaining approval from universities and governing boards;
- how their institution weights research, teaching, and service for tenure and promotion considerations;
- the role of outside letters in advancing or imperiling tenure cases; and
- how standards for tenure and promotion have changed in recent years.

Setting guidelines

Each school involved in the study shared the guidelines that govern tenure and promotion. Unsurprisingly, these documents varied widely in format and degree of detail, but as a baseline nearly all contained (1) an explanation of the process for compiling and evaluating a dossier for tenure and promotion and (2) a description of the categories of evaluation (most commonly research, teaching, and service).

Thirty of thirty-four participants are governed by a set of guidelines that complement those of the university. Of the four without school-specific guidelines, one is currently developing them. Six of the thirty establish a specific set of guidelines at the unit or departmental level within the public affairs school.

Many respondents commented that a certain degree of subjectivity is unavoidable when developing guidelines. Though the attendant flexibility may be beneficial to tenured faculty review cases or to the school, respondents agreed that many candidates find it frustrating.

Approving tenure and promotion cases

The levels of clearance for approving cases vary depending on how a particular school is nested within its university. Generally speaking, however, cases for tenure and promotion originate at the school level with a faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee and the dean. They then continue to a university-wide APT committee, then often to the provost, president, and board, as relevant. For twenty of the respondents, cases originate at school-level decision points and proceed to the university, while five have an intermediate stop at a college that comprises the school. For the remaining nine, a case begins at a unit within the school before continuing on to the full school and then the university.

There was significant variance in how respondents characterized the relative balance of influence between school level tenure and promotion decisions and those steps above them. Eighteen of thirty-four respondents reported that the higher levels of the approval process (college or university committees) are typically deferential toward school decisions on tenure or promotion cases. One respondent said, “I’ll say this: They [higher levels] trust the department vote. They trust our judgment. Given the process that we put them [candidates] through, we usually get strongly upheld.” Another stated that “our provost gives great deference to the level that is closest to the substance of the faculty member’s research.”

Seven respondents described their school’s higher levels as taking a less deferential role. One respondent said that “the president and dean have high degrees of influence over these outcomes. They are not a rubber stamp. I’ve see the committee overturned several times, especially in emerging fields." The remaining eight respondents characterized higher-level engagement at their school as varied. One dean said that review "falls between routine and rubber stamp. Reversals do happen, but they are notable when they do."

Regardless of the degree of deference a school received, respondents generally agreed that they are most likely to have their decisions upheld at higher levels when there is agreement between the school committee and deans and directors. Additionally, a school or unit's reputation for academic rigor helps pave the way for success. "How carefully our university APT committee looks at things is a function of the reputation of a college, in terms of how carefully they're looking at tough cases," one respondent said. This focus on sustaining academic reputation within the university was a common refrain throughout the interviews.

Categories of evaluation

At twenty-nine of the thirty-three schools represented in the interviews, the categories on which faculty members are evaluated are the standard trio found across academia: research, teaching, and service. Five respondents reported that their institution pursues another formal structure. Three of these explicitly evaluate some sort of externally engaged scholarship or community service, while the other two segment intellectual contributions to the academy into additional categories.

Respondents were asked to describe the balance of consideration between the three categories; some answered in quantitative terms, while others used percentage weights. Most emphasized that the relative weighting described in written guidelines does not match the actual process of evaluating a particular case.

RELATIVE WEIGHTING CATEGORIES, WITH MOST HEAVILY WEIGHTED FIRST	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	REPRESENTATIVE EXPLANATION
RESEARCH, THEN TEACHING AND SERVICE	13	"Most of the weight goes on the research. Teaching and service tend to be pass/fail. You can't be a complete loser, subject to some level of adequate performance. I think that's a widely held view. We don't announce it, but it's the case. The mentorship program makes that clear."
RESEARCH, THEN TEACHING, THEN SERVICE	8	"We say 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service. I actually think that it's more like … 55-35-10. Clearly the research is the biggest chunk. Teaching is not equivalent with research. I test this by asking myself—will a mediocre teacher-superstar scholar have a stronger dossier than a superstar teacher-mediocre scholar? Absolutely."
RESEARCH AND TEACHING, THEN SERVICE	4	"There's actually truth in the 40-40-20 [research, teaching, and service respectively]. Here we take teaching *so* seriously that you can't dog it. You have to be an effective teacher. Sometimes it can be challenging for new assistant professors—the department not only has some amazing scholars, but most of those people are *very* successful teachers."
TEACHING OR RESEARCH, THEN SERVICE	4	"We expect people to exceed [our standard] in research and meet it in the other two or exceed [our standard] in teaching and meet it in other two."
OTHER	5	"We've historically been a college that could easily give you tenure on the basis of service. That's changing—all three are pretty balanced. There's been a tilt over the last 20 years toward research." "[We prioritize] excellence in meeting the needs of our public officials [through all three categories], due to the unique history of the school. It's very outwardly focused."

Number of responses (n=34)

As shown in the table above, traditional scholarly research predominates when faculty are being evaluated for advancement at the majority of public affairs institutions in this cohort. Teaching is the second most-heavily-weighted portion, carrying near-equal weight as research at a substantial minority of programs surveyed. The service dimension is least significant: Nineteen respondents characterized service as either having minimal impact on advancement decisions or being a simple threshold beyond which there was no marginal value to continued work.

With the usual caveats for small sample size, there does appear to be a divide between public and private institutions with respect to balance. Nine of ten private school respondents reported that research stands exclusively as the leading category, while only thirteen of twenty-four public universities had research alone at the top. Each of the remaining eleven public institutions clearly indicated that teaching is (or could be, if the guidelines call for the candidate to select their focus) the leading category for evaluation.

The role of outside letters

Because of the importance of research in tenure and promotion decisions, it's no surprise that outside letters from scholars in a candidate's field are critical to evaluating his or her scholarly potential. While there was almost uniform agreement that letters have a high or very high level of impact on a case, respondents had different views on how letters play a role. Some ascribed their significance to the interdisciplinary nature of public affairs schools. "We're a very multidisciplinary school," one said. "Lots of our people don't have deep subject matter expertise in the candidate's field." Another stated that "letters help us understand the impact of a given piece or line of research. It also helps us assess the quality of the journals they're publishing in."

Eleven respondents emphasized that letters are influential because they are a potential veto point. One said that "a negative outside letter can carry a huge amount of weight, though a few lukewarm letters and a bunch of positive letters is fine." Another stated that letters "can dislodge an opinion, but not form one." Two respondents went further and said they have seen a single critical letter kill a case or flip faculty.

The high stakes represented by letters most likely reflect a sense that permeated the general explanations of tenure and promotion standards. For most schools, these decisions are opportunities to enhance reputation relative to peer institutions. One respondent said, "Universities are quite prestige conscious. What we look for is 'At my famous institution, we would grant this person tenure.'" Another said, "They act as a validator. We say, 'Wow, coming from him, that's really weighty.'" This attentiveness to prestige plays a crucial role in several dimensions of tenure and promotion decisions.

Four respondents were bearish on the effect of letters. One said that in most cases they are likely to be redundant: "The correlation between outside letters and [faculty's previous impression of a candidate's] overall quality is so strong, I'm not sure they matter." Another suggested that their value is on the wane, perhaps because of the comparatively small number of scholars working in many subfields: "As [letters'] confidentiality has come more in question, they've lost some influence."

Changes in recent years

The Alliance team asked respondents to reflect on changes they have witnessed in tenure and promotion considerations in the time they have been involved with them, and a few emerged. The most common observation was that standards have risen across the board, especially compared with when the respondents themselves pursued tenure or promotion. "There's an expectation that everyone will be sensational," one said. "It really is a buyer's market." Another argued that "people who glided through in the 1990s might struggle today, and I don't think we're different than most places in that respect."

Further, many reported that the balance of research, teaching, and service has changed slowly but perceptibly. Some observed a shift toward a greater emphasis on teaching, and a few noted that engagement outside the university has begun to be recognized. These issues will be explored more in the subsequent sections of this report.

Key takeaways

The conversations on process and general guidelines illustrated several prevalent trends:

- Tenure and promotion considerations are crucially important decisions, and the guidelines and process governing them retain subjective elements. Respondents observed that this subjectivity may contribute to candidates' sense that the process and decisions are opaque.

- At almost all respondents' schools, traditional scholarly research is the leading or predominant category of evaluation, while the weight given to teaching almost always exceeds that given to service. At many institutions, the marginal benefit of exceeding some bar in service and even teaching is low.
- It appears that schools in public institutions are somewhat more likely than those in private ones to weight teaching or service more heavily.
- The expectations on faculty are extremely high and have continued to rise in recent years, reflecting enormous competition for tenure-track positions in schools of public affairs.
- Enhancing or maintaining the prestige of a school or university is a significant component of tenure and promotion considerations, most likely contributing to the focus on research productivity.
- Almost all respondents reported that outside letters from leaders in the field play a large role in assessing tenure and promotion cases. In some institutions, letters function as a veto point of scholarly quality, while in others they contribute to the promotion of the school's prestige.

SECTION III: The Role of Research

Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that scholarly research is the most significant factor in tenure and promotion considerations: Fully two-thirds indicated that research is the most heavily weighted piece of a candidate's portfolio. Given the centrality of the research component to the outcome of a case, the methods used to evaluate scholarly output are especially important.

