Inspiring Leadership | **Leadership Foundation** for Higher Education

Rewarding and recognising academic citizenship

Bruce Macfarlane, University of Bristol and Damon Burg, University of Southampton

University of **BRISTOL**

UNIVERSITY OF **Southampton**

Inspiring Leadership | **Leadership Foundation** for Higher Education

Prepared for:
The Leadership Foundation

Report date:
01/07/18

Small Development Projects

Small development projects (SDPs) were first launched in 2004 - shortly after the creation of the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Since then they have proven to be very popular and have introduced a range of innovative activities of benefit to higher education.

Bruce Macfarlane, **University of Bristol** and Damon Burg, **University of Southampton**

Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction and background

Academic citizenship is a term widely used in higher education to refer to those activities distinct from research and teaching that support and offer services to both the university and wider society. It covers both academic and professional disciplines. An increasing number of institutions are referring to academic citizenship in their reward and recognition policies for academic staff. However, there is a need to understand better how academic citizenship is being defined in theory and how policies are operating in practice within the context of a rapidly changing higher education environment.

Project objectives

The study sought to analyse the ways in which higher education institutions (HEIs) conceptualise and operationalise policies in respect to academic citizenship in rewarding and recognising academic staff.

The objectives of the project were to:

▌ Produce a guide to good practice in recognising and rewarding academic citizenship, directly informing the development of HR/workforce policies based on national and international exemplars.

▌ Develop discussion tools of relevance to both national and international delegates in leadership and management programmes thereby supporting the then Leadership Foundation's objectives and mission.

▌ Through the dissemination strategy, influence wider debate at the national and international level concerning the role of academic citizenship.

Research methods

A review of the literature on academic citizenship was conducted along with a search of institutional websites as a means to understand conceptual issues and map different approaches in defining and implementing relevant policies. The policies of 15 higher education institutions (HEIs) who formally reward and recognise academic citizenship were analysed and field visits made to a further five HEIs – four from the UK and one from Australia. These HEIs were representative of a range of university traditions including teaching-led, research-intensive and professionally focused institutions. Thematic analysis was undertaken to identify commonalities between policies and identify barriers to their effective implementation. A guide to good practice to inform policy formation was produced together with discussion tools intended as learning materials suitable for staff and educational development purposes.

Key findings

Universities are adopting four main approaches in incorporating academic citizenship into their reward and recognition strategies: 1) as a mainline criteria; 2) as a second-level criteria; 3) as a stand-alone award; and 4) as a required behaviour.

There is often a failure to adequately define academic citizenship and a bias toward interpretation of this term largely in the context of internal service. A confusion of terminology in respect to the third leg of the academic role – aside from research and teaching – adds to the imprecise use of the phrase. There is an allied tendency to negatively frame academic citizenship as a potential absence, with the focus on academic staff who are perceived as poor academic citizens. This has led to academic citizenship being treated as a benchmark expectation rather than an area in which excellence should be encouraged. If academics are perceived to fall short of benchmark expectations this can result in decisions to block or delay promotion opportunities. This negative framing may be connected to the growing performative pressures on academic life within the higher education sector. Ensuring that academic citizenship is adequately recognised and rewarded should also play a positive role in the context of gender equality.

Resources and tools

The study includes a guide to good practice and three discussion tools that have been developed as an interactive learning and teaching resource for leadership and management training and development purposes.

Recommendations

It is recommended that HEIs:

1) Define academic citizenship more clearly and comprehensively by reference to both internal and external service work, identifying a wide range of examples to enable academic staff to comprehend the scope of this expectation.

2) Frame academic citizenship as a positive behavioural norm that is treated as equivalent in status to research and teaching rather than as a behavioural deficit, lack of evidence in respect to which might hold back promotion prospects.

3) Encourage academic staff to be well-rounded academic citizens active in respect to both internal and external service.

4) Pay explicit attention to issues of equity and collegiality that can arise from differentiated, hierarchically based expectations with respect to academic citizenship.

5) Monitor the extent to which formal academic citizenship responsibilities, such as programme and module leadership and other administrative duties, are fairly divided between men and women as part of a commitment to gender equality. ■

01 Introduction and background

'Academic citizenship' refers to a set of attitudes and activities connected to internal and external service work supporting the infrastructure of academic life and the wider civic mission of the university (Macfarlane, 2007a; 2008; Nixon, 2008). It plays a vital role in community cohesion both within and without the university and been described as "the intertwining of participation in, engagement between, and mutual responsibility of, universities and society." (Nørgård and Bengtsen, 2016, 4). More simply it can be understood as all the activities that academics undertake that are not directly connected with their own research or teaching activities.

Academic citizenship consists of a very wide variety of activities such as personal tutoring of students, mentoring colleagues, serving on university committees, undertaking leadership and management roles within the university, acting as a peer reviewer for an academic journal or funding body, working as an external examiner, organising a conference for a professional or academic society, editing a journal, or serving on a public committee of enquiry. These are just examples of the breadth of work, both within and without the university, undertaken by academics.

However, there is widespread concern that academic citizenship is withering due to the effects of performativity on the nature of modern academic life (Havergal, 2015). Peer review, for example, is a voluntary and unpaid activity that helps to sustain academic publication. The system is under strain though, in part due to "a performance evaluation system that rewards publications as academic scholarship while rendering invisible a fundamental component in the production of that scholarship" (Dean and Foray, 2018, 1). Here the concern being expressed is that academics are now less willing to give up time for review activities when their productivity and performance in research and teaching are being more closely evaluated. The global market for academic labour has reframed academic life and placed an ever-greater emphasis on research (Rhoads and Szelényi, 2009). The decision to remove esteem indicators

from the Research Excellence Framework in 2014 may also have undermined commitment to activities that previously would have 'counted' in this periodic evaluation of research quality in UK universities.

Much of the literature adopts a tone of lamentation about the way academic citizenship has "declined" (Thompson et al, 2005, 127) over a long period of time constituting what Dean and Foray (2018, 1) refer to as a "long goodbye". It is widely acknowledged that the displacement of academic self-governance with a more managerial style of leadership in universities can be associated with the decline of academic citizenship. This implies that fewer individuals are now required to participate in activities core to the academic unit and institutional context, leading to a disengagement of many academic staff in the process. The declining proportion of academic staff on so-called 'all-round' academic contracts to teach, research and perform other administrative, management and service duties is in evidence in both the UK and Australia. This 'unbundling' of the academic profession (Macfarlane, 2011) indicates that there are now fewer individuals who see academic citizenship as one of their core activities. Such concerns are not confined to the UK but are expressed by scholars on an international basis, especially in North America and Australasia. Others go further in arguing that academic citizenship, as defined largely as internally directed activities within the university, has a negative impact on individual research productivity and, in turn, career and promotion outcomes (Bergeron et al, 2014). There is certainly a widespread impression that good academic citizens do not get promoted because of a lack of recognition for these types of activities (Bacon, 2014).

Despite the concerns expressed in the literature, the attitudes and activities associated with academic citizenship are central to institutional success, student satisfaction and community cohesion. Yet, activities contributing to these goals are often challenging for HEIs to evidence (Macfarlane, 2007b). This is partly due to the increasing emphasis on performance indicators in relation

to teaching and research and the conventional absence of comparable direct evidence in relation to academic citizenship. Moreover, although academic citizenship may be broken down into a series of tangible activities (eg personal tutoring, mentoring colleagues, etc), they are also closely connected with behaviours and attitudes of a less tangible nature making it harder to evaluate and evidence. In many respects the French expression esprit de corps, meaning a sense of shared pride and loyalty to the group, encapsulates the intangibility of academic citizenship.

