

# What Do We Mean by Service, How Much Should We Expect, and Should Compensated Service Count?

Many, if not most, institutions adopt a tri-part structure when it comes to the duties and responsibilities of a university professor: teaching, scholarship, and service. This subject of numerous articles. However, rather than an attempt at a policy statement the following is meant to be a cursory examination of some of the challenges we all face with regard to the question of service at Stockton. There are at least three issues involved in here, the first being what do we mean by service? The second is how much

tutorial. On the other hand, a similar articulation of the quantity and types of service faculty must perform does not exist in the Master Agreement.

When we turn to the local level there is again no clear equivalent statement from the University as to how much service a faculty is responsible for.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that the University is entirely silent on the matter of what counts as service. There are three areas which have provided • [ ^ \* ~ ãä) & ä @ { æ^!: @ C [ [ |ãä æ | q Agreement, the contract each tenure stream faculty signs, and the University/School/Program standards. As the first is the item under consideration for the Task Force, Union, and Administration, we will here focus on the latter two.

E&@-æ |ç { ^ { à^!q & } dæc|ã • @ † || | , ä \* á~ ä • æ á |^• ] [ ] • ãäã • .

Note that only the fourth typically specifically references service:

- 1) Offer courses in your Program and the General Studies curriculum;
- 2) Serve as a preceptor to students;
- 3) Participate in professional activities, scholarship and/or creative activities as appropriate to the discipline;
- 4) Provide service to the University, community and profession;
- 5) Perform other duties as designated by the Dean and/or the Pro

are more detailed than the language in the individual contracts, they are still not particularly specific. Perhaps not surprisingly, the most detailed statement of service requirements can be found in the various program standards. Since each set of program standards has to be approved by both the School and the University at large, it is reasonable to take these to be the clearest statement of what the University sees as arge, it

promotion. There were faculty in the early days who could receive tenure and promotion without publishing much, if anything at all, so long as they made significant service contributions. However, that has long since ceased to be the case. This is not an ascension in terms of its national reputation is not built on the number of hours faculty spend in curriculum committees. Rather, the rise in reputation has been tied to the increasing number and prestige of the articles, conference presentations, artistic productions, books, grants and the like promulgated by the faculty.

The shift in culture likely occurred for many reasons:

perhaps as the initial surge of work to build the new college decreased, there were more opportunities for faculty members to focus on their scholarly/creative work

as the desire for increased institutional prestige.

the increased speed at which knowledge changes in some fields requires faculty members to remain active scholars as one way of keeping up with changes in order to be responsible faculty members

in times of low morale at the university, faculty members may remember that time invested in scholarly work makes it easier for them to get a new job elsewhere

It is also important to note that, regardless of the reasons, the shift in Stockton culture has increased the percentage of Stockton faculty members who prize the opportunity to engage in research and scholarship. Although Stockton continues to state that teaching is the number one priority, the shift in institutional priorities toward scholarship has meant that when looking for new faculty, it is essential to seek out faculty who prize this part of academic life. That creates a circumstance where faculty coming in are likely to feel frustrated if they lose time from their scholarship to engage in

• ^ | ç ã ^ T @ ã ^ ç ã ^ à æ ^ â • | • â • ñ • â



arrangements pretty much everywhere, although which activities fall into which category varies. The question then becomes is there any principled or systematic approach to making this distinction?

As we said at the top, this essay is not meant to settle this question; rather, it is meant to contribute to a community wide discussion. As a start we would like to consider one solution to the question that has been advocated by administrators, both here and elsewhere; any activities which carry any compensation are *ipso facto*, not service. The very fact of being paid means a faculty member is no longer engaged in service. Despite the advantages of such an approach in terms of simplicity we will conclude this essay by arguing that this proposed solution is untenable. However we ultimately to resolve the question, some activities must be both compensated and considered service.

To begin with, adopting what amounts to a stipulative definition approach is essentially arbitrary and therefore provides no meaningful guidance. After all, if the question is why does *this* activity and not *that* [ ] ^ , æ | æ c & [ { ] ^ } • æ ã } , • æ ã \* % W ^ || , ã ã à ^ & æ • ^ c æ [ ] ^ ã • ^ ç ã ^ æ à c @ [ c @ | ã } [ c ã blatant question begging.