In this section, public affairs faculty offered insights on

- how their school assesses the quality and quantity of a research portfolio;
- the informal advice offered junior faculty to help ensure that their research is meeting expectations;
- how their school views different types of research, such as between various disciplines, applied versus theoretical and collaborative versus individual, as well as research aimed at different audiences or focused primarily on public policy as opposed to public administration; and
- how tenure and promotion considerations affect faculty research choices.

Evaluating research output

The majority of written guidelines are quite general in their description of how research is evaluated, but respondents reported that their review committees have a sense of both the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed, published research expected for advancement. Therefore, respondents were asked to describe the evaluation process in broad terms. A few key trends emerged.

First, most respondents emphasized that the schools' interdisciplinary nature requires multiple approaches to evaluating research consistent with the norms of a candidate's discipline. For example, they cautioned that economists are not ideally positioned to evaluate methodologies or weight the value of specific professional journals and presses for political scientists. Thus, deans and APT committees must make a special effort to ensure that all faculty involved in tenure or promotion decisions are well informed about the research practices of other fields. The use of different evaluation methods also underscores the importance of outside letters as validators of candidates' scholarly contributions in their specific field or subfield. Most respondents agreed that this interdisciplinary challenge can be managed but that doing so requires active outreach to explain each field's practices.

Second, nearly every participant reported using objective numerical metrics—usually journal impact factor analysis or citation counts—in assessing the significance and quality of a candidate's scholarly contributions to his or her field. They also agreed, however, that there is considerable debate within the academy about the value and limitations of quantitative analysis of scholarly output. Many participants expressed serious reservations and warned against over-reliance on them:

- "The easiest approach is Google Scholar. I find that not to be the best method, especially for the tenure decision, given the relative brevity of their [tenure candidates'] time in the field. I tend to use journal impact factor, which reflects the quality and impact of a journal."
- "Google Scholar is very important—it shows resonance, which is as important and perhaps more so than just getting an article in a journal."
- "I'm not that comfortable with citation counts, impact factors, and Google Scholar. We do all of them, but also look at what and where a disciplinary journal's attention is."
- "Citation counts aren't that meaningful in a multidisciplinary field. I look at whether the research either impacted outside the academy or changed trajectory inside. We need both quantitative and anecdotal evidence."

- "We look at journal impact factors, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate. More and more, I find we're looking at simple metrics, which can be manipulated."

Third, some schools have begun to expand their conceptions of research productivity to consider and potentially reward research whose impact goes beyond the academy. For some, this takes the form of considering the resonance of scholarship in media and communications. One respondent said, "We're interested in media hits [when evaluating research.] A media-hit-heavy paper doesn't substitute for a journal, but it does enter the conversation." Another said that "we're now looking much more at how you're engaging, giving speeches, news engagement, media engagement, most read, most downloaded, etcetera. These are crucial for generating scholarly impact. We're in a transitional phase now."

Other institutions are beginning to consider demonstrated impact on practice or policymakers. One respondent said that "we've started talking about measuring direct impact on policy through, for example, testimony or service on a government commission or agency advisory committee. This type of impact is gravy for already excellent research."

Unwritten advice conveyed to candidates about research

The advisory group emphasized that written guidelines and established processes are often supplemented by advice or local knowledge. Therefore, the Alliance team asked the full respondent pool what, if anything, they would tell junior scholars developing a research agenda with tenure or promotion in mind. Almost all respondents reported that they pass along some consistent piece of counsel.

Most emphasized that the time before tenure should be devoted to building out a highly traditional scholarly body of work. Some suggested that finding opportunities for pushing scholarship beyond the academy more appropriately occurs later in a career. "I tell them [more junior scholars] to be straight arrow," one respondent said. "Do the refereed journals stuff, because that's the easiest route to tenure. I really value that you get out and about, but if you could put that off until you get tenured, that would probably help."

Another said, "While we might think beyond traditional scholarly impact sometimes, I would be judicious in how I allocated my time. Without some substantial body of conventional work, you'd be at great risk. Many faculty wouldn't value it." Most emphasized that tenure brings increased flexibility, though not complete flexibility until after promotion to full professor.

Further, most respondents said they convey a sense of the internal "pecking order" of publication outlets within a given discipline and subdiscipline, as well as an estimate of the appropriate number of pieces. But respondents had considerably different views on whether candidates should pursue a smaller number of more ambitious pieces or a greater number of narrower ones. One respondent advises colleagues to "swing for the fences. We have a sense of whether a piece is a big idea or not, a game changer in the literature. We want to see home runs." Against that, another respondent said that "in my experience, we don't distinguish a lot around the quality of the publication. Quantity carries somewhat more weight than quality. At the margin, the incentive is to get something published, period."

A common encouragement is for a narrow research focus. "Don't spread yourself too thin. Figure out what you want to be known for, and focus in there," one respondent said. This suggestion seems intertwined with the desire to cultivate reputational prestige in a given field. One said that "we try to recommend people establish themselves in a single research area. For example, we're well known for public finance, so there's strong internal capacity to build a reputation in this area."

Most respondents were fairly confident that faculty take their advice seriously and emphasized that delivering it informally is preferable to enumerating every point in guidelines.

Incentives and their impact on research choices

The research section of the interviews concluded by asking respondents about whether the tenure and promotion process incentivizes faculty—especially junior faculty—to pursue a research strategy that they may not otherwise. Almost all agreed that this core professional incentive does in fact affect faculty incentives.

INCENTIVES FOR LARGER RESEARCH OUTPUT

- "In general, I worry there's increasing pressure to spend more and more time on research to increase your marketability. If we continue to focus on numbers—more pieces are better—this could lead to some untoward choices, like splitting one article into two, fudging a number, making a minor change to republish something, or generally doing less thoughtful work."
- "Ours creates incentives so you want to do quick hits and focus on small questions with a great number of articles."
- "Tenure and promotion pushes people to do more writing or push for better journals than they might otherwise do. It probably impacts less around topics and more around the ambition of the work."

INCENTIVES FOR AVOIDING RISK

- "Incentives are stronger to continue existing research or collaborate in an area they already know rather than to pursue something totally new."
- "It channels folks into a traditional [disciplinary] track. I had a young man who had been at Treasury. I encouraged him to have an article in a public policy journal, but he was worried that the economists wouldn't respect it."
- "It encourages a very traditional scholarly approach. Even though alternative pref-

erences would be considered, the safe thing to do is to take the default position. When you're brand new, why not go the safe route?"

- "For pretenure, they spend a few years getting articles out of their dissertation, so they're not doing a lot of new stuff. It incentivizes a focus on safer outputs over a new focus."
- [This institution allows faculty to submit a dossier for tenure early if they have excellent records.] "I've noticed an interesting gender component. Women tend to be more risk averse. I was interested in promoting two women with tenurable records in year three, but both of them asked to wait."

INCENTIVES FOR A PARTICULAR RESEARCH FOCUS

- "It's important to ask whether we're getting more or less relevant. [Incentives may make us] better at producing peer-reviewed articles, but are we better at meeting the key questions of practice?"
- "Our process creates a tendency for people to want to do research that lends itself to large datasets with sophisticated quantitative methods over, say, surveys and interviews."
- "From the university on down, our expectation of grant seeking does have influence on people. The types of things people pursue are tilted toward the things that might be fundable."

Key takeaways

While there was not perfect consensus on the research component of the tenure and promotion review, the interview section focusing on evaluating research in tenure and promotion considerations had several consistent themes:

- Most schools of public affairs use traditional conceptions of scholarship when evaluating faculty for tenure or promotion. For the most part, this entails a robust publication record in disciplinary or public affairs journals or presses. Accomplishing this successfully is the primary focus of the early years of a scholar's career.

- Respondents indicate that, for the most part, faculty are incentivized to pursue a highly focused line of research aimed at traditional scholarly audiences, with at least some sole-authored work. This is key to building a reputation in a subfield, which strongly informs the tenure or promotion decision.
- Many respondents caution against relying excessively on numerical measures of research impact, suggesting that they are too blunt an instrument for a critical, delicate task like tenure and promotion reviews.
- Most respondents said that, because of the high stakes of the tenure and promotion decision, faculty internalize this incentive to pursue traditional, disciplinary scholarship and act in a risk-averse manner. Many implied that encouraging faculty to do so is essential to building and maintaining the academic rigor of schools of public affairs, especially in the eyes of their universities.
- Once tenure and promotion is achieved, most respondents said, faculty have greater flexibility in allocating their time and attention. A few were concerned that the habits developed while working toward tenure and promotion will continue to predominate throughout a career.

Recognizing Different Types of Scholarship

At the advice of the advisory group, the project team asked respondents to reflect on whether different types of research tend to be advantaged when candidates come up for tenure and promotion. The team selected five dimensions of research: research within different academic disciplines; whether research is more applied or more theoretical; whether research is produced collaboratively or individually; whether the audience of the research is primarily scholarly or primarily practitioner; and whether the research is focused more on public policy or public administration or management. The results are detailed below.

Do you believe that your school's tenure and promotion considerations provide equal opportunities for recognition for research in each of the following dimensions?