Despite these challenges, a growing number of HEIs in the UK and internationally have incorporated recognition of academic citizenship within their appraisal and performance frameworks. These include, among others, Manchester Metropolitan University, the University of York and the University of Birmingham. Internationally, in addition to the mainstream evaluation of academic citizenship contributions, some institutions have implemented staff awards (eg University of Witwatersrand, South Africa; Harvard University, USA) and modules within academic staff development programmes (eg University of Auckland, New Zealand). These institutional initiatives point to the growing recognition of the importance of academic citizenship indicating the need for a systematic analysis of evidence as to how universities define, evaluate and reward academic citizenship as part of their third mission.

However, there is still some scepticism as to whether academic citizenship or service (as it is widely referred to in a North American context) is afforded equivalent status to teaching and research. In the US, service has long been described as the short leg of the three-legged stool (Ward, 2003) while others have used the metaphor of a "third poor cousin" (Brew et al, 2017). The intensification of academic work and the disaggregation of the academic profession, especially in the context of the research-focused university, means that those who perform most of the service work may even constitute a distinct group, recently identified as 'academic artisans' (Brew et al, 2017).

In reward and recognition schemes a lot of attention is normally devoted to (re)balancing the status of research and teaching. Over the last 20 years considerable efforts have been expended on seeking to raise the status of teaching following the recommendation of the Dearing report (NCIHE, 1997) in a UK context. Similar efforts have taken place internationally, influenced in part by the scholarship of learning and teaching movement, which is

mainly based in the United States. However, these efforts have tended to dominate the debate at the expense of focusing on academic citizenship. ■

02 Research approach

This project explored how HEIs define and interpret academic citizenship where this appears within their reward and recognition structures for academic staff, identified different approaches to policy, and evaluated the complexities and challenges connected with its implementation. The human resource (HR) policies of 20 selected HEIs were analysed and interviews held with expert informants in both HR and senior academic management positions at five of these institutions. The first stage of this work involved identifying institutions that included academic citizenship (or proxy terms including 'service') within their workforce policies. The second stage involved making field visits to selected institutions as a means of collecting more fine grained practice-based evidence, including selectively interviewing key informants in senior HR and university management roles as appropriate. Skype interviews were also used for international sites.

A small number of selected higher education institutions (HEIs) participated directly in this project on the basis of their willingness to discuss their current policies with respect to academic citizenship. These five HEIs – four from the UK and one from Australia – were representative of a range of university traditions including teaching-led, research-intensive, and professionally focused institutions. The key informants were either directors (or deputy directors) of human resources (HR) or a pro-vice-chancellor at one of the HEIs. The institutions were anonymised on the basis of their locational distinctiveness, as follows:

❚ Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university

❚ Associate director of human resources, Midlands university

❚ Director of human resources, Northern city university

❚ Director of human resources, Northern county university

❚ Deputy director of human resources, Scottish university

The policies of a larger pool of 15 further institutions were identified and drawn on within this study (eg University of Bristol, University of York, etc). The names of these institutions have not been anonymised as their policy statements in respect to academic citizenship are available publicly via the internet. The analysis contained in this report is based on documentary analysis and interviews with key informants as a means of identifying overarching themes.

The third stage of the project involved developing a short guide to good practice (see appendix 1) and three discussion tools based on both background literature and institutional practices. In order to engage leadership and management learners, the discussion tools included stimulus questions that ask potential participants to evaluate the implications of developing reward and recognition for academic citizenship. ◼

03 Analysis of findings

Approaches to policy implementation

Universities adopt a range of approaches in defining, interpreting and implementing reward and recognition structures with respect to academic citizenship. Four main approaches were identified as a result of an extensive review of over 100 institutional websites and five field visits.

1. **Academic citizenship as a mainline criteria**

   These universities list academic citizenship as one of the mainline criteria within their reward and recognition systems. Institutions normally adopt three mainline criteria with research and teaching (both broadly defined) as two of these three criteria. A wide variety of terms are used to describe the third element including 'knowledge transfer', 'knowledge exchange', 'administration', 'service' and so on. Examples of HEIs adopting this approach include the Universities of Birmingham, Exeter [up to senior lecturer level], Manchester Metropolitan [at professorial level], Nottingham and York.

2. **Academic citizenship as a second level criteria**

   It is comparatively rare for academic citizenship to be classified as a mainline criteria on a par with teaching and research. It more usually appears as a second-level criteria with a lower comparative level of recognition. Here, the term often appears as a constituent element of other mainline criteria, such as leadership. Institutions that adopt this approach include the universities of Bristol, Portsmouth and Western Australia.

3. **Recognition via stand-alone institutional awards**

   A third approach used by a number of institutions is to recognise academic citizenship via a stand-alone staff award or special one-off payments.

These awards are separate from the mainstream academic promotion system. Stand-alone awards are promoted as part of the university's strategy and in recognition of outstanding individuals (or small groups) who are identified as role models of academic citizenship. Stand-alone awards can be found at Royal Holloway University of London, Harvard University in the US, and the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa.

4. **Classification as a required behaviour without explicit reward**

   In this final category, academic citizenship is not explicitly rewarded but is identified in HR policies as a required behaviour of all academic staff. This is essentially a statement of expectation and no positive reward is attached. However, indirectly, such a policy can potentially influence promotion decisions where it might be deemed that a member of academic staff has not (yet) met the institutional benchmark for academic citizenship. Institutions adopting this approach include the 'Midlands university' and the 'Northern city university', two of the institutions whose identity was anonymised.

Issues of definition

A number of observations can be made in respect to the way in which academic citizenship is defined by HEIs. There is a fuzziness or lack of clarity in the way in which many institutions define this term. Some make no attempt to define it at all, leading to a negative framing of academic citizenship as a behavioural deficit. Institutions that identify the need for academic citizenship as a required behaviour often identified a 'lack' of collegiality as a problem among some academic staff. Another reason why academic citizenship is left undefined in policies is that the term is incorporated as a second or even third level phrase under other mainline terms, such as leadership or enterprise. This means that the expression is cited very often without explicit definition.

[Sector agency leader A]

"We don't have an actual definition… it is about engagement in the whole life, work and activity of the university and also our external engagement."
(Director of human resources, Northern city university)

"Well I don't know whether the university has a definition written down anywhere."
(Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university)

"An expectation of 'good citizenship' is a relevant factor within the criterion of excellence in the role, primarily in the sense that there will be a negative impact for anyone who is regarded as a 'bad citizen'. 'Good citizenship' is defined as "a willingness to be involved in all those aspects of school, faculty or university life normally expected as a matter of course from academic staff". It should be noted that excellent citizenship will not be a compensatory factor where academic performance does not meet the minimum required standard."
(University of Bristol, 2017: paragraph 3.1.5)

The different approaches to inclusion and recognition of academic citizenship may be a reason, in part, for the fuzziness in definition. However, this does not explain why universities do not have an internal working definition for academic citizenship. This appears to be based largely on tacit knowledge of what the term means along with an emphasis on internal service. Several universities though have recently reworked their academic reward schemes to include academic citizenship.

"One significant thing however we've just done is to revise our and pretty well revolutionise the criteria that we use for promotion and it now has a much bigger emphasis on both leadership and citizenship than previous."
(Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university)

It needs to be acknowledged that the plethora of terminology used to describe the 'third leg' of the academic role acts as a further barrier to clarity of understanding. Terms such as 'external engagement', 'leadership' and 'enterprise' are frequently used that incorporate forms of academic citizenship, both internal and external to the institution.