It might be different if there was an *intrinsic* distinction between the kinds of activities that could be identified and then utilized to separate them into different categories. However, in our search of the literature we have not been able to find any such feature or features. In some institutions a chair is a compensated position, in others it is not. In some directors are compensated, in others they are not. In some advising is compensated and in others it is not. The list goes on. We have not even

been able to find any *reference* to such a distinguishing feature except where the

å[ & { ^ } • ! ^ - | ^ } & % & ^ • • ã ^ + • ^ ! ç ä [ | % ã ! á ^ } • [ { ^ +



in preparation for an exam or providing feedback ahead of time on papers or essays. Once these additional elements are factored in the demands on faculty have easily crept above 40 hours per week. This leaves precious little time for service in the week even though most colleges and universities have an enormous, seemingly unending amount of service that needs to be done. We contend this is the primary reason why, purely from a practical standpoint, most colleges and universities have recognized that they need to provide compensation to incentivize faculty to pick up some of these activities.

Furthermore, as we have also seen, all this is exacerbated by the fact that a) there is no clear statement of *how much* be spent fulfilling their service obligations; b) there is no clear statement of the proper *proportion* of service when balanced against the other non-teaching demand, scholarship; c) there is no universally agreed upon method for determining *who* decides the answers to a & b.

Assuming we still think it is appropriate for faculty to have a life outside of the institution, people will need to conduct their own personal cost/benefit analysis as to whether this is worth their time to take on the additional aave

demanding and time consuming. However, we cannot change the fact that there are a limited number of hours in a week.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

As a result we contend any future system must continue to accept that many of the positions that have carried compensation must also be counted, to some extent, as service. Any system that is both insubstantial and impractical, and most likely quickly devolve into an exploitative, abusive system. Obviously, given the limited scope of this paper we have not had been able to provide an alternative approach. Clearly it would entail negotiations with the Union as well as a robust commitment to shared governance with the faculty at large. However, how we operationalize both these factors is but one of several important conversations we must have as we move forward.

## APPENDIX I

### Stockton University Statement on University & Community Service

#### 6.3 University and Community Service (Found in Faculty Evaluation Policy, 2015)

6.3.1 Faculty shall contribute to the University's mission through effective participation in governance activities, including leadership roles at the Program, School, or University-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the University community, including activities related to alumni and the University Foundation.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as State or regional



APPENDIX II  
School Standards

*School of Arts and Humanities  
Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

Preamble

A uniform set of standards for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship and community services in the School of Arts and Humanities must be fair, flexible, and provide reasonable goals and expectations for those who seek tenure and promotion in the School.

Such a set of standards designed to evaluate all faculty in fields as diverse as Visual Art, Communications, History, Philosophy and Religion, Language and Culture Studies, Literature and the Performing arts must also be broad enough and flexible enough to

.ot[.ot2mr)-6(so)-6hmq0.000 TETc(ro)-6(a)e 792 rD( )7(Pe)-5(rf)9-6(rmi)-7(o)14(n)-6(i556.92 Tm0 g0 C

In general, after reviewing the College Faculty Evaluation Standards, we recommend adoption of the College Standards as a desirable set of School Standards as the detailed sections below will show.

This College policy is occasionally elaborated upon to reflect the unique efforts of faculty in the School of Business which may distinguish them from faculty in other Schools. Individual Program guidelines within the School will be more specific.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 Through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, School, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College Foundation.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations, disciplinary associations, and professional organizations. Faculty are expected to contribute to the College mission through service to our community, region and the State or the Nation.

6.3.3 Normally the College expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership on campus and to their disciplines and professional organizations.

6.3.4 Evaluation of achievements in this area focuses on the significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation. Clear goals, adequate preparation and appropriate methods of providing service, significant results of the service, and reflection on the contribution and its use to improve the quality of future service are all aspects of documenting achievement in campus and community service.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:



Preamble:

The School of Education recognizes the importance of teaching, scholarship, creative activity, and service as important conditions for tenure and/or promotion. While learning and teaching are important to all Schools within the College, they are central to our mission. The School of Education faculty teaches undergraduate and graduate courses to a variety of audiences, with courses that include both disciplinary content and pedagogy.

In the School of Education, we recognize that scholarship informs and enriches teaching. Appropriate scholarship takes many forms, including but not limited to: disciplinary, interdisciplinary, applied, and pedagogical research, as well as grant acquisition.

The School of Education values service to its programs, the School, and the College at large. Distinctive to the School of Education is its level of commitment to community service through partnerships with local institutions and agencies within the community.

### 2.3 College and Community Service

2.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the achievement of the School and mission through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, School, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College Foundation.

2.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional disciplinary associations. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's mission through service to our community, region, and the State or the Nation.

2.3.3 Normally the School expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in

selected 2 0 612 792 re9d C00912 0 6v(e)-6(ct)7rwr nBT/F3 12 ty 13DC q0.00000912 0 6-6(e)-6(ct)





The faculty of the School of General Studies is distinctive, as well. The school includes no programs with majors. Faculty members teach in the Basic Studies (BASK) program, the Writing program, which offers a minor, and other interdisciplinary minors.

The recently adopted policies include college-wide expectations for faculty regarding teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and college and community service. Given the diversity of the faculty of the School of General Studies, we propose that the statement of faculty responsibilities (pp. 2-3) and the description of college standards for faculty evaluation (pp. 4-9) contained in the aforementioned policy document be adopted as the School of General Studies standards for faculty evaluation.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 The faculty role includes contributions to the college through effective participation in governance activities including leadership roles at the program, school, or College-wide levels. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, including activities related to alumni and the College.

6.3.2 Faculty may also contribute in broader arenas such as state or regional organizations or disciplinary associations. In addition, faculty may contribute to the College's mission through service to our community, region, and the State or the Nation.

6.3.3 Normally the College expects probationary faculty to serve the College and community in selected activities, while faculty who are tenured and/or of senior rank would be expected to have more substantial records in this area, as demonstrated by achievements in leadership.

6.3.5 Evidence of effectiveness in College or community service may include such items as:

6.3.5.1 One or more activities that demonstrate knowledge for the benefit of the College, or of a non-college group or individual.

6.3.5.2 Contributions to professional organizations that are focused on service or professional responsibility as opposed to scholarship, research, or artistic/creative work. For example, an officership or service on a professional board may be more appropriately listed here, whereas editing a special issue of a journal may be more appropriately listed under the section on scholarship.

6.3.5.3 Demonstrating professional skills or a significant amount of time, talent, energy, and involvement beyond that which might be expected by the usual citizen or member.

*School of Health Sciences  
Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

Note: The School Standards for Health Sciences were drafted and approved at a time when the name of the school was the Health Sciences Center. This policy was reendorsed by the Health Sciences Faculty. The following text has been revised only to the extent necessary to acknowledge the new name; there have been no substantive changes.

Approved by Faculty November 29, 2007

Approved by Dean of Professional Studies December 10, 2007

Re-Affirmed by Faculty and Dean of Health Sciences November 18, 2010

This policy covers all members of the Health Sciences School faculty, including tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty.

**Preamble**

This policy specifies school-wide considerations for faculty evaluation in the School of Health Sciences (HLTH). This policy has been developed to elaborate upon the unique efforts of faculty in the School of Health Sciences which may distinguish them from faculty in other college schools.

Such distinctions should be incorporated into the faculty evaluation procedure.

5.2 The college-wide Faculty Evaluation (Policy # ) shall serve as the standard for faculty evaluation.

**6.3 College and Community Service**



These standards were created in order to clarify the College policies as they relate to the faculty of the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The faculty of the School Natural Sciences and Mathematics recognizes that the liberal arts college environment offers unique challenges and opportunities. In the following standards, we elaborate the definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service. We encourage each candidate for reappointment, tenure and promotion, and their program to give careful consideration to constructing a feasible and rigorous plan of individual goals. We also encourage the programs and the candidates to explicitly address the College, School, and Program standards for personnel evaluation in the program letter and the

### 6.3. College and Community service.

6.3.1. The NAMS faculty's role in contributing to the achievement of the College's mission may include participation in governance activities, such as taking on a leadership role at the program, School, or College-wide level. These contributions may require the capacity to work collaboratively with other members of the College community, which may include activities related to alumni and the College Foundation or other agencies.

6.3.2 . 6.3.5. Same as the College Standards (6.3.2-6.3.5)

### *School of Social and Behavioral Sciences Standards for Faculty Evaluation*

This policy covers all members of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty, including tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty

#### Preamble

The faculty of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences support the College standards and intend for the elements of this document to further elucidate the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service from the perspective of the social and behavioral sciences.

### 6.3 College and Community Service

6.3.1 Because the social and behavioral sciences are necessarily entwined with ongoing changes and challenges in society, policy, and culture, community service can be an important aspect of faculty development.

6.3.2 Multiple modes of community engagement are valued and consistent with the

6.3.2.3 service to the campus community through the development of engagement or enrichment opportunities for our students,