RECOGNITION FOR THE FOLLOWING DIMENSION	YES, THERE'S EQUAL RECOGNITION	NO, ONE IS ADVANTAGED OVER THE OTHER	UNCLEAR/ NOT CERTAIN
A. Different academic disciplines?	25	8	1
B. Applied research vs. theoretical research?	12	17 *7 applied adv.* *10 theoretical adv.*	5
C. Collaborative vs. individual research?	25	2 *1 individual adv.* *1 collaborative adv.*	7
D. A primarily scholarly audience vs. a primarily practitioner audience?	2	31 *31 scholarly adv.* *0 practitioner adv.*	1
E. Public policy focus vs. public administration/ management focus?	24	9 *7 policy adv.* *2 admin adv.*	1

Number of responses (n=34)

Most respondents were confident that different academic disciplines have equal opportunities for advancement, though about one-quarter still had some misgivings. One respondent worried that "it's harder for people in emerging fields, though not impossible. We have to make a conscious choice to understand your field and aspirations." Another respondent said, "From the reference point of my years of experience, more quantitatively based researchers will have more success in the promotion and tenure process."

Another said that "it's very difficult for us as a collective faculty to think about evaluating somebody positively who is outside of our methodological scope. We tend to talk about their scholarship like economists." Several respondents referred—positively or negatively—to this apparent trend toward evaluating scholarship using the standards of economics.

Respondents had disparate impressions of their school's relative valuing of theoretical and applied work, assuming that it is peer reviewed. Twelve respondents asserted that both sides of the sometimes-hazy divide are equally valued, with several observing that applied work is more valued in their public affairs school than it would be in a traditional disciplinary department.

Ten respondents noted a preference for theoretical research, however. One said that "theoretical work is still considered 'grade A.' We say we want to value more applied work, but it is not our default preference. We're getting there slowly." Another said that "there's a bias toward theoretical work, mostly because it's easier to do. In the applied work, you have to go out in the field. When this field began, it was populated by people who were veterans of work in the field. They could do … powerful analysis. Even the true academics would go into government for a while, do some research, and come back. We do less of that now."

Conversely, seven respondents reported that their school favors an applied orientation. One connected the concentration to his school's hiring pipeline. "We have no faculty who do purely theoretical stuff," he said. "It's certainly the case that we're more applied generally, and that's been reflected in our hiring decisions."

Most respondents have noted that the field is moving toward an embrace of more collaborative research, though typically they either require or strongly suggest that candidates produce some sole-authored work. "The whole industry has changed," one respondent said. "The name of the game is larger and larger teams of researchers. There are a number of people who have no individual work." Several cited a larger trend across universities and academia. "Collaboration is very much encouraged from the university," one respondent stated. "It has a number of [cross-cutting] discovery themes in which our school participates." Any uncertainty on the part of participants was primarily due to difficulty in clearly identifying and evaluating a candidate's specific contribution to a collaborative project.

There was nearly unanimous agreement that research aimed at a traditional scholarly audience remains, in the words of one respondent, “the coin of the realm.” One attributed this to the broader incentive structure: “You have to talk to your fellow scholars—they’ll write your letters and cite your work.” Many respondents said work with a traditional scholarly orientation that could be shared with practitioners (via school or university communications and media teams) would be applauded but that this downstream concern would have little marginal value.

Finally, most respondents reported that their school seeks to be comprehensive in managing the differences between policy and administration in tenure and promotion considerations. To the extent that one or the other is advantaged (as is the case for nine respondents), it is usually a function of school identity and is reflected in the mission and hiring process. While separate from the tenure and promotion question, most respondents said the public affairs field has become more policy-heavy in recent decades. Some bemoaned that movement, while others regarded it as natural and appropriate. One respondent rejected the continuum entirely. He chuckled, then stated, “The difference between the two is something that matters only to academics. We have people who think that to be a public policy school is to not be a public management or administration school, and vice versa.”

SECTION IV: The Role of Teaching

Twenty-five respondents reported that the teaching component of the tenure and promotion consideration carries less weight than research but more than service; for a substantial minority of respondents (ten of thirty-four), it can carry near-equal weight. Within this small sample, public institutions were more likely than private ones to weigh teaching more heavily. One area of agreement was that respondents took pride in the quality of their faculty's teaching.

In this section, public affairs faculty offered insights on

- the methods their school uses to evaluate teaching;
- the shortcomings of student evaluations and approaches to mitigating them;
- the informal advice they offer candidates for tenure and promotion on meeting expectations for effective teaching; and
- how tenure and promotion considerations impact the time, attention, and approach given to teaching.

Methods of evaluating teaching

Most institutions' tenure and promotion guidelines described a wide variety of potential ways for candidates for tenure or promotion to demonstrate their teaching acumen, including student evaluations, peer evaluations, and syllabus evaluations; PhD student advising; junior faculty mentorship; course development; pedagogical innovation; and teaching awards. In most cases, candidates have the flexibility to provide a range of evidence of their teaching success.

Many respondents observed that, in practice, a few formal evaluation techniques administered by schools tend to carry much of the weight in assessing teaching. The most commonly mentioned were student evaluations, peer classroom teaching evaluations, and peer syllabus evaluations.

TYPE OF EVALUATION	
Student evaluations	34
Teaching evaluations	19
Syllabus evaluations	22

Number of responses (n=34)

Every school takes student evaluations of teaching into account in tenure and promotion considerations. Most respondents indicated that their school has an unwritten numerical expectation. One fairly typical response: "On a 1-to-5 scale, there's a norm that both course and instructor should be at a 4 overall."

Nearly every respondent emphasized significant limitations in the utility of student evaluations, which may be worrisome given their ubiquity. The limitations are largely a result of measurement challenges that can lead to perverse incentives. Though the challenges are not unique to schools of public affairs, the sizable teaching mission of professional schools means they deserve particular attention.

Unwritten advice conveyed to candidates about teaching

We asked respondents if they consistently convey advice to ensure that candidates succeed in the teaching portion of the tenure and promotion review. Most offer suggestions, especially concerning how much time and effort to devote to teaching. Nearly every respondent encourages candidates to teach attentively and conscientiously, of course, but two common opinions emerged.

The first, larger cohort advises that candidates should be careful to limit the percentage of their time dedicated to teaching, mostly to ensure enough time to implement their research agenda. One respondent stated, "My advice is always, teach the bare minimum.

Don't do new class preps or things of that nature. Make sure [your teaching] is good enough, but don't try and invest way too much time in teaching. You want to keep the focus on research." Another put it this way : "Be good enough [at teaching], but once you're pretty good focus on research."

About half of respondents characterized teaching as a threshold consideration, with little marginal benefit conferred by investing resources to move beyond a defined proficiency level. "Teaching is a threshold to be passed," one said. "At some point, you don't get much more credit." Another respondent associated teaching's threshold nature to the overall tilt toward research: "Given that in the current environment the largest increment of value toward tenure and promotion is going to be research, it's going to be lopsided on that front."

Additionally, many respondents emphasized that deans or faculty deans proactively work to protect candidates for tenure or promotion from teaching requirements that are excessively onerous or may harm their prospects for success. Most respondents who regard teaching as a threshold consideration report some variation of one dean's goal to "minimize the number of course preparations, plug them into required courses to save time, and have them teach two sections of that. We want to minimize that burden." Several other respondents reported that they allow more junior faculty to take course releases in the semesters prior to tenure or promotion releases to allow them to give research their undivided attention.

One other reason so many respondents encouraged limiting teaching time is the disconnect between the time and effort teaching requires and its payoff in terms of tenure and promotion considerations. Reflecting on his institution, one respondent said that "teaching is probably 10% of a case. Scholarship is probably 80%. But teaching can be 80% of our job, because these schools were set up to teach people. It doesn't get the weight it deserves." Others observed that, because of the manner in which teaching is evaluated, the elements of teaching outside classroom instruction—such as advising, mentoring, or pedagogical innovation—may not be recognized. "Teachers do a lot of things that don't end up getting measured. Certainly I felt that a lot of time I was putting in was underestimated," one said. Another stated that "[since] we're going to look at course load and evaluations and confirm they're fine, I wouldn't advise spending time on mentoring and advising."

A smaller category of respondents said they advise candidates for tenure and promotion to avoid minimizing their teaching responsibilities. "Don't think that you should sacrifice your teaching for research. That will not be looked kindly upon here," one said. Another said his school is looking to expand the evaluation of different sorts of teaching responsibilities. "We have different kinds of teaching and training—lectures, simulations, applied projects, working with clients," he said. "It's become a heterogeneous education experience, and we try to evaluate this on its own terms. It's a work in progress." These respondents were usually at schools where the teaching component of the tenure and promotion review is weighted coequal or nearly coequal with research.

Many respondents did not fit neatly into either of these two broad categories, and every respondent expected instructional quality to be high. It is clear, however, that informal advice reinforces the secondary role of teaching in the tenure process.

Incentives and their impact on teaching choices

As with the research section, the final question in the teaching section was whether the tenure and promotion process incentivizes faculty, especially junior faculty, to pursue a teaching strategy that they may not otherwise. Most respondents affirm that professional incentives have an impact.

INCENTIVES TO LIMIT TIME SPENT ON TEACHING

- "Many people put less energy into teaching than they would be naturally inclined to do."

- There is an impact "to the extent that minimizing the time you spend teaching maximizes the time you can spend doing research."
- "It's very challenging to be an assistant professor because both teaching and research standards have gotten higher."
- "If you find yourself spending more than half your time on your teaching, you're slighting your research. … I don't think that the guidelines [have an impact], but the process and advice probably do."
- "Regardless of what we tell folks, it's research, research, research. We do have some folks coming in with teaching expertise who just can't wait to teach, but they understand that it's a burden they've got to manage."

INCENTIVES TO GIVE ADDITIONAL ATTENTION TO TEACHING

- "They're careful not to buy out too many courses—we make sure we have several classes to look at, and the university doesn't look kindly on people who look to be avoiding the classroom. … People are very conscientious."
- "We have a very competitive teaching award. Students nominate a professor, and it's extremely competitive and prestigious."
- "If someone is willing to be a team player and jump in and teach a course we really need, that could count for them subconsciously."

PERVERSE OR MISALIGNED INCENTIVES

- "Really good teachers have a higher load, because they're good. This becomes an issue over time. It's a bad incentive: Don't be too good a teacher because you get bombarded. We have to look out for good teachers."
- "Junior faculty do follow the advice to minimize time in this area. The challenge for them is that there can be the temptation to spend more time with students than the perfectly rational action. Time with students is good for the institution, but

perhaps not optimal for tenure."

INCENTIVES IMPACTING INNOVATION AND EXPERIMENTATION IN TEACHING

- "New faculty … are interested in trying experimental things teaching-wise. The lack of pressure about pursuing a precise path in the teaching realm (while I do think folks feel that pressure in the research realm) perversely demonstrates that teaching is less weighty."
- "We really reward integration of faculty research into teaching, and the informal incentives structure pushes them toward an integrated structure."

Key takeaways

Major themes from the teaching section include:

- Many respondents expressed major misgivings about the utility of student evaluations, saying that a host of measurement issues or perverse incentives diminish their reliability.
- There is substantial and growing attention to alternative means of evaluating teaching.
- The lower weighting of teaching relative to research in tenure and promotion consideration seems to encourage minimizing the amount of time candidates for tenure and promotion dedicate to instruction at some (though not all) schools of public affairs. In many cases, teaching is treated as a threshold to be met, with little marginal return in exceeding it.
- Many respondents reported that faculty feel caught between the desire to dedicate time to the teaching mission of professional schools and the need to produce top-flight traditional scholarly research. They emphasized that school leaders should be aware of these potential tradeoffs.

Student Evaluations: Shortcomings, and Public Affairs Responses

One respondent stated that "the student evaluation instruments are not very sophisticated. They're superficial. They haven't been updated in years. They're archaic—I don't think they represent much." Another explained her dissatisfaction this way: "Though we primarily use student evaluations, I consider them to be the least satisfactory metric. There's a massive measurement problem." In describing this problem, respondents pointed out the following:

- Students may penalize teachers of challenging or technical material. One respondent said that "if you have a class that's really hard and people get frustrated, they're going to take that out on your evaluations. In our schools, there's much more care about the teaching score than there should be. That has the result of making classes too easy."
- Voluntary response systems may lead to response samples biased toward the most positively enthusiastic or (likelier still) critical students.
- Faculty with smaller class sizes tend to to receive higher evaluations than those with larger ones.
- Required courses often receive lower evaluations than elective ones. One worried respondent, whose school gives primary consideration to student evaluations said, "I don't want my faculty penalized for teaching unpopular courses."
- Evaluations may be negative because of things that have nothing to do with teaching. "We pay attention to student evaluations," one respondent said. "But we also pay attention to the fact that women and people of color are evaluated more harshly."

Some respondents emphasized that schools can take steps to minimize the impact of these measurement challenges. One respondent reported that it is his responsibility to provide context when discussing evaluations. "We don't have ... an unsophisticated focus on the evaluation numbers," he said. "We have data showing [the above trends], and faculty have this context when they make decisions."

One respondent's school requests analyses of grade distribution to guard against the possibility that a focus on student evaluations might lead to less rigorous teaching: "If you're giving out 70% As, that would be a problem. We've never had an issue on the low end." Another respondent reported that her school “worked out a system to evaluate a given course relative to itself. For example, evaluations for teaching a section of macroeconomics are compared to other macro scores.” This helps resolve the bias against technical and core courses.

On balance, respondents agreed that student evaluations are a vital component of teaching assessment but that they sometimes take on excessive importance, creating the potential for perverse incentives. To be a useful tool for tenure and promotion purposes, they must be put in the proper context that places their limitations up front.

Nineteen of the thirty-four respondents said that, to help balance these limitations of student evaluations, their school conducts formal peer evaluations of teaching and considers them part of the tenure and promotion review; twenty-two said they have formal syllabus reviews. “In peer evaluations we’re moving away from quantitative toward qualitative,” one respondent stated. “We want to focus more on constructively improving rather than on numbers.”

SECTION V: The Role of Service

The service component of the tenure and promotion consideration is the least heavily weighted category among the schools surveyed. Sixteen respondents confirmed service as the least-weighted of the three categories. Fourteen positioned it as about coequal with teaching and below research, but even those respondents agreed that service consumes the smallest portion of faculty time at their school.

In this section, public affairs faculty offered insights on

- how their schools understand service and evaluate it for tenure and promotion;
- several hypothetical examples of faculty engagement with practice, and whether such engagement would be worth a candidate's time and effort;
- the informal advice they offer to candidates for tenure and promotion on meeting their school's expectations for service; and
- how tenure and promotion considerations affect the choices faculty make concerning service.

Defining and evaluating service

First, we asked respondents to explain how service is defined at their school. At most schools it falls into three general categories:

- service to the school and university, including service on faculty committees, advisory boards, or administrative posts within the institutions;
- service to the profession, including roles within faculty professional organizations, journals, or organizing conferences; and
- public service, including work with practitioners in government or not-for-profits, providing testimony before public officials, and certain types of consulting with practitioners.

Almost all respondents reported that for tenure or promotion purposes their schools evaluate service as a box to be checked. The view of the category as a threshold consideration is similar to teaching, though clearly the bar is far lower for service. One respondent who reported that service is 10% of a case at his school said, "You can't really be denied because of service, in effect. It may as well be rated zero."

Respondents concurred that when evaluating a candidate's service record for tenure and promotion, service within the school or university is the most common way to meet the expectation. This usually takes the form of serving on a number of faculty committees, ideally those that are neither excessively time-consuming nor controversial. Some respondents conceive of service in terms of faculty citizenship: "The thing that would hurt you if is you're a bad servant of the school, not if you didn't do public service," one stated. A record of professional service seems to be somewhat less commonly expected of candidates for tenure or promotion.

A repeated challenge associated with evaluating service in a more sophisticated way is the difficulty of measuring the significance of a contribution. "I don't think there's any consistency in the way service is evaluated," one respondent said. "I think it's hard to tell how important somebody's service is. For example, they may have sat on a commission but never said a word. There's no way to know, and I don't know how you can measure it."

At the suggestion of the advisory group, the Alliance asked the respondents about one specific potential element of a service portfolio: compensated consulting. This returned an interesting and unexpectedly sharp division: Fourteen respondents replied that paid consulting generally would be considered part of a service record, while nineteen replied that it generally would not (one was uncertain). Some in the former group asserted that, within certain time constraints and approval structures, paid consulting is an appropriate form of outreach in that clients would usually be practitioners in a faculty member's field. In one such case, a faculty member was compensated to identify best practices for bringing people into the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) pipeline. One respondent tied it to the matter of prestige: "Consulting is valuable insofar as it enhances the reputation of the school." Others were concerned that such work would detract from research goals (especially if pursued before tenure) or that compensation would be untoward in light of the school's mission and focus.

Unwritten advice conveyed to candidates about service

As with the research and teaching sections, respondents were asked what, if any, advice they offer to candidates for tenure and promotion to ensure that they meet expectations with respect to service.

By far, the most common response was that candidates should ensure that service does not consume too much of their time, primarily because it is a threshold consideration. "Nobody ever got tenure because of an excellent service record," one respondent said. "Do enough to punch the ticket." Many respondents report that they have to train candidates for tenure or promotion to avoid overcommitting. "Service is a Goldilocks story," one said. "You want to do just the right amount. I've had to talk to colleagues about how they're simply doing too much." Another was clear about where opportunity costs accrue: "I would tell any junior person to not let it take away research time."

When advising which types of time-limited service activities their junior faculty should pursue, most respondents suggested serving on committees. "I tell them to be part of one committee and no more, and try to avoid the more political committees, such as hiring," one respondent said. Another emphasized the manageability of committee work. "If we ask them to participate we expect them not to draw any complaints. As long as we're not hearing anything, we're hearing enough." Several pointed out that an added benefit of committee work is the chance to build connections within the school and university. "It's a good way for more senior faculty to take notice of your citizenship," one said.

Some respondents did report that they advise candidates to make public service a portion of their service portfolio, and there was general agreement that the best way to do that is to incorporate public service into an existing research strain. "Harmonize the relationship between your research and service," one said. Another argued that integrated service is the most valuable sort of service: "You want to be doing things that reflect what you do [in your research]. Service outside of [our school] that really utilizes your skills and particular contributions is going to be much more highly valued than other stuff." But even this impulse is subject to time pressures, the same respondent said. "If you can get any attention for your work in the broader policy stream, that would be viewed as a positive. However, that depends on how much extra work it takes."

Respondents' guidance about how to best select service activities reflected a point of tension that emerged repeatedly throughout the interviews: that there is a desire among faculty to spend more time and effort engaging with the world of practice, but that doing so may not be optimal from the perspective of professional expectations. One respondent said this is largely because of the type of person who chooses to work in a public affairs school. "People are drawn here because of their appetite for service and are drawn down the rabbit hole." Another contended that it is a function of the importance of their expertise to society: "The tendency for junior faculty is that they come to a policy school and the world wants them. We have to warn junior faculty that they're overinvolved and need to wait a bit. A housing expert we have, for example, is called on all the time."

Most respondents who said junior faculty should minimize service work emphasized that after they achieve tenure and promotion, both the expectation of their school and professional service and their flexibility to pursue public service increase dramatically. In the case of the former, this greater expectation is an imperative driven by school or department leadership. One dean said, "I protect younger faculty from expectations, but as soon as they get tenure I jump all over them."

Incentives and their impact on service choices

Respondents were asked if they believed that the incentive structures of tenure and promotion requirements and internal advice to candidates modify the choices that junior scholars make with respect to service. There was less certainty in the service category than in research or teaching that the tenure and promotion process affects candidates' choices; nonetheless, a number of competing themes emerged.

INCENTIVES FOR LIMITATIONS ON SERVICE ACTIVITIES

- "If it were really 20%, more people would do more here. But the relative importance of research is so powerful that it's not that big."
- Incentives and advice "gives them [candidates] pause. Since they're trying to balance their entire lives and the professional arc is so long, they understand that the big service obligation may have to come later. It's more a prudence effect than a chilling effect."
- "Some of them might do more applied work if they thought it would be rewarded. We had a person leave for another university who said that he was spending too much time running [an outreach] center, and it was impacting his research."
- "Clearly they put less time into external activities than they would be inclined to do."

INCENTIVES FOR MORE SERVICE THAN WOULD OCCUR OTHERWISE

- "They'd probably do less with regard to school service or committee work if they could get away with it."

- "We do have quite a bit of influence, and we emphasize the importance of community service. In my experience elsewhere, there was no incentive to do work out in the community."

POTENTIALLY MISALIGNED INCENTIVES

- "We say we want more engagement. We're very focused right now on making sure the incentives align with what we have in the language."
- "Similar to teaching, junior faculty may do more service work than is individually optimal for their narrow tenure decisions."
- "I think we [the school and APT committee] value service to the academic community more than [external service], which becomes problematic as you advance because you have a better chance to build your reputation as a knowledge broker between academia and practice early on. It limits the amount of effort they take once a journal article is accepted to raise awareness of the work."
- "We need to do better at recognizing shared wins. For example, send [me] to Volcker for a year to do some collaborative work and have it be seen as a win for [my school], a win for Volcker, and a win for me."

MINIMAL IMPACT ON SERVICE CHOICES

- "I don't think [the tenure and promotion process has an impact on service choices]. Bizarrely, this can be so damn random."
- "The issue of public service would probably have more focus if it needed to, but in my time we haven't needed to. The ethos permeates the school."
- "One of the really good things about being in a public policy school means it's really easy to fulfill the service portion given the nature of our areas of focus."

Key takeaways

Key themes from the service section:

- Respondents agreed that service is usually the least heavily weighted and least fully developed of the three categories of evaluation for tenure and promotion. In fact, most respondents were concerned that overcommitment to service is made at the expense of research.
- In most schools, the service component is fulfilled by meeting a certain threshold, and moving beyond it provides little marginal value. As such, many senior faculty members encourage junior colleagues to keep their commitments minimal.
- Candidates for tenure tend to be channeled into service to the school rather than service to the profession or public service.
- There appears to be a genuine appetite at many schools for greater engagement with public service outside the academy, but professional incentives encourage delaying such activity until after the tenure and perhaps promotion hurdles are overcome.
- Candidates seeking to pursue public service engagement, either by working for a public agency or conducting tailored research for one, would be advised to ensure that the engagement is fully integrated with their existing research and supports scholarly productivity. This approach to service is challenging (and still inadvisable at many schools) but does suggest opportunities for collaboration with practice.

Hypothetical Examples of Engagement with Practice

The Alliance was particularly interested in how schools conceive of opportunities for public service. Therefore, respondents were asked about two hypothetical scenarios in which junior faculty encounter opportunities to spend a significant portion of their time engaging directly with practitioners in their area of expertise.

SCENARIO I: Working in a public agency

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIO	GENERALLY, YES	GENERALLY, NO	UNCLEAR/ NOT CERTAIN
An opportunity has arisen for a junior faculty member to work directly in a public agency for a year. With an eye toward tenure and promotion, would you advise him or her to pursue it?	**18** *2 strong yes* *16 yes with reservations*	**11**	**5**

Number of responses (n=34)

The first scenario, a stint working directly in a public agency, was met with some skepticism. The most common response was to delay any work directly within a public agency until after the tenure (and perhaps also the promotion) hurdle has been cleared. That said, a narrow majority did agree that under certain circumstances, a more junior faculty member could also benefit from taking such a position and that it does happen. Some representative comments:

- “It comes down to previously prepared research. If they were clearly above the bar, they should take it on. If they [aren’t above the bar] … it seems that they’re more concerned about practice, and it hurts in the tenure decision.”
- “I think it would be valuable if it fits into your research track or you learned things that support your research agenda and teaching. We should encourage this kind of thing, generally. However, if the transition costs are too high, that’s something to be mindful of.”
- “We would hope that this would lead to an accelerated trajectory upon their return. There’s no explicit credit for it in the tenure and promotion process; it can’t substitute.”
- “If likely to lead to benefits of one of the following sorts—data, access to data, access to decision makers, funding sources—we would support that.”
- “In the old days, most of us had government experience before we got our PhD or some-

time in our career. Young people won't be able to work on applied problems if they haven't worked in government." [From a dean strongly supportive of time spent in government early in a career.]

Eleven respondents felt that working in a public agency would be a distraction from building a more traditional portfolio for tenure or promotion. "It would probably be perceived as negative in terms of progress," one said. "It's really uncommon—their first objective has to be tenure," another stated. A third presented the issue as one of protecting academic identity and reputation: "If one stopped the [tenure] clock they could get labeled a practitioner, and then it gets into the old academic bias."

Respondents from private universities were more likely than those at public universities to think that taking time to work in external public service before tenure or promotion is advisable. Seven of the ten respondents from private schools answered yes to this hypothetical scenario, while only eleven of twenty-four public school respondents said the same. (It follows that schools in private universities were also somewhat more likely to be able to stop the tenure clock for such service.)

Though stopping the tenure clock (the number of years, usually between five and seven, that a candidate has to establish a tenurable record) is not absolutely necessary for pursuing public service, there does seem to be a relationship between whether candidates can do so and whether a stint in a public agency would be advisable. The team asked each respondent if a candidate could stop the clock in this scenario. Twenty-three said yes, eight said no, and the remaining three were uncertain.

WOULD IT BE PRUDENT TO WORK DIRECTLY IN A PUBLIC AGENCY FOR A YEAR?		GENERALLY YES	GENERALLY NO	UNCLEAR/ NOT CERTAIN	TOTAL
Can the tenure clock be stopped for external public service?	Yes	17	3	3	23
	No	1	6	1	8
	Unclear	0	2	1	3
TOTAL		18	11	5	34

Number of responses (n=34)

It seems that increasing the flexibility of the tenure clock would reduce the disincentive to take time to work in public service early in a faculty member's career.

SCENARIO 2: Conducting tailored research for a public agency

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIO	GENERALLY YES	GENERALLY NO	UNCLEAR/ NOT CERTAIN
An opportunity has arisen for a junior faculty member to conduct tailored research on a project for a public agency. With an eye toward tenure and promotion, would you advise him or her to pursue it?	**30** *6 strong yes* *24 yes with reservations*	**3**	**1**

Number of responses (n=34)

Almost every respondent agreed that a junior faculty member would be prudent to pursue tailored research or project work with a public agency, provided that the resultant work could appear in peer-reviewed publications. This echoes the broader trends of the primacy of the research category and the desirability of integrating service activities into the research stream. One respondent was proud of his school's capacity for harmonization, stating that "we solicit projects [that we could support and get publishable material from] regularly from state agencies, local governments, regional development groups, nonprofits, and others."

SECTION VI: Respondents' Normative Attitudes Toward Tenure and Promotion Considerations

At the close of the interviews, each respondent was asked to reflect on the tenure and promotion system as a whole and answer questions that cut across individual categories. These questions provided an opportunity for respondents to consider the future of tenure and promotion systems as well as public affairs engagement beyond the academy.

In this section, public affairs faculty offered insights on

- whether and how tenure and promotion standards align with their school's mission;
- whether candidates for tenure and promotion find guidelines to be clear and flexible;
- if and how they would change the balance of consideration between research, teaching, and service in their schools and across the field;
- what role non-tenure-track faculty play in meeting the research, teaching, and service goals of their institution; and
- strategies for schools to bridge the gap between academia and practitioners.

Attributes of the tenure and promotion system

QUESTION	GENERALLY YES	MIXED	GENERALLY NO
1. Do you believe that the tenure and promotion process governing your school aligns with and reflects its mission?	28	4	1
2. Do you think that junior faculty (candidates for advancement) find it to be generally clear?	24	4	5
3. Do you consider it to be generally flexible?	20	8	5

One respondent declined to answer these questions, for a total of n=33.

QUESTION 1 For the most part, respondents agreed that the guidelines and considerations governing tenure and promotion at their schools align with institutional missions. Most also offered some element of mission alignment their school has struggled with or that could be improved. One typical comment was on the challenge of aligning school mission with the needs of the broader institution. "We lean harder on peer-reviewed research than we [otherwise] would . . . due to our role in a major research university," one said.

"The mission is somewhat contested," another said. "It's a very strange position to be a professional school in a place like [my university]. Our standards look like those consistent with the university." A third framed the school identity challenge in contrast to disciplinary concerns: "There are people who think we shouldn't be so close to the disciplinary departments, and should put more weight on the public facing portion."

Another refrain was that professional incentives can be aligned with mission through informal processes even though formal arrangements may not reflect mission-driven goals. "The analytical answer [to question one] would be no, but the practical answer is yes because we have makeshift stratagems," one respondent said. "That puts a lot of pressure on me—not that I'm complaining. It just does." Another reported seeing progress toward formalizing informal considerations: "We're trying to integrate informal processes into the formal nature. The other schools are starting to recognize that engaged research on the part of the faculty is a good model. If we can codify the informal processes, it will be a benefit to universities generally."

It was clear from responses to this question that in practice, the missions of public affairs schools cover a sufficiently broad mandate that balancing all of them (including academic rigor; teaching and training; and engagement at the community, state, national, and international level) presents a challenge in general, including for tenure and promotion. This is not unique to the academy but is perhaps exacerbated by the public-facing nature of public affairs schools.

QUESTION 2 More than two-thirds of respondents agreed that candidates for tenure and promotion find guidelines and processes generally clear, at least within reasonable limits. Many agreed that a certain degree of opaqueness is unavoidable and perhaps preferable.

"There's a fair bit of uncertainty, though to limit it would stifle the kinds of innovation and creativity we hope to find in our best faculty," one said. Another replied that "people tend to get paranoid and overthink things. They say … 'I don't know what I'm supposed to do.' We make it clear to them … that there are multiple paths. It's clear to the decision makers."

Several respondents who believe their school conveys expectations reasonably well attributed that to mentoring. "We haven't had difficulty in this regard. Mentoring is pretty important to us; we don't like to be in a position where people don't make tenure," one said. For another, informal advising is key: "They [guidelines and process] are a little vague. The unwritten notions get around." Laying out expectations is no small undertaking, according to some. "I say 'generally yes' only because we spend a lot of time making it clear to them," one respondent stated. "It's really hard to do, though."

Among the nearly one-third who were less sanguine about the clarity of the process, most felt that not much more progress could be made. "It's, appropriately, a source of incredible anxiety. I don't really know if it could ever be clear," one replied. Another was more philosophical: "It's the nature of these things for junior faculty to think they're less clear."

QUESTION 3 About three-fifths of respondents agreed that the tenure and promotion system affords general flexibility. Some linked it to the clarity issue raised in Question 2. "We are flexible to the point of being ambiguous," one participant said. Another drew a distinction between process and standards, saying that the "process, of course, is pretty rigid. But treat each case individually: The criteria get applied on an individual basis recognizing the diversity of people's interests." One respondent laid out what drives his school's flexibility: "It's a function, first, of our interdisciplinary nature; second, it's a case-by-case consideration; and third, it's hard to develop consensus on precisely what we want."

A substantial minority described their school's approach as more exacting or prescriptive. "It can be customized within reason, but a candidate would have to make a really strong case," said one respondent. Another stressed the role senior faculty who structure guidelines play in flexibility or the lack of it: "They're too rigid for my taste. A slightly compulsive person wrote them. But that's a tradeoff price of getting more clarity."

Normative views on the balance of consideration

The next questions asked for respondents' personal opinions on whether their own school's balance is generally right or if it should be modified in any way.

QUESTION	ABOUT RIGHT	SHOULD BE MODIFIED	UNCERTAIN
4. Thinking about your school, do you believe that the balance of consideration between research, teaching, and service is about right, or should it be modified? How?	27	5	2
5. Thinking about the public affairs school landscape generally, do you believe that the balance of consideration between research, teaching, and service is about right, or should it be modified? How?	10	18	6

Number of responses (n=34)

QUESTION 4 Most respondents were comfortable with the relative weights given to research, teaching, and service at their own institution, which might be expected considering that many of them have a hand in shaping and implementing their school's tenure and promotion process.

Among the majority who believe that the balance is about right, the various subgroups are instructive:

Some respondents at schools with a heavily weighted research focus affirmed that retaining this focus is the best option.

- "For tenure, you have to earn your stripes. You've got to show that you can do [the top-flight research]. You've got to paint a realist painting before you can go abstract."

- "I'm comfortable. If my goal were to improve the functioning of the school, I might increase teaching and service. I'm generally on the academic-quality side of the spectrum relative to the faculty."
- "I helped write these guidelines, so [I think they're appropriate.] But we have continuing robust and productive arguments about this. There are people on all sides. It's a vital conversation that every institution should have at all times."

Some believed that maintaining a strong research focus was important given the expectations of their university.

- "As an R1 university, we have a strong responsibility to make sure the research component is heavily weighted."
- "You couldn't really draw down the research component due to our role in the university. Maybe our definition should be a bit more elastic. Some things that fall under service could fall under research. … Perhaps we should think of it as 'research and impact.'"
- "We came to this balance after several failed promotions [at the university level due to insufficient research focus] about a decade ago. If I were less concerned about the university's role, I'd probably weight teaching more heavily."
- "It's appropriate given the constraints the university puts on us. I wish we had more flexibility in how we judge the quality of people's work and its impact."

Other respondents defended their school's research focus because of competition from peer schools.

- "I'm not sure I could change the system without hurting the department, given that everyone else is playing by the same rules."
- "In the real world, I'm pretty comfortable with what we've got. It's a pernicious system generally, but we work within it."

Still others were satisfied with the present system because their school chooses to weight teaching and/or service nearly as heavily as research.

- "We're one of the last R1 institutions that value [teaching and service] strongly. I hope we can hold on to it."
- "It's very important that we keep teaching very important. This is likely because of my background [in classroom instruction]."

Among the minority who would like to modify their school's relative weighting of research, teaching, and service, all suggested strengthening the relative positions of teaching or service.

- "I would give assistant professors eight years instead of six to relieve a bit of time pressure. I also want practitioners to comment on the value of the work. If you're a scholar of education policy, has the [Department of Education] actually read your work? I'd rather see a lot more of that than glorifying teaching scores."
- "I would make service more about public service and service to the profession. It's valued but doesn't have close to the same cachet as even less-than-A-plus research. There's research that could be accepted into the 'minor journals' category that's more highly valued than public engagement."
- "More emphasis on teaching, less emphasis on peer-reviewed articles—let's make the articles a threshold. There's an underemphasis on service in some ways. ... In our discipline, you need to interact with people in practice. We need more balance. That way we're stronger as scholars and we're stronger in terms of our teaching because we're informed by our connections to practice."
- "I'd raise up the teaching component to make it coequal to research. We also need to get better at evaluating this [teaching]."

These findings make it clear that while most respondents are largely comfortable with the primacy of research, there is interest in exploring ways to elevate teaching and service or in finding opportunities for research to be more engaged with practice or integrated with teaching and service.

QUESTION 5 Respondents were much less confident that public affairs schools as a whole have arrived at the proper balance, as only ten respondents agreed that it is about right. Most respondents signaled a desire to change the balance across the community, usually to more closely align with the approach taken by their institution.

Here are representative comments from the majority who would modify the balance in some way:

- "There's a crisis of confidence in public institutions. We're not doing our part to try to address it. A teeny corner of that problem is our fault. We need to make publicly credible, publicly consumable public purposes part of our writ again."
- "I'd like to see public policy schools reprioritize academic excellence a little bit."
- "The field doesn't value the public service. We are schools of public affairs and policy. I think there needs to be more recognition of engagement."
- "We're encouraging academics to write to each other, and we're failing."
- "It's a more complicated challenge [for public affairs] than when I was in political science. Our schools are required to be a bit more flexible, and the service component is bigger."
- "It's a collective action problem: Since all schools play by similar rules, we would need to change widely to change individually."
- "It seems there are some places that are getting a bit extreme in their expectations about publications. I hope that other schools don't get so wrapped up in this numbers game."

From the minority of respondents who believe the balance is about right across the community:

- "We do all right. It should be modified in political science departments. There's very little respect for engagement there."
- "As far as I can determine, it seems right to me. The profession is mature to the point that there's a common understanding of expectations."
- "I'd like to think that scholars in our field are thought of as equally outstanding from an intellectual perspective, so I like the emphasis we have on research before tenure. I don't think it's helpful for us to be seen as less scholarly, less academic. This would give public policy faculty less of a standing within the university."
- "There's quite a bit of variance across schools, which seems reasonable."

While it is clear that there is a strong sense that the field should modify how it weights research, teaching, and service, there is considerable difference about which direction it should go. Regardless, reputational concerns and the internally competitive nature of the field promotes a certain degree of standardization and discourages individual institutions from large deviations.

Closing questions for future conversations

To conclude the interviews, respondents were asked two general questions that could inform future discussion within the public affairs education community.

Respondents were asked to explain the role of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty in their schools and how they are evaluated. In view of broader trends in academia and the rising expectations for tenure-track faculty, it is understandable that schools of public affairs rely on adjunct faculty, clinical faculty, contract faculty, lecturers, or dedicated researchers to augment tenure-track faculty.

Every one of our respondents reported that their school uses NTT faculty in some way and that their evaluation standards reflect a different blend of research, teaching, and service. The heavy focus on research in tenure means NTT faculty are more heavily weighted toward teaching and service.

This is a representative sampling of respondents' descriptions of the role of NTT faculty:

- "We're a bit top-heavy. We have lots of lecturers and professors of practice relative to junior tenure-track faculty. They have their own guidelines. Lecturers are primarily teaching focused, and professors of practice are primarily public facing."
- "We have clinical faculty. They're non-tenure-track faculty who have their own promotion stream. Their workload is different: very little research, focused on teaching and service. We also have research faculty in some of our centers that are supported by soft money and focus on research."
- "We hire contract faculty to deal with teaching and service. That's where we try to get people who are very policy engaged."
- "We don't use the term professor of practice, though we might like to. For example, one of our faculty was budget director for the city [in which our university is located]. When he came up for full [professor], we were able to overweight that service as a stand-in for publications. NTT faculty are a very eclectic group."
- "We have a group of distinguished senior fellows that might be professors of practice at other universities. They're not really evaluated, and [are] kept at the discretion of the dean. Faculty don't weigh in."
- "We just have everything: research, teaching professors, adjuncts, lecturers."

The allocation of responsibilities between tenure and non-tenure-track faculty at public affairs schools is an area that most likely deserves further attention in the community. There is some evidence of a trend toward a division of labor, with tenure-track faculty concentrating on research and non-tenure-track faculty supporting the teaching and service missions. This possibility raises some interesting questions. Would this development be normatively good for the overall missions of public affairs institutions? Can the integration of research, teaching, and service be achieved if those responsibilities are partially delineated between different individuals, job titles, or centers? Alternatively, does this specialization raise quality and quantity within each category?

Finally, respondents were asked if their school has a defined, dedicated capacity to bridge the gap between research and practice—either identifying to faculty fruitful opportunities for engaged research or pushing faculty research toward impactful areas of practice. Most respondents agreed that this is a worthy aim, but schools take very different approaches to achieve it.

Some respondents suggested that this task is the responsibility of faculty members. "It's an ad hoc process based on individual faculty relationships with, say, Brookings or practitioners, but we have a strong cultural expectation of it," one said. Several others stated that their school's media or communications office is the appropriate venue to amplify a faculty member's research. "For us, the responsibility lies with the individual," one respondent stated. "The communications offices help with media outreach, but that's a bit different than what you're describing."

Many respondents expressed the view that the responsibility for bridging this gap is (or should be) centralized at the leadership level at a school. "Our associate dean of research kind of focuses on this, as does the dean," one reported. "We have to serve as an information conduit to alert people on what might be of interest." Another identified bridging the gap as a priority. "We recognize this as a need. We've done a couple of things. We've built a searchable database of faculty publications, for example. ... We need to be more proactive." Another is currently experimenting: "I have two people who staff a policy bridge. . . . We've historically had a successful model for people working in education research. It's very active and dynamic. Whether we can be as intensive in everything else remains to be seen."

For others, research and outreach centers within or adjoined to the school serve this purpose. "We're building a stronger linkage between the centers and the faculty," one said. "Centers have been only doing work for clients. We want to have some impact on the scholarship side." Another stated that "while certainly individuals do some things, much of it is done by our public service organizations. They're the institutions and centers around specific issues. They're really great at translation." Several others who agreed with this line of thinking pointed to the university level as the appropriate owner of such an effort.

Bridging the gap between scholarly research and the world outside the university is an evergreen challenge in academia, and one that is especially present in public affairs given its outward-facing nature. Respondents made clear that as schools of public affairs chart their future, a sustained effort to promote interaction between research and practice will be important.

SECTION VII: Conclusions

The project charge of this study was to 1) summarize the landscape of tenure and promotion practices and 2) explore how schools of public affairs balance consideration of scholarship, teaching, and service. The issues are clearly complex and multifaceted, but the following section seeks to identify consistent themes and detail important questions for the public affairs education community.

Consistent views throughout the interview pool

1. Tenure and promotion processes are extremely influential. The respondents agreed that the formal and informal pressures in the tenure and promotion process modify the choices made by candidates for each rank. Though this is to be expected given the significance of these two milestones in the professional arc of an academic, it underscores the importance of ensuring that the incentives in the tenure and promotion process are consistent with the overall goals of the institution.
2. Of the three primary categories, research is the most heavily weighted in tenure and promotion. Nearly every respondent made clear that each additional piece of research has some marginal value in tenure and promotion considerations at their institution. They also were definite that investing time and effort in teaching and service beyond an accepted threshold is unlikely to have the same marginal benefit.
   a. Respondents at most schools agreed that before faculty clear tenure and promotion hurdles, they are best served by devoting most of their time and energy to developing a research stream that is published in traditional peer-reviewed outlets.

b. Respondents agreed that their school takes its teaching mission seriously and that faculty often teach more than is necessary for tenure or promotion standards. A substantial number of respondents observed that teaching is treated as a threshold consideration, with minimal marginal value in exceeding the predetermined level of proficiency.

c. In most cases, service carries the least weight of the three categories, and respondents advised that extensive service to the school, university, profession, or public is best delayed until after tenure. Several suggested that service could be best pursued by integrating it into an existing research stream or by conducting outreach around a set of peer-reviewed findings.

3. Public engagement, whether through applied research or public service, is not a significant element in the professional expectations of junior scholars. Because of professional incentive structures, adhering to more traditional research aimed at a scholarly audience and minimizing time spent in external service are the safer approach.

4. The multidisciplinary nature of public affairs schools can present opportunities and challenges with respect to tenure and promotion considerations. Respondents said their multidisciplinary schools affords students and scholars alike unique opportunities to approach material in ways that would not be possible in a single department. However, multidisciplinarity also creates challenges when faculty must evaluate the scholarly output of colleagues outside their own discipline. This situation can elevate numerical measures of scholarly impact (Google Scholar, citation counts) and outside letters to outsized importance in the tenure and promotion review process.

5. Reputational issues and institutions' prestige consciousness are subtle factors in

the weight given to research in the tenure and promotion process. Some expressed a sense that their school takes pains to demonstrate its academic rigor within their university, especially relative to traditional disciplinary departments, and linked this to the primacy of research output and the likelihood that university APT committees affirm school decisions. Many also observed that outside letters are often evaluated through the lens of whether a prestigious peer institution would grant tenure or promotion to the candidate in question.

6. To the extent that some respondents were interested in exploring changes to the tenure and promotion system, they faced a collective action problem. Respondents stated that public affairs schools are in a competitive market, which reinforces broadly similar approaches to tenure and promotion. A school that departs from prevailing trends faces significant risk.
7. Standards at schools of public affairs have risen over the past decades. Many respondents—most relatively senior—said that junior faculty face higher expectations today than when they pursued tenure, especially with respect to research productivity and teaching. Some felt that these expectations are becoming excessive.

Key questions for the path forward

Almost to a person, the respondents emphasized that schools of public affairs must be consistently mindful of the consequences of their tenure and promotion policies and processes. That, combined with areas of uncertainty or disagreement among respondents, gave rise to several important questions that the community may wish to contemplate.

1. It is clear that, in many cases, the dominance of research output in tenure and promotion decisions comes at the expense of the other two categories. Should this

circumstance change, or is it necessary to protect the rigor and reputation of the field? What impact does the public-facing mission of public affairs schools have on identifying the proper balance between research, teaching, and service?

2. To what extent do the habits that faculty members develop early in their career inform their choices later? If junior faculty are encouraged to devote most of their time and attention to research, can a school's desired degree of teaching excellence, applied research, and externally engaged service be achieved by senior faculty and non-tenure-track faculty?
3. Engagement with practice is often a secondary or tertiary concern for public affairs faculty due to professional incentives or personal preferences. To what extent should schools regard such engagement as essential to their missions? Is the teaching mission sufficient to fulfill this part of their mission, or should more be expected?
4. Should more be done to promote applied, policy-relevant research? How should schools structure their efforts to disseminate impactful research to practitioners and the general public?
5. How can schools promote, support, and incentivize greater harmony between faculty's research, teaching, and service? What are the impediments to this integration?
6. Schools rely more and more on specialized faculty, such as lecturers or professors of practice, to augment their research, teaching, and service missions. Is this a positive direction for the profession and for public affairs institutions?

On balance, the interviews demonstrate a considerable desire by many in schools of public affairs to ensure that the scholarly, teaching and service missions can coexist in a complementary way in the years ahead. The Volcker Alliance hopes that this report assists individual institutions in better understanding the current landscape as they evaluate their own standards and practices for tenure and promotion. The Alliance also hopes that readers will find this to be a valuable contribution to the ongoing fieldwide discussion of how schools can be more engaged with practice and have more significant impact in the public arena.

Through the Public Service Excellence program and its other initiatives, the Volcker Alliance stands ready to collaborate with schools and other civic institutions to promote excellence in public policy and public administration education.

APPENDIX: Full Survey

Typically, surveys were administered over the phone in sixty to ninety minutes. In a few cases, time constraints required concluding the survey before completion. In this situation, the Alliance team either arranged a second call or sent the remaining questions to the participant via email.

I. Process and execution

Explanatory

1. Who sets your tenure and promotion guidelines?
   a. School
   b. College (of which the primary school is a part)
   c. University
2. When were they last updated?
   a. Year
3. How is an applicant's case approved?
   a. By school alone
   b. By school > university
   c. By university alone
   d. By unit > school > university
   e. Other (describe)
4. How long does the process take?
   a. Number of months
5. What are the categories of evaluation/"realms of excellence"?
   a. Standard—research, teaching, service
   b. A different arrangement (what?)
6. If 5a, what is the stated balance between the three realms?

a. Excellence in all is required

b. Two of three required

c. Research>teaching and service

d. Research and teaching>service

e. Only research is affirmatively required

f. Other

7. How many outside letters required? How are they selected?

a. Number

b. Narrative

8. Who is suitable to write a letter? How are they selected?

a. Narrative

9. At the school level, who votes on tenure and promotion?

a. Those at a candidate’s level and above

b. Other arrangement

Interpretive

1. Does the stated balance between research/teaching/service align with the experience of evaluating an application? In what unwritten ways does it diverge?

2. How would you characterize the relative influence of the department/unit head, dean, and provost/university official?

3. In practice, how much weight do outside letters carry?

4. Has the process of tenure and promotion changed in any broad, significant ways since you became involved in it?

II. Research

Explanatory

1. Which of the following are stated means of evaluating scholarship?

a. Journals

b. Top presses

c. Reviews

d. Conference panels/speaking invitations

e. Awards

f. Citations

g. Grants

Interpretive

1. How do you measure research impact?
2. Is any crucial aspect of how research is evaluated by your school's tenure and promotion guidelines unwritten? What advice would you give junior scholars building their research portfolio to maximize the likelihood of their receiving tenure?
3. Do your school's tenure and promotion guidelines provide opportunities for recognition for a full spectrum of public affairs research, including:
   a. For different disciplines/fields of study?
   b. For applied research versus more theoretical or general work?
   c. For collaborative versus individual research?
   d. For differing audiences, such as primarily scholars or primarily practitioners?
   e. For research that focuses on public policy formulation/evaluation versus public administration/management?
4. Does the tenure and promotion process impact the research interests of junior scholars? Please explain.

III. Teaching

Explanatory

1. Which of the following components of teaching are evaluated?
   a. Classroom instruction
   b. Student advising
   c. Pedagogical innovation (for example, new teaching methods, curriculum development)
2. How is teaching excellence evaluated?
   a. Full teaching course load
   b. Student evaluations
   c. Faculty evaluations
   d. Evaluations of syllabi
   e. No formal evaluations are considered

Interpretive

1. Is any crucial aspect of how teaching is evaluated by your school's promotion and tenure guidelines unwritten? What advice would you give junior scholars in regard to teaching to maximize their likelihood of receiving tenure?
2. Do your school's guidelines provide opportunities for recognition for the full spectrum of public affairs teaching, advising, and pedagogy?
3. Does the promotion/tenure process impact the teaching activities of junior scholars?

IV. Service

Explanatory

1. Which of the following types of "service" are listed as fulfilling this requirement?
   a. School/university service
   b. Service to the profession

c. Public service to government or a not-for-profit

d. Consulting for fee

2. Does compensated work for an external body count as service?

a. Yes

b. No

3. Do the guidelines describe the relative expectations of service for pretenure and tenured faculty?

a. Yes—equal

b. Yes—a greater expectation for senior>junior faculty

c. No

4. Thinking of public service outside the academy, does the "tenure clock" stop if junior faculty work outside their university?

a. Yes

b. No

Interpretive

1. Is any crucial aspect of how service is evaluated by your school's tenure and promotion guidelines unwritten? What advice would you give to junior scholars in regard to service to maximize the likelihood of their receiving tenure?

2. Do your school's guidelines provide opportunities for recognition for the full spectrum of public affairs service, generally? How about in the following scenarios?

a. An opportunity has arisen for a junior faculty member to work directly in a public agency. With an eye toward tenure/promotion, would you recommend pursuing it?

b. An opportunity has arisen for a junior faculty member to conduct tailored research on a project for a public agency. With an eye toward tenure/promotion, would you recommend pursuing it?

3. Do you believe that your school has a culture that prioritizes applied work in the service of public issues?
4. Does the promotion/tenure process impact the service activities of junior scholars?
5. Notwithstanding professional incentives, is there an appetite among faculty for greater collaboration with practitioners (especially in government) generally? At the more junior levels?

V. Primary: Normative and background questions

1. Do you believe that the tenure and promotion guidelines governing your school align with and reflect its mission?
   a. Generally yes
   b. Mixed
   c. Generally no
      How?
2. Do you think that junior faculty find the guidelines to be genuinely clear?
   a. Generally yes
   b. Mixed
   c. Generally no
      Why?
3. Do you consider them to be broadly flexible or broadly rigid?
   a. Broadly flexible
   b. Mixed
   c. Broadly rigid

How?

4. Thinking about your school, do you believe that the balance of consideration between research, teaching, and service is about right, or should it be modified? If so, how?
   a. About right
   b. Should be modified
5. Thinking about the public affairs school landscape generally, do you believe that the balance of consideration between research, teaching, and service is about right, or should it be modified? If so, how?
   a. About right
   b. Should be modified
6. Generally, do you believe tenure and promotion guidelines impact faculty engagement with practitioners? How?
7. Demographic questions:
   a. How many tenure-track faculty does your program have? How many nontenured teaching or research faculty? Of the non-tenure-track faculty, how many are adjuncts and how many are contract faculty?
   b. Do you have guidelines/requirements for contract renewals that are similar to tenure guidelines/requirements? If so, do they include teaching, research, and service, or only teaching?
   c. Does your school have a defined, dedicated capacity to bridge the gap between research and practice?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study was executed by the Volcker Alliance's Public Service Excellence team, which manages the Alliance's portfolio concerning preparation for public service. Pradeep Nair directed this program area through March 2017, and Maggie Mello and Peter Morrissey make up the project team, with Peter as the research lead. The project design, execution, and completion was overseen by Anthony J. Dowd in his capacity as interim president of the Volcker Alliance, then by Thomas W. Ross when he became president in July 2016. Any comments, questions, or suggestions can be directed to Peter at pmorrissey@volckeralliance.org.

The project advisory team gave generously of their time and talent throughout the study. Their contributions were crucial to honing the research approach and structuring the survey, and the project team is grateful for their willingness to make time to offer insights.

- Kirsten Gronbjerg, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University
- Michael Nichol, Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California
- Mark Rom, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University
- Allan Stam, Dean, Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy, University of Virginia

The Alliance team is also immensely grateful to the public affairs faculty members who agreed to participate in the study.

- Vicky Wilkins, Senior Associate Dean, School of Public Affairs, American University
- Kevin Desouza, Associate Dean for Research, School of Public Affairs, College of Public Service and Community Solutions, Arizona State University

- Roland Anglin, Dean, Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University
- Eric Verhoogen, Vice Dean, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University
- David Birdsell, Dean, Marxe School of Public and International Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New York
- Judith Kelley, Senior Associate Dean, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University
- Mary Beth Walker, Dean, Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University
- Kathryn Newcomer, Director, Trachtenberg School of Public Policy, The George Washington University
- Suzanne Cooper, Academic Dean for Teaching and Curriculum, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- Reggie Robinson, Director, School of Public Affairs and Administration, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Kansas
- Merl Hackbart, Interim Director, Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, University of Kentucky
- Philip Joyce, Senior Associate Dean, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland
- Laura Bloomberg, Associate Dean, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota
- Barton Wechsler, Dean, Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri
- Sherry Glied, Dean, Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, New York University
- Jos Raadschelders, Associate Dean for Faculty Development, Glenn School of Public Affairs, Ohio State University
- John Keeler, Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

- Marc Holzer, Dean Emeritus and University Professor, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University, Newark
- R. Karl Rethemeyer, Interim Dean, Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, University of Albany, State University of New York
- David Van Slyke, Dean, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University
- F. Gregory Gause, Professor and Head, Department of International Affairs, Bush School of Government and Public Service, Texas A&M University
- Jeryl Mumpower, Chair and Professor, Department of Public Service and Administration, Bush School of Government and Public Service, Texas A&M University
- Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, Deputy Dean for Research and Strategic Initiatives, Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago
- Paul Teske, Dean, School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado, Denver
- Robert Wilson, Professor, Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas
- Henry Brady, Dean, Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley
- Bradley Wright, Professor and Head, Department of Public Administration and Policy, School of Public and International Affairs, University of Georgia
- Frayda Bluestein, Associate Dean for Faculty Development, School of Government, University of North Carolina
- Angela Eikenberry, Professor, School of Public Administration, College of Public Affairs and Community Service, University of Nebraska, Omaha
- Anne Khademian, Director, School of Public and International Affairs, Virginia Tech University
- Sandra Archibald, Dean, Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington

ABOUT THE VOLCKER ALLIANCE

The Volcker Alliance was launched in 2013 by former Federal Reserve Board chairman Paul A. Volcker to address the challenge of effective execution of public policies and to help rebuild public trust in government. The nonpartisan Alliance works toward that broad objective by partnering with other organizations—academic, business, governmental, and public interest—to strengthen professional education for public service, conduct needed research on government performance, and improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental organization at the federal, state, and local levels.

This publication is the product of the Volcker Alliance. It is an important goal of the Alliance to produce reports that contain ideas, proposals, and recommendations for dealing with persistent governance problems in new ways based on independent research and analysis supporting constructive solutions. To stimulate this process and maintain project independence to make such conclusions and recommendations as they deem to be appropriate, these Alliance projects are commissioned to proceed without the requirement of approval of their conclusions and recommendations by the board of directors collectively or by individual members of the board of directors.

The Volcker Alliance

560 Lexington Avenue,

Suite 16B

New York, NY 10022

(646) 343-0155

info@volckeralliance.org | www.volckeralliance.org