Negative framing

There was a recognition that universities need to better evaluate the work that their academic staff are performing, beyond research and teaching.

"What we've done is, rather than providing a checklist for anybody because we recognise that there's very diverse patterns of activities that all academics have."
(Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university)

This shift is also a practical one in as much as essential university work that requires academic staff to participate (eg recruitment, promotion and marketing, developing links with employers, etc) may not be addressed if rewards are entirely focused on research or teaching. However, this concern has led some institutions to frame academic citizenship negatively as something that 'must get done' rather than as an activity that deserves positive recognition. Certain individuals are tagged as a problem and lacking in collegiality as opposed to a focus on the many who are satisfactory, good or even excellent academic citizens. This has led to academic citizenship being seen as a benchmark activity that some academic staff do not contribute to adequately. If benchmark expectations are not met it is common for institutions to look to punish these academic staff by turning down their applications for promotion even if they have demonstrated excellence in other areas of their work (ie teaching and research).

"Normally it's the absence of citizenship that blocks people from progressing, however good they are at the other things. So in some ways it's more important but you won't get promoted on it alone."
(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)

"I think the previous system, because of that really incentivised selfishness because people would just focus on their own CV and their own research."
(Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university)

A large part of the reason for the negative framing of academic citizenship, as conveyed by key informants, is that HEIs feel that a culture has developed, connected with performativity and neo-liberalism in the modern university, whereby academics have focused excessively on their research activities, principally research grants and publications, at the expense of the academic citizenship work that the university needs in order to function well.

When asked if academic citizenship is as important as research and teaching, the response from key informants was not positive.

"No, I mean I think it's just one of the requirements of the role that we have."
(Director of human resources, Northern city university)

"I think in terms of the status of the activity we haven't probably got to the point at which people think either that's equal in terms of its status or its attraction."
(Director of human resources, Northern county university)

This attitude leads to a sense that the academic citizenship work often gets pushed to a few eager, willing or simply more acquiescent academics that take on more than their fair share. However, although this situation is widely recognised, the approach taken to academic citizenship appears to be more 'stick' than 'carrot'. This is illustrated by the way in which some universities look to block or delay promotion on the grounds of a lack of academic citizenship.

Informing someone that they have not been successful in gaining a promotion is never an easy conversation. However, when this has occurred on the basis of a perceived shortcoming in respect to academic citizenship it is potentially a much harder conversation. Rather than pointing to, for example, a need to improve student feedback data or increase research grant income in relation to teaching and research, refusal on the grounds of academic citizenship may be seen as a much more personal judgement about an individual's character and also, probably, harder to evidence as well.

"Well I guess the people who are judged as not being good citizens never take that news well. It does mean… it's quite hard, it's much less personal to say 'you haven't been promoted because you haven't got enough research publications', that's something far more objective. Whereas if you say 'you've just not been very helpful to colleagues' or 'you've not offered to take on roles', that's a much harder message to deliver and receive. So yes it has the impact on the individual feeling less. Some of them turn it round and then start volunteering for things, so it's not a full stop."
(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)

The negative framing of academic citizenship needs to be understood in the context of the rapidly changing landscape of higher education. This has only comparatively recently brought in its wake more penetrative analysis and measurement of academic work

including the development of workload models. Such models tend to focus largely on the teaching function and, to some extent, on significant administrative and managerial tasks in relation to both teaching and research. Wider aspects of service that are lower in esteem and harder to measure than department or faculty-wide leadership roles, such as mentoring colleagues or advising students, are rarely included in workload models. A key informant highlighted the way in which measures of success are more tangible than judgments that might be made about contributions to academic citizenship.

"I think it's more qualitative than quantitative. So, for example, when we've been looking at things like research, some of the indicators you can get with publications, you can look at the journals around, you can look at research applications and awards and get kind of hard figures for that. Again, there's more of a judgement around that because people may be contributing to things, or members of committees, but it's much more intangible in terms of what their individual contributions are and how you quantify that and how you make the comparability between one contribution in one area and one in another."
(Deputy director of human resources, Scottish university)

Internal and external service

Another important observation is that academic citizenship is predominantly interpreted by HEIs in terms of internal service rather than external service. Internal service in relation to academic citizenship refers to work carried out within the institutional context such as membership of key committees and working groups, mentoring of departmental colleagues, and leadership roles in relation to teaching and research. External service refers to work conducted in the wider academic and civic context including chairing academic conferences and other work in relation to scholarly societies, reviewing and refereeing activity for journals and grant awarding bodies, external examining, and serving as an expert on a public committee of enquiry.

The definitions adopted by 'Northern county university', 'Northern city university', and 'Midlands university' were largely oriented toward institutional or internal level activities only. Some other universities, especially those committed to more prominent recognition of academic citizenship within their policies, offer a more rounded definition with a stronger emphasis on external as well as internal service. The emphasis on internal service was apparent both in written documentation and in interviews with key informants.

Typical comments justifying this emphasis included:

"It's a bit about recognising that these are important things for the academic staff to engage in and that they're important in terms of the running of the university."
(Deputy director of human resources, Scottish university)

"Citizenship is, the definition for us, we always refer to doing things which are of more benefit to the organisation."
(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)

As these comments suggest, part of the reasoning for focusing on internal service is that these activities are seen as more directly and immediately beneficial to the university. Like most organisations, universities have a natural inclination to prioritise rewarding work that directly helps them function. Internal service is also something that is easier to evidence and evaluate whereas external service can appear less tangible. Academic line managers will be more aware of who is serving on a university committee or in a leadership role within the department rather than serving in similar capacities for, say, an academic society or performing other service roles, such as editing a journal within a scholarly community, externally. Further, with universities becoming more business oriented in their management and corporate structures it is perhaps unsurprising that reward and recognition systems tend to value internal over external service. However, universities still benefit, both in terms of prestige and in demonstrating their contribution to wider civic society, via the external service work of academic staff.

This is not to say that universities do not recognise that academic staff perform external service, to academic societies for example, but that this is sometimes categorised differently or given comparatively less emphasis, especially within appraisal and staff review documents. A key informant at one of the selected HEIs spoke of the way in which such activities are categorised as 'external engagement'.

"Currently we've split out two things which have previously been mashed together. External engagement we split out, which we talk about engagement with industry, professions, public sector bodies, policymakers, things like that. We count that as external engagement, not citizenship."
(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)

External service activities tend to have a higher relative status than most internal service (Macfarlane, 2007a). They indicate ways in which the prestige of recognition is accorded to individual academics, and by extension, their university (Blackmore, 2016). External service work can play an important supporting role in making a case for a promotion to reader or professor, indicating that the individual is held in high esteem through external examinerships or invitations to give keynote lectures, for example. In the UK, the appointment of main panel chairs for the Research Excellence Framework for 2021 is an example of prestigious and influential external service work appointments bringing benefits for HEIs in terms of soft power and improved tacit knowledge. Moreover, some external service work, such as consultancy, can generate income for individuals and their institutions. Prestigious external service roles are not always remunerated though, or only a token payment is made (eg external examining). As a result, universities rarely pay explicit attention to external service in relation to academic workload.

A distinction between 'locals' and 'cosmopolitans' may be made between employees in most organisations (Merton, 1947). 'Locals' tend to be loyal, long serving members of staff with high levels of tacit knowledge about how the organisation works and with a reference group largely consisting of colleagues working for the same organisation. 'Cosmopolitans', by contrast, normally have higher levels of professional qualification, are more closely connected with members of an outer reference group and are likely to be more mobile. The distinction between locals and cosmopolitans has been applied to academics working in higher education (eg Gouldner, 1957; Goldberg, 1976) with cosmopolitans identified as those who prioritised research, were well connected to members of their disciplinary community outside their institution, and would tend to know fewer colleagues within their institutions. Locals were characterised as more teaching focused whereas cosmopolitans tended to be more research oriented.

This analysis remains relevant for understanding academic citizenship since most universities place greater emphasis on internal service in recognising academic citizenship benefiting locals in the process. Cosmopolitans may interpret academic citizenship more readily in terms of external service. If institutional policies exclude this area of work from their definition then this might lead to cosmopolitans being more readily identified as lacking in 'collegiality'. Setting expectations in relation to both internal and external service would

accommodate both locals and cosmopolitans and help to extend understandings of their role in the process, ideally creating what Goldberg (1976) referred to as 'cosmo-locals'. It is important to encourage a balance between internal and external contributions to ensure that academics remain active and connected across the piece.

Differentiated expectations and equity issues

Activities recognised under the banner of academic citizenship can vary considerably in terms of prestige or status. While advising students or personal tutoring may make an important contribution to the university, a considerably higher status is attached to being invited to give a keynote at an international conference or acting as an expert advisor to government or a respected international organisation. As academics progress through their careers one might reasonably expect that opportunities to perform more prestigious, external service roles will occur. However, should this mean that more senior academics might, as a result, perform less in the way of internal service roles than more junior colleagues?

A small minority of the institutions selected for inclusion in this study set differentiated expectations in relation to academic citizenship across academic levels. These indicate that more junior academic staff (eg lecturers/assistant professors) may be expected to perform more internal service work such as student advising while more senior staff (eg professors) will be expending more time and effort on external service roles. The University of Exeter recognises academic citizenship as a mainline criteria for promotion through to senior lecturer level. At associate professor and full professorial level, though, the term 'academic leadership' is used to describe activities that are increasingly external or outward facing. The University of York provides another example. It delineates three levels of expectations in respect to academic citizenship linked to different academic ranks or levels. Level 1 (lecturers or assistant professors) includes pastoral responsibilities for students. However, this expectation disappears by level 3, which describes the kinds of activities that a professor might perform. While transparency with respect to expectations is important, the risk here is that differentiating them in this manner can reinforce a divide between academic staff based on levels of experience and seniority and potentially cause a hollowing out of collegiality in the process leading to a culture where senior academic staff withdraw from more

lowly esteemed, internal service roles (Massy, Wilger and Colbeck, 1994).

A final but extremely important aspect in the development of policies in academic citizenship relates to ensuring that expectations in relation to academic citizenship apply equally to both men and women. The literature on higher education has identified the way in which the expectation to perform low esteem service work can often fall disproportionately on the shoulders of women. The phrase 'academic housework' (Heijstra et al, 2017) is a self-mocking pejorative that has been used to describe this phenomenon. Several studies show that these greater expectations can seriously delay the career progression of women (eg Misra et al, 2011). Any policy in relation to academic citizenship needs to be cognisant of this research and the risk to gender equity which it implies if such work is not explicitly recognised and rewarded.

Given the propensity for women to contribute strongly to academic citizenship, rewarding this activity explicitly should have a positive impact on closing the gender gap in terms of promotion prospects. It is promising that this is a point that some of our key informants highlighted.

"We tried to ensure that from a diversity point of view we were acknowledging this important activity that takes place, some of which tends to be undertaken by females, for example."
(Director of human resources, Northern county university)

"I think we're hoping that we will, firstly from a gender equity perspective, very much thinking that this will help redress our gender diversity gap, because we think that the sorts of things we are valuing, explicitly valuing more, often tend to be done by women."
(Pro-vice-chancellor, Australian university)

The second of these key informants went on to state that the introduction of the new policy in relation to academic citizenship in their HEI (as a mainline criteria) had coincided with a large increase in the proportion of women applying for promotion. This is a hopeful sign that the explicit recognition of academic citizenship may be having a positive impact in terms of equity. ◼

04 Resources and tools

The project objectives are designed to benefit the higher education sector and Leadership Foundation (now Advance-HE) members through a guide to good practice (see Appendix 1) and the production of three discussion tools. These are designed to aid the development of university policy development. They are also intended to have an impact more widely and to provide learning materials of relevance to international participants in Advance-HE programmes. ■

05 Recommendations

The following recommendations are intended for university human resource professionals and academic staff with senior managerial responsibilities for reward and recognition policies. They may be of further interest to Athena SWAN committees, faculty deans and heads of department where support structures and mentoring schemes are important in encouraging individual academics to apply for promotion.

HEIs need to:

1) Define academic citizenship more clearly and comprehensively by reference to both internal and external service work, identifying a wide range of examples to enable academic staff to comprehend the scope of this expectation.

2) Frame academic citizenship as a positive behavioural norm that is treated as equivalent in status to research and teaching rather than as a negative behavioural deficit, lack of evidence in respect to which might hold back promotion prospects.

3) Encourage academic staff to be well-rounded academic citizens active in respect to both internal and external service.

4) Pay explicit attention to issues of equity and collegiality that can arise from differentiated, hierarchically based expectations with respect to academic citizenship.

5) Monitor the extent to which formal academic citizenship responsibilities, such as programme and module leadership and other administrative duties, are fairly divided between men and women as part of a commitment to gender equality. ∎

References

Bacon, E. (2014) *Neo-collegiality: Restoring engagement in the managerial university.* Stimulus Paper. London: London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Bergeron, D., Ostroff, C., Schroeder, T. and Block, C. (2014) 'The dual effects of organizational citizenship behavior: Relationships to research productivity and career outcomes in academe', *Human Performance*, 27: 99-128.

Blackmore, P.D. (2016) *The role of prestige in UK universities: Vice Chancellors' perspectives.* London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Brew, A., Boud, D., Lucas. L. and Crawford, K. (2017) 'Academic artisans in the research university', *Higher Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0200-7 [accessed 3 March, 2018].

Dean, K.L. and Foray, J.M. (2018) 'The Long Goodbye: Can Academic Citizenship Sustain Academic Scholarship?', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(2): 164-168.

Goldberg, A.I. (1976) 'The relevance of cosmopolitan/local orientations to professional values and behaviour', *Sociology of Work and Occupations,* 3(3): 331–56.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957) 'Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles – I', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 2(3): 281–306.

Havergal, C. (2015) 'Is 'academic citizenship' under strain?', *Times Higher Education*, 29 January.

Heijstra, T.M., Steinthorsdóttir, F.S. and Einarsdóttir, T. (2017) 'Academic career making and the double-edged role of academic housework', *Gender and Education*, 29(6): 764-780.

Macfarlane, B. (2007a) *The Academic Citizen: the virtue of service in university life.* New York and London: Routledge.

Macfarlane, B. (2007b) 'Defining and rewarding academic citizenship: the implications for university promotions policy', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(3): 291-303.

Macfarlane, B. (2008) Academic Citizenship and University Life. In Robinson, S. and Strain, J. (eds) *Ethics for Living and Working.* Leicester: Troubador Publishing, pp. 89-107.

Macfarlane, B. (2011) 'The morphing of academic practice: unbundling and the rise of the para-academic', *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(1): 59–73.

Massy, W.F., Wilger, A.K. and Colbeck, C. (1994) 'Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality', *Change*, 26: 11-20.

Merton, R.K. (1947) Patterns of influence: Local and cosmopolitan influentials. In Merton, R.K. (ed) *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, pp. 387–420.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E. and Agiomavritis, S. (2011) 'The ivory ceiling of service work', *Academe*, 97(1): 22-26.

National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (NCIHE) (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society: Report of the National Committee*. London: HMSO.

Nixon, J. (2008) *Towards the Virtuous University: The Moral Bases of Academic Practice.* Routledge: New York and London.

Nørgård, R.T. and Bengtsen, S.S.E. (2016) 'Academic citizenship beyond the campus: a call for the placeful university', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(1): 4-16.

Thompson, P. Constantineau, P. and Fallis, G. (2005) 'Academic Citizenship: An Academic Colleague's Working Paper', *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 3: 127-142.

Rhoads, R. A. and Szelényi, K. (2009) 'Globally Engaged Universities: The Changing Context of Academic Citizenship', *Education and Society,* 27(2): 5-26.

Ward, K. (2003) *Faculty Service and the Scholarship of Engagement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

University policies and developments in respect to academic citizenship

Aston University (2017) *Internal Academic Staff Promotions Procedure.* http://www.aston.ac.uk/staff/hr/policies/academicpromsprocedure/ [accessed 6 June, 2017].

Harvard University (2017) *Harvard Heroes Program*. https://hr.harvard.edu/harvard-heroes-program [accessed 21 October, 2017].

Manchester Metropolitan University (2017) *Professoriate Performance and Remuneration (PPR) Scheme.* https://www2.mmu.ac.uk/humanresources/a-z/policies/professoriate-performance-and-remuneration-ppr-scheme/ [accessed 6 May, 2017].

Royal Holloway University of London (2017) *HRI Wins University Award.* https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/history/research/researchcentres/holocaustresearchinstitute/news/hri-wins-college-award.aspx [accessed 20 June, 2017].

University of Auckland (2017) *Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice.* https://www.clear.auckland.ac.nz/en/pgcert.html [accessed 12 July, 2017].

University of Birmingham (2017) *Promotion of Academic, Professional and Teaching Staff* 2017-18. https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/staff/excellence/academic/index.aspx [accessed 18 April, 2017].

University of Bristol (2017) *Academic Promotion Procedure.* http://www.bristol.ac.uk/hr/policies/promotion/procedure.html [accessed 24 March, 2017].

University of Exeter (2017) *ExeterAcademic.* http://www.exeter.ac.uk/staff/exeteracademic/yourcareer/educationandresearch/ [accessed 26 August, 2017].

University of Leeds (2017) *Reward and Recognition: Grades 2 – 9 and clinical academic staff.* http://www.hr.leeds.ac.uk/rewardpolicy [accessed 18 April, 2017].

University of Nottingham (2017) *Promotions.* https://nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregrading/promotion/index.aspx [accessed 3 July, 2017].

University of Portsmouth (2017) *Policy on Promotion and Appointment to Reader and Professor.* http://policies.docstore.port.ac.uk/policy-082.pdf [accessed 10 July, 2017].

University of Strathclyde (2017) *Academic Professional Staff Example Objectives*. http://www.strath.ac.uk/hr/adr/objectivesetting/academicprofessionalstaffexampleobjectives/ [accessed 8 March, 2017].

The University of Western Australia (2017) *Service Criteria*. http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/working/academic/portfolio/folio-3.-service [accessed 1 August, 2017].

University of Witwatersrand (2017) *Vice Chancellors Academic Citizenship Awards.* https://www.wits.ac.za/media/news-migration/files/VCs%20Citizenship%20Award%20Final.pdf [accessed 15 April, 2017].

University of York (2017) *Promotion of Academic, Research and Teaching Staff.* http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/registrars-secretary/academic-promotions/ [accessed 5 April, 2017].

Appendices

Appendix 1: Academic Citizenship: A Guide to Good Practice

What is academic citizenship?

Academic citizenship refers to a set of attitudes and activities connected to internal and external service work. They help to support the infrastructure of academic life and the wider civic mission of the university.

What activities does this include?

Academic citizenship consists of a very wide variety of activities such as personal tutoring of students, mentoring colleagues, serving on university committees, undertaking leadership and management roles within the university, acting as a peer reviewer for an academic journal or funding body, working as an external examiner, organising a conference for a professional or academic society, editing a journal, or serving on a public committee of enquiry. These are just examples of the very wide range of activity, both within and without the university, undertaken by academics.

Why is academic citizenship important?

The attitudes and activities associated with academic citizenship are central to institutional success, student satisfaction and the integration of the university into wider civic life. Activities associated with academic citizenship help to support a number of communities, notably students, institutional colleagues, disciplinary and communities, charitable, professional and business organisations, the government, and international bodies.

How can academic citizenship help the university?

Academic citizenship is central to academic staff collegiality, student satisfaction and institutional reputation. It improves collegiality by rewarding academics for mentoring junior colleagues, contributing to committee work and serving in a wide range of leadership capacities. The involvement of academic staff as expert advisors to government and a range of external organisations strengthens the civic contribution of the university and its reputation. Students benefit from academic citizenship policies that encourage and reward academic staff as mentors and personal tutors. Academic citizenship has also been positively linked to addressing inequalities among academic staff. Research has shown that there is a propensity for women to strongly engage in academic citizenship. Rewarding this activity explicitly should have a positive impact on closing the gender gaps in academic careers. ■

What should be included in an academic citizenship policy?

In their academic rewards and recognition policies universities should ensure that academic citizenship is:

1. **Defined clearly and comprehensively** by reference to both internal and external service work, identifying a wide range of examples to enable academic staff to comprehend the scope of this expectation.

2. **Framed as a positive behavioural norm** that is treated as equivalent in status to research and teaching rather than as a negative behavioural deficit, lack of evidence in respect to which might hold back promotion prospects.

3. **Linked to the enhancement of equity and collegiality** through policies that recognise academic citizenship contributions, both internally and externally, at all levels in the academic hierarchy.

4. **Understood as a means of strengthening the contribution of the university to wider civic life.**

Appendix 2: Discussion Tools

Discussion Tool 1: Understanding academic citizenship

*"The university is an intellectual collectivity, and not just a collection of stimulating individuals and necessary services...
It is a pattern which is sustained by academic citizenship."*
Edward Shils (1997, 86)

The third mission

Across the world, the mission of universities is conventionally described in terms of teaching and research. Yet universities have always been connected with a broader social or civic mission sometimes described as service. This means that universities are associated with three missions: teaching, research and service (Cummings, 1998). However, Kelly Ward has described service as "the short leg of the three-legged stool" (2003:4) as it has tended to be neglected compared to teaching and research. While the terms are closely associated with what universities do, the terminology surrounding the so-called 'third mission' of the university is more disparate and reflects a deeper conceptual division between social and economic purposes. Some interpretations favour economic goals (such as 'knowledge transfer' or 'applied research') aimed mainly at generating income in the commercial sector while others are symbolic of a broader civic and social purpose (such as 'engagement' or 'academic citizenship') (see figure 1). Most universities seek to blend both economic and social purposes within their third mission. Deeper levels of engagement are associated with building relationships between universities and its members, including academic staff (Watson, 2007). Public universities, or private institutions in receipt of public funds, are normally expected to demonstrate their social or civic mission as part of their third mission activities.

Figure 1: Examples of the third mission

Purpose	Examples
Economic mission	'National Taiwan University (NTU)…actively seeks opportunities to collaborate with industries in the private sector so as to fulfill its social responsibilities of giving back to society'. Internet source: **http://www.ntu.edu.tw/english/about/vision.html**
Social and civic missionn	'Victoria University of Wellington will be respected for leading thinking on the major issues confronting environmental, societal, cultural and economic well-being, for resolutely fulfilling its 'critic and conscience' role and for the betterment of society'. Internet source: **http://www.victoria.ac.nz/about/governance/strategic-plan/vision,-mission-and-purpose**

What is academic citizenship?

It is important for the third mission of the university as a collective concept to be connected to reward and recognition policies as an *individual* concept. Making such a link apparent helps to motivate academics to work towards the social and civic mission. The risk otherwise is that the social or civic mission will remain disconnected from the day-to-day work of academics and in the way they are rewarded. This is where defining 'academic citizenship' can play a crucial role. This term refers to a set of attitudes and orientations that are central both to maintaining the infrastructure of academic life, in the university and in the disciplines, as well as fulfilling the university's role in civic engagement (Macfarlane, 2007a; Macfarlane, 2007b; Nixon, 2008). It involves serving a series of overlapping communities, internally, including students, institutional colleagues and the university itself, while externally it involves serving academic disciplines and professions to which academics belong as well as the broader public interest and global partners. This is also how most academics understand the term (see figure 2).

Figure 2: Definitions of academic citizenship given by academics

> "Academic citizenship implies being part of a community which is supportive of students, colleagues and stakeholders."
>
> "Academic citizenship implies that academics have responsibilities that extend well beyond those to their immediate colleagues, students, discipline and university...they have obligations to society at large."
>
> "I would see service in the sense implied as going beyond one's contractual obligations."
>
> **Source: Macfarlane (2007a)**

Forms of academic citizenship

Three of these communities – students, colleagues and the university – represent internal service. The remaining two – the discipline or profession and public service – are forms of external service. Most universities recognise both the internal and external service role although sometimes adopt different terminology to describe these types of activities. External service is sometimes called 'engagement' and internal service is more commonly referred to as 'citizenship'.

Figure 3: Internal and external forms of academic citizenship defined by senior managers

> "Taking part in leadership specific projects, membership or leadership of committees, involvement in things like student recruitment, outreach activities. I guess externally things like external examining, membership of bodies and councils and committees and external organisations or societies; reviewing for grant awarding bodies."
>
> **(Deputy director of human resources, Scottish university)**
>
> "Citizenship is…doing things which are of more benefit to the organisation than the individual, they're not entirely selfless but the main motivation isn't a selfish one to pursue your own research interests. So it could be taking up programme director roles, personal tutoring roles, things that you don't get extra money for but you take your turn to do. External engagement we split off [from academic citizenship] and we talk about engagement with industry, professions, public sector bodies, policymakers, things like that. We count that as external engagement, not citizenship."
>
> **(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)**

Status and recognition

However, not all forms of service or academic citizenship are equally recognised and rewarded and some are more highly esteemed than others. Student service, in particular, sits at the bottom of the pyramid because, while this work is central to the role of a university, much of such activity is not highly esteemed. Some types of institutional service are high in status (eg dean of a faculty) while others carry less kudos (eg admissions officer for an undergraduate programme). As academics become more senior there is an expectation that they will engage with external service more than internal service.

Figure 3: The 'service pyramid' (see Macfarlane, 2007a)

Type	Examples
Public service	Serving on a public committee of enquiry; advising the government
Service to the discipline or profession	Peer reviewing of grant proposals or academic papers; serving on an editorial board; external examining
Institutional service	Management and leadership roles; serving on university committees
Collegial service	Mentoring; teaching observation
Student service	Personal tutoring; giving feedback on assignments; writing references

Conclusion

Academic citizenship is central to the work of academics. However, the focus on the teaching and research functions of the university means it has traditionally been overlooked. In a UK context the influential role of the research excellence framework and the teaching excellence framework has contributed further towards its marginalisation. However, it is important for universities to think about how best to evaluate the academic citizenship contributions of their academics if they are to successfully link their collective social and civic mission with individual reward and recognition structures.

Activities and questions

1. Identify and share examples of academic citizenship work in which you are involved.

2. Estimate roughly how much time you spend doing teaching, research and academic citizenship. If you had 100 points to represent the time you spend on average across all three activities, how would you divide these points? (eg teaching, 40 points; research, 30 points; academic citizenship, 30 points).

3. Do you think that your institution sufficiently recognises and rewards academic citizenship? Are some forms of academic citizenship rewarded more than others? If so, is this right?

References and further reading

Cummings, W. K. (1998) 'The service university movement in the US: Searching for momentum', *Higher Education*, 35: 69–90.

Macfarlane, B. (2007a) 'Defining and rewarding academic citizenship: the implications for university promotions policy', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(3): 291-303.

Macfarlane, B. (2007b) *The Academic Citizen: the virtue of service in university life.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Nixon, J. (2008) *Towards the Virtuous University: The Moral Bases of Academic Practice.* New York and London: Routledge.

Shils, E. (1997) *The Calling of Education: The Academic Ethics and Other Essays on Higher Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Watson, D. (2007). *Managing Civic and Community Engagement.* Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

Ward, K. (2003) *Faculty service and the scholarship of engagement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Discussion Tool 2: Evidencing academic citizenship

Introduction

It is particularly challenging for institutions to ensure that academic citizenship activities are adequately captured within performance systems (Macfarlane, 2007). This is partly due to the increasing emphasis on performance indicators in relation to teaching and research and the conventional absence of comparable direct evidence in relation to academic citizenship. There are tensions associated with recognising the collective benefits of academic citizenship (such as mentoring) within systems designed primarily to evidence and reward individual achievements (Thompson, Constantineau and Fallis, 2005). This is further connected to a growing perception that, in a careerist academy, academic citizenship is coming under increasing strain (Havergal, 2015).

The context

In a UK context, the removal of esteem indicators from the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) may have further exacerbated strains on levels of commitment to activities including peer review and external examining. Aside from research intensification, other pressures have come to bear on academic citizenship such as the casualisation of academic labour and the unbundling of the academic role with the result that fewer academics are now employed on 'all round' contracts in a full-time capacity. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that a persistent gender gap exists in relation to expectations with respect to who undertakes more lowly esteemed or 'less visible' forms of academic citizenship (Misra et al, 2011).

Despite these pressures, in recent years a number of UK universities have started to incorporate academic citizenship within their appraisal and performance frameworks. These include, among others, Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Birmingham. Internationally, in addition to the mainstreaming the evaluation of academic citizenship, there are further examples of reward and recognition strategies including staff awards (University of Witwatersrand) and as part of academic staff development programmes (University of Auckland). These institutional initiatives point to growing recognition of the importance of academic citizenship.

Internal and external service

Academic citizenship occurs both within and without the university and so it is important to acknowledge both types within any reward and recognition scheme. If this does not occur there is a risk that academic citizenship will be defined too narrowly in terms of what someone does only within the university.

Figure 1: Identifying evidence of academic citizenship

Engaging – inter-professional and public audiences
Authoring – eg teaching materials, coursewares, etc
Leading – eg courses, journals, societies, etc
Mentoring – eg colleagues and external peers
Organising – eg field trips, work placements, etc
Representing – eg school, faculty, university, etc
Reviewing – eg academic papers, grant applications, etc
Sharing – eg self-authored teaching materials
Tutoring – eg student advisement, pastoral support, etc

(Adapted from Macfarlane, 2007)

However, even where universities include academic citizenship within their promotion and appraisal systems they find it challenging to identify clear criteria that can be used as evidence. Academic citizenship is generally seen as more intangible in defining criteria than either teaching or research.

Approaches to reward and recognition

Universities use four main approaches in incorporating academic citizenship into their reward and recognition policies, as follows:

1. Mainline criteria

This is where academic citizenship is given equivalent status to teaching and research as criteria for appraisal and promotion.

University of York

Criteria:

- Research
- Teaching, scholarship and professional practice
- *Academic citizenship*

http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/registrars-secretary/academic-promotions/
[accessed 14 April, 2017].

Nottingham University

Criteria:

- Research and scholarship
- Teaching and learning activity
- University and academic service and good citizenship (whether by offering eg leadership, management, administration, knowledge transfer or pastoral care within the University, or by engaging on behalf of the university with the wider community, including internationally)

https://nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregrading/promotion/index.aspx
[accessed 27 March, 2017].

University of Strathclyde

Criteria:

- Research
- Teaching
- Knowledge Exchange
- Citizenship

Examples given:

- to take on the role of course director/leader/coordinator/equivalent by x date
- to take on a senior departmental/school management role by x date
- to take on membership of a faculty/university committee by x date
- obtain a role as an external examiner by x date.

http://www.strath.ac.uk/hr/adr/objectivesetting/academicprofessionalstaffexampleobjectives/
[accessed 16 April, 2017].

2. Sub-criteria
This is where academic citizenship is incorporated as a sub-criteria within a headline category, such as 'leadership'.

University of Bristol

Criteria:

• Excellence in research
• Excellence in teaching and learning
• Clinical contribution (where relevant)
• Academic leadership and good citizenship

http://www.bristol.ac.uk/hr/policies/promotion/guidance-excellence.html#a6
[accessed 16 April, 2017].

University of Portsmouth

Promotion depends on:

1. leadership and academic citizenship, plus at least ONE (or combination) of the following:
2. enterprise and innovation
3. research
4. teaching and education

http://policies.docstore.port.ac.uk/policy-082.pdf
[accessed 4 June, 2017].

University of Western Australia

1. Teaching and learning
2. Research and scholarship and/or other relevant creative work
3. Service

http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/working/academic/portfolio/folio-3.-service
[accessed 19 July, 2017].

3. Standalone awards or payments

This is where academic citizenship is recognised through a university award to an outstanding member (or teams) of academic staff normally on an annual basis and/or via special payments. However, these awards and payments are not normally part of the mainstream reward and recognition structure.

Harvard University

'Harvard's heroes'. An award for academic staff on the basis of various criteria including:

"Citizenship and Community - Outstanding citizenship at either the local or University level. Takes action to build or strengthen a caring, connected University community. Makes Harvard a great place to work, teach, and learn."

http://hr.fas.harvard.edu/rewards_recognition
[accessed 15 August, 2017].

University of Leeds

One-off payments of between £250-£1500 for:

"Community activities within the university (that are over and above expectations of the role but not sufficient to warrant a change of grade and where workload remission is not normally granted). Community activities relate to providing a general service and citizenship within the area or university which is outside the remit of the individual's/team's role."

http://hr.leeds.ac.uk/rewardpolicy
[accessed 12 June, 2017].

Royal Holloway, University of London

Principal's Exceptional Citizen Award

"Presented to individuals or teams who demonstrate the most outstanding achievements in some or all of the following:

• willingness to extend themselves to help others
• improving the quality of life in the college and/or wider community"

https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/humanresourcesdocs/rewardandrecognition/staff
[accessed 23 July, 2017].

4. As a benchmark or required behaviour that is not explicitly rewarded

This is where academic citizenship is considered as a benchmark activity or expected behaviour but is not specifically rewarded. If academics are judged not to have engaged insufficiently in academic citizenship this can adversely affect their prospects of promotion.

Aston University

"Citizenship is a prerequisite for promotion at all levels"

http://www.aston.ac.uk/staff/hr/policy-procedures/other/academicpromsprocedure/
[accessed 4 August, 2017].

Durham University

"As a member of Durham's academic community, you are expected to adhere to the principles of good citizenship, being generous with your help and support to others and collaborating with your academic colleagues in matters relating to research, learning and teaching, and knowledge transfer, and working for the benefit of your department and the university as a whole."

'Good Citizenship and Conduct'

https://www.dur.ac.uk/hr/goodcitizenshipandconduct/
[accessed 17 August, 2017].

Conclusion

These four approaches to rewarding and recognising academic citizenship raise many questions. Some institutions choose to place academic citizenship at the heart of their strategy while others seek to subsume it within other more commonly occurring terminology, mainly connected with leadership and management. Not all institutions choose to explicitly reward academic citizenship, regarding it as a benchmark requirement for any academic, a part of the normal expectations for those working at a university. In many respects this attitude represents the most common approach since many universities do not explicitly reward academic citizenship. However, if these activities are not included in reward and recognition strategies is there a risk that the attitudes expected of academics may not materialise?

Activities and questions

1. Should academic citizenship be a benchmark expectation for all academics without being formally incorporated into reward and recognition structures or should it be specifically included, as some institutions have chosen to do?

2. Which of the four approaches to evaluating academic citizenship identified in this discussion tool would you favour and why? Is there an alternative approach that you think would be better?

References and further reading

Havergal, C. (2015) 'Is 'academic citizenship' under strain?', *Times Higher Education*, 29 January.

Macfarlane, B. (2007) *The Academic Citizen: the virtue of service in university life,* Routledge, Oxford.

Shils, E. (1997) *The Calling of Education: The Academic Ethics and Other Essays on Higher Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, P. Constantineau, P. and Fallis, G. (2005) 'Academic Citizenship: An Academic Colleague's Working Paper', *Journal of Academic Ethics,* 3: 127-142.

Discussion Tool 3: Equality and academic citizenship

Introduction

There are many positive benefits in formally recognising academic citizenship, most notably in better connecting the university's social and civic mission with individual reward systems. However, there are also potential risks associated with incorporating academic citizenship within human resource policies. This discussion tool will examine four of the challenges that are involved including the effects of academic performativity and gendered expectations.

Risk 1: 'Gaming' the system and hollowed collegiality

By formally recognising academic citizenship there is a risk that academics may change their patterns of behaviour in order to meet performance targets leading to the neglect of non-audited elements. For example, research performance by academics is now audited in many countries in terms of the perceived quality of publications and research grants won. However, the work of academics in supporting others in their research development through mentoring and collaboration tends to be overlooked. Similarly, teaching performance is often assessed through student evaluations. These normally occur at the end of teaching courses but before students have had their summative assignments assessed and returned. This means that assessment and feedback, an important aspect of the student experience and the work of academics, tends to be neglected in evaluations. The same problem may occur if academic citizenship is evaluated and not all elements are assessed.

The less 'visible' and prestigious elements – such as advising students and mentoring academic colleagues – are especially at risk here. More 'visible' and prestigious forms of service activity, often taking place externally to the institution or involving more senior management responsibilities, may attract a disproportionate amount of attention as they have higher symbolic value. If this occurs there is an attendant risk that academics may withdraw from performing internal activities with lower levels of symbolic value. This phenomenon has been labeled 'hollowed collegiality' (Massy, Wilger and Colbeck, 1994) and can result in splits between junior and senior academics based on substantial differences in service expectations.

An example of the way in which this division works in practice is given by the University of York (UK) (2017) in identifying three separate 'levels' of academic citizenship activity. This lists a large number of examples of types of activity both internal and external to the university. As the levels progress, there is more emphasis on external as opposed to internal activities indicative of the work of a more experienced academic. Examples at level 3 (the most senior level) include success in business generation, public and community engagement, and service as a member of a national or international funding body. In distinguishing between the various levels, 'effective pastoral and co-curricular work with students (where appropriate to the role)' is given as an example at level 1 intended for more junior or less experienced academic staff. However, this expectation does not appear at level 3 for more senior academic staff.

Figure 1: Academic Citizenship levels at the University of York

Academic citizenship: Level 1

The applicant should indicate the process involved in initiating, managing and bringing to a successful conclusion the indicator involved. Performance at this level means competence in key aspects of academic citizenship as indicated by:

- Effective discharge of departmental/inter-disciplinary responsibilities, eg engaged and effective participation in departmental/inter-disciplinary administrative activities and committees.
- Active involvement in formal departmental general activities, eg open days, student support, student employability, staff meetings, relevant committees.
- Representation of the department's/inter-disciplinary grouping's activities with other audiences.
- Involvement in departmental/interdisciplinary policy initiatives or course re-structuring proposals.
- The beginnings of an external engagement profile.
- Effective pastoral and co-curricular work with students (where appropriate to the role).

Academic citizenship: Level 2

Applicants for promotion claiming performance at Level 2 should be fulfilling the criteria for Level 1 and, in addition, should demonstrate:

- Effective discharge of significant responsibility in a department/inter-disciplinary centre* or in the wider university.
- Evidence of an effective contribution to the department and university by balancing their academic citizenship activities (both internal and external) with their academic work.
- An established external engagement profile.

Other supporting indicators that would strengthen the case include:

- Effective contribution to university level committees or projects.
- Effective contribution to committee(s) above departmental/inter-disciplinary programme level.
- Evidence of a leading role in engaging with non-specialist audiences (eg through contributions to cultural enrichment or science outreach events beyond the university's own initiatives).
- Evidence of setting up, developing and sustaining new relationships with client organisations or other universities and/or an established reputation and acknowledged expertise with senior managers in client organisations and/or professional associations.
- Serving as an officer of a national or international learned society.
- Active and effective contribution to departmental/interdisciplinary

Source: University of York (2017).

Risk 2: Gender inequality

Academic service is associated with gendered expectations. Here, the term 'academic housework' has been widely coined as a self-mocking pejorative for the tendency to allocate lowly esteemed service work disproportionately to female academics. These gendered responsibilities are associated with caring in the workplace and can result in an excessive amount of time-consuming and lowly esteemed service work inhibiting, or at least delaying, their promotion chances (Acker and Feuerverger, 1996; Grant and Knowles, 2000; Heijstra et al, 2016; Misra, et al, 2011).

Moreover, women with other bases of intersectionality or multi-marginality such as being a member of a minority ethnic group and/or working in academic disciplines with historically low levels of female participation (eg physics), may encounter additional burdens associated with academic housework (Turner, 2002). The expectations of academic housework appear to affect women academics at all levels, even full professors (see figure 1)

Figure 2: Academic housework

"…that bloody pastoral thing that the woman always seem to get dumped with the students, which I don't really mind doing but it's always the women that are doing it…"
(Theresa, modern civic university, south).

"We have to do more admin in terms of what we get asked to do. I'm the chair of the board of examiners… I was head of graduate school, and oh that was not torture but that was three years of something on the shoulder… like a weight on your shoulder, it doesn't go away."
(Stephanie, ancient university, north).

Source: Macfarlane and Burg (2018)

Risk 3: Academic citizenship will remain the 'short leg' of the three-legged stool

While academic citizenship may be formally included in reward and recognition structures it may continue to be perceived as the least important of the three academic roles behind research and teaching. Even if it is included as a mainline criteria, will it be treated as equally important as teaching and research in practice? One way of potentially tackling this challenge is to explicitly divide academic citizenship into internal and external service and assign a weighting to both that, combined together, equate with teaching and research. This would ensure that academic citizenship counted for the same as both teaching and research.

Risk 4: Failing to challenge self-centred behaviour

Despite the challenges of rewarding academic citizenship there is perhaps an even greater risk in not rewarding it. University senior managers see academic citizenship as an essential counterweight to the modern emphasis on individual achievements in research in particular (Macfarlane and Burg, 2018). Phrases such as 'refused to take on a role', 'has consistently dropped colleagues in it at short notice', 'missed deadlines' or 'missed student assessments or things like that' are used to describe the behaviour of academics who are regarded negatively by their colleagues and senior managers (Macfarlane and Burg, 2018). In extremis this can result in an academic not being promoted despite achievements in other areas of academic life. Such decisions can be hard to make given the very personal nature of the judgment.

"Well I guess the people who are judged as not being good citizens never take that news well. It does mean…it's quite hard, it's much less personal to say 'you haven't been promoted because you haven't got enough research publications', that's something far more objective. Whereas if you say 'you've just not been very helpful to colleagues' or 'you've not offered to take on roles', that's a much harder message to deliver and receive. So yes it has the impact on the individual feeling less. Some of them turn it round and then start volunteering for things, so it's not a full stop."
(Associate director of human resources, Midlands university)

In this regard it is very important that universities develop academic citizenship policies that pay due respect to evidence and equality issues to ensure fairness and transparency.

Conclusion

Academic citizenship implies that the third mission should be social and civic, not just entrepreneurial. It's the key to maintaining the invisible infrastructure of academic life. There needs to be a stronger connection between the university's civic mission and individual reward and recognition to make 'public service' meaningful. Incorporation into university promotions policy is important but needs monitoring to ensure performative effects, 'game-playing' and potential gender inequalities do not undermine it.

Activity and questions

Reflect and discuss the following statement from a senior academic in terms of attitudes to academic citizenship:

"I have been a full professor and head of department for many years now. I am a leading scholar in my field and spend a lot of time travelling, networking and forging new partnerships internationally. The service work I do is mainly connected with my work nationally and internationally as the chair of a major scholarly society and as the editor of one of the leading journals in my field. I am also a member of a national commission of enquiry. I simply don't have the time to do any reviewing of papers any more. I think it's a good development activity for my doctoral students and occasional ask junior colleagues to help out too. As for teaching, I do very little now as my time is better spent on leadership work. If a student asks me for a reference I normally only agree if they are outstanding. I expect them to write the reference and I will then sign it or have my secretary do this on my behalf. As head of department I allocate roles to faculty as part of my commitment to distributed leadership. Women tend to be much better at dealing with student problems and many make excellent student advisors. They have the patience and the motherly touch which many men lack I think."

Do any aspects of the attitudes represented by this fictitious quotation ring true? Is 'academic housework' allocated disproportionately to women or other groups in academe?

References and further reading

Acker, S. and Feuerverger, G. (1996) 'Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26: 401–422.

Grant, B. and Knowles, S. (2000) 'Flights of imagination: Academic women be(com)ing writers', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 5(1): 6-19.

Heijstra, T.M., Steinthorsdóttir, F.S. and Einarsdóttir, T. (2016) 'Academic career making and the double-edged role of academic housework', *Gender and Education*, 29(6): 764-780.

Macfarlane, B. