



Roger Soder

School-university collaboration is important for practical, as well as ethical reasons. A public metropolitan university unwilling to engage in authentic interactive exchange relationships with its community risks alienation of support and unwarranted state intrusion. Such a state-dominated university ceases to be a source of critical objectivity and becomes a passive producer of whatever transient state needs dictate. The practical ground for collaboration thus becomes ethical, in that a university so dominated meets neither its own needs nor that of the state.

The Wealth of Higher Education, Reward Structures, and School-University Collaboration

It is said that when Queen Victoria's train rode through the "Dark Country" of mines, mills, steam engines, and blast furnaces of industrialized England, the curtains were drawn so the Queen would not be forced to gaze upon the gloomy squalor. Was it just Victorian fastidiousness that made the Queen turn away? Or profound ignorance? Did she just not give the matter any thought at all? Whatever the case, we today can see the irony of this unwillingness or inability to acknowledge the bustle of power, to celebrate the sources of England's vitality. National wealth is apparently taken as a given; but the means to such wealth are not fit for conversation or viewing.

We can see in the Queen's behavior a kind of reverse hubris, a refusal to acknowledge the source of one's strength. Better it would be, we might argue, to understand with great depth and subtlety those sources in order to seek their succor and protect them from harm. But those of us in higher education must hold in check our smugness at seeing what she did not. Many of us do much as she did, in that we ignore the sources of our institutions' strength, of our institutions' wealth; and many maintain a monumental confusion over just where the wealth comes from.

In the first part of this article (see *Metropolitan Universities*, Spring 1991), I spoke of some of these sources of strength in considering the shifts in institutional mission, from teaching and service to research, shifts observed in the course of the national Study of the Education of Educators; and I suggested some of the consequences to the university in the lemminglike pursuit of research university status at the expense of other institutional missions. The emphasis in the first part was on the particular instance of colleges of education and their teacher preparation programs. The emphasis remains the same in this concluding part. Here, I will focus on the additional costs of the shift in mission, in terms of the faculty reward structure and how the reward structure can jeopardize or support a particular source of wealth—school-university collaboration.

In speaking of the faculty reward structure, we must begin with a basic assumption—namely, the continued existence of the structure itself. The reward structure in higher education, as in virtually all aspects of life, can be altered, but it cannot be renounced entirely. What we need to talk about is whether a given structure does what we want, and, if it doesn't, how a better structure would better meet our needs.

A shift in university mission from teaching and service to research necessitates a shift in the reward structure for those who have a major role in meeting that mission. Research production and obtaining extramural funding become the bases for rewards, rather than teaching and, even less so, service and working with community agencies. These changes in reward structure were observed in the course of our Study of the Education of Educators and are supported by the findings of other researchers. During visits to twenty-nine institutions, Study researchers asked hundreds of faculty members what it would take these days for an assistant professor to get tenure and promotion. The responses from faculty members in all types of institutions, ranging from large research sites to regional universities to former normal schools to private liberal arts colleges, were much the same.

One faculty member summed up the entire business in a few words: "It's generate dollars, which will translate into research where publications will accrue." Another explained the matter this way:

Research and writing is the only way you get promoted, but it's not enough to write for the field—you have to write for your colleagues. We had a man in math ed who didn't get promoted because he just published in teacher education magazines.

Another faculty member suggested that "There's more emphasis on research and publications. Our dean favors those who do research and get grants. There's a tendency to look for new people with long publication lists."

Although some reward structures are reported as vague, others appear to have a certain precision on the face of it:

You want to know how it works? Okay. If you get in [names a leading journal] that's 4 points. [Names another leading journal] is 3 points, a journal like [names journal oriented to applied high school teaching] is the lowest—that gets you 1 point. If you're second author, only half the points.

The current reward structure has particular consequences for education faculty members who might wish to conduct at least part of their work in the schools. Some of these consequences were considered at length in the course of a recent evaluation study of school-university partnerships, conducted by the Center for Educational Renewal. The study focused on twelve partnerships in as many states, linked together by membership in the National Network for Educational Renewal. The Network, created by Center Director John I. Goodlad some five years ago, has as its major guiding principle the need for simultaneous renewal of K-12 schools and teacher preparation. Such a principle eschews the traditional noblesse oblige role of universities "helping" schools, or using the schools as sites for student teaching or obtaining research data for faculty interests. The principle of simultaneous renewal, with its clear implications for faculty involvement in schools in new ways, provided the framework for the Center's evaluation study of school-university partnerships. How were faculty members involved in the partnership activities? Given the change in norms—e.g., from distanced data gatherer to at once giver and receiver willy-nilly in the thrall of gritty public schooling—how did faculty members fare? What kinds of support did they perceive themselves receiving from their institutions? How were they working with K-12 educators, and how were K-12 educators in turn becoming involved in renewal of teacher preparation programs? Data pertaining to these and related questions were sought in interviews with faculty members at the twelve Network school-university partnerships during on-site visits in the 1988-1989 academic year.

As might be expected, little new was reported to the researchers. At each of the partnerships, one finds education faculty members who find it exciting and professionally and personally rewarding to work in K-12 settings with educator/colleagues on problems of mutual concern. The work is difficult, involving considerable commitments of time. And the work is difficult, too, because of the norm of give-and-take, rather than noblesse oblige dispensation of expertise. Other articles in this issue make the same point. These difficulties are exacerbated considerably, however, by the current reward structure commonly found in the partnership institutions of higher education. In each of the sites, researchers talked with faculty members

who have had to curtail their involvement in partnership activities because of the immediate and perceived future harm to their academic careers. Faculty members report that they are advised by academic administrators and other colleagues to focus on individual research projects leading to articles and books. Under the current reward structure, denial of tenure is a very real possibility for many assistant professors who indulge in anything other than research.

Another caveat is in order at this point. It should be noted that not all faculty members object equally to the current reward structure. Observations during both the Study of the Education of Educators and the school-university partnership evaluation study suggest that some faculty members use the reward structure as an excuse to avoid mucking about in the confusing and bothersome business of K-12 schools. "I would dearly love to become involved," we were told on many occasions, "but what with the new emphasis on research and publication at this university, I dare not do aught but my writing." So the argument would run and in some cases would be found a true bill. But other instances must give us pause. When a tenured faculty member is doing little in the way of research and writing, yet claims that the reward structure prevents involvement in K-12 schools, the structure seems more an excuse than a true impediment.

***The current university
reward structure is a major
impediment to effective
school/university
partnerships.***

This caveat notwithstanding, it is clear that the current reward structure is a major impediment to effective school-university partnerships and the simultaneous renewal of K-12 schools and teacher preparation programs. The reward structure, as I have stated, cannot be renounced. But it can be altered. The question is how to change it, how to work around it, how to make it more reasonable. What kind of reward structure should we have? How should we give social and economic meaning to the work that faculty members do? In effect, how do we put this kind of work (working with schools in simultaneous renewal) into some sort of form so we can talk about it in common terms?

If we are to change the reward structure to one more appropriate to the kinds of work faculty members might be involved in, we need to address a number of related topics:

- First, we need to shift our time perspective from short-term to long-term. Much of the work growing out of collaborative efforts necessarily takes place over a period of years. I have been observing one school-university partnership in particular since its inception some five years ago, and only recently have I been thinking that it may be time to write an analysis. In a collaborative effort, there can be no quick turnaround of numerous articles in short order,

based on what might be ephemeral effects. Rather, the emphasis must be on the definitive outcomes that emerge only slowly, on the impact over the longer term. We must establish that one substantial article is worth more than three superficial ones.

- Second, we need to consider a variety of methodologies, a variety of means of doing this business of scholarly inquiry. We need to understand that case studies, action research, and observation can yield valid data, along with the more traditional research designs. We need to find different ways of talking about what we are doing, what we are finding.
- Third, we need to reconsider the bias against multiple authorship. We still find the single-authored manuscript more valued than sharing credit among two or more collaborators, as indicated, for example, in the earlier quote: half the points for each of two authors. We must understand that there is nothing inherently wrong with joint efforts, and we simply cannot reduce the value of an activity and diminish its reward because of collaboration.
- Fourth, we need to reconsider the kinds of people a faculty member might be collaborating with, both in inquiry and reporting the results of that inquiry. We are talking here about working and collaborating with K–12 educators, not just other faculty folk.
- Fifth, we need to reconsider the places where reports and articles are to appear. It makes little sense to insist that only a few, select refereed journals are worthy, or that articles in practice-oriented journals are of little account in promotion and tenure decisions. We must broaden our notions of acceptable media without lowering our standards for professional reporting.
- Sixth, we need to reconsider the ways in which faculty document their activities and disseminate their results. A colleague of mine has devoted hundreds of hours to a partnership task force, developing a conceptual framework of the intertwined issues of equity and excellence. How is this sort of work to be documented and included in his vita in such a way as to avoid looking like he is padding?
- Seventh and probably most important: on a more basic level, we need to consider broad, even more perplexing questions about the definition of scholarly work. Every article focused on the theme in this issue of *Metropolitan Universities* argues that collaborative work with the schools is a worthy task for our institutions and their faculties. But is such work worthy, in itself, as a scholarly activity? How are we to judge its suitability for reward, assuming that we need an assurance of some sort of rigor, some way to reward the quality, rather than assume that quantity is all that matters? Are there not distinctions to be made about such work, distinctions in terms of originality, thoroughness, use of up-to-date information and state-of-the-art methodology, skill in analyzing situations, and in analyzing and presenting results? How, then, are these attributes to be documented and evaluated? Must the work necessarily result in some form of dissemination to be shared (and judged) by others? Or must one insist on something beyond the collaborative work itself, a set of metastatements about the work through which it is to be interpreted and explicated?

These and related questions must be addressed if we are to try, once again, changing the reward structure. To do so will be difficult and tedious, what with time-honored and hoary traditions of research and publication, institutional inertia, and the high need for stability in human existence. More than that, change will be controversial and painful, because there always will be those who, in various subtle ways, will let it be known that to change the reward structure is to lower standards in order to assure that incompetents will get by. To respond to these attacks is enervating and unproductive; but to refuse to respond is to invite festering resentment and confusion. What adds to the difficulty are the not-always-acknowledged insecurities of many faculty members. Strong resistance to changing the reward structure comes from those who reason thusly: "What I did to become validated as a professor is what everyone else must do: it cannot be otherwise without calling into question my own validation."

Given these difficulties, one might reasonably ask if the game is worth the candle. Why should the reward structure be changed merely because some people say it is important for schools and universities to collaborate on their mutual renewal? One reason we could posit for the need to change is ethical. Schools and universities should work together, and faculty should be rewarded for their part of the collaboration, on the grounds that such work and rewards will result in a better society, one more likely to be just and decent. But there is another argument that might have a more direct appeal, one that is circumstantial and politically practical, but, in the end, also ethical. What might this argument look like?

By this argument, the wealth of a university (at least what we might properly call a metropolitan university) comes from collaborating with other agencies in the community and meeting the needs of a variety of

***There is an exchange
relationship between
university and community,
which is a source
of strength for the
university and which it
ignores at its peril.***

local constituencies. More specifically, a metropolitan university might reasonably include, as a central part of its mission, a teacher preparation program intertwined with a school-university partnership for the betterment of schools and the betterment of those who would teach in them. (It should be stressed, of course, that institutions not wishing to make a full commitment to teacher preparation in all of its dimensions would be better off not getting involved in the first place.) The preparation of teachers is a local affair, with most seeking credentials coming from within the confines of a hundred-mile radius of a given campus. Schooling, too, is a local affair, funded in very large part by the state and through local tax measures.

This entire journal, *Metropolitan Universities*, is dedicated to a new vision

of the university, one more fitting than the traditional one to societal needs. What is more fitting for a metropolitan university than interactive involvement in the affairs of K–12 schooling and teacher preparation? It is this sort of collaboration that the public can rightfully expect of the institutions it supports. It is this sort of collaboration that represents the true source of wealth for the metropolitan university, wherein something of value is produced within the local community to stay within the local community. There is an exchange relationship that thus obtains between the university and the community, which is a source of strength for the university and which it ignores at its peril.

A metropolitan university that ignores this source and plumps instead for research institute status, in effect says to the community: “We will accept your support and will take in your sons and daughters. But as to the quality of their education, and to the education of future teachers, and especially as to the condition of your elementary and secondary schools, we will give these matters little attention, because we have better things to do. We search for new knowledge, the benefits of which will trickle down to you in due time.”

Clearly, such an argument will have little long-term appeal and will, in the end, result in alienation, anger, and lack of support. By refusing commitment to the exchange relationship, the institution engenders a sense of unfairness, a sense of not getting a proper return. The community will, through its regulatory and budgetary agencies, retaliate with inappropriate accountability measures, meddling in the curriculum, and general curtailment of academic freedom. When the institution gives in to this kind of external intrusion, it ceases to be a source of critical objectivity and a source of new knowledge, and becomes a passive producer of whatever state bureaucrats and politicians happen to want at the time. Far from making the institution more responsive to the needs of the community and the schools, such external intrusion makes it impossible for the institution to respond at all.

Much is at stake here. When metropolitan universities pull down the curtains to avoid what is thought of as the gloomy squalor of teaching, preparation of teachers, and public school renewal, they may pride themselves, as did Queen Victoria, in their refusal to acknowledge the source of their wealth. But such pride has a price—the very existence of the critical function of the university. It is thus that the argument from circumstance for involvement with teaching, teacher preparation, and public schools is, in the end, an ethical argument after all. The university is ethically obligated to meet the needs of the students and the larger community; it cannot do so if it has allowed itself to have its critical function destroyed because it failed to meet those needs. Accordingly, on both prudent and ethical grounds, it is far better to know the source of one’s wealth, accede to it, develop a reward structure based on it, and proceed in a manner more fitting to fulfill the exchange relationship with one’s community.

Suggested Readings

Goodlad, John I., ed. *The Ecology of School Renewal, Eighty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Goodlad, John I. *Teachers For Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: Forms of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1954.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A., and John I. Goodlad, eds. *School-Community Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Eight occasional papers reporting and analyzing aspects of school-university collaborative efforts are available from the Center for Educational Renewal, Miller Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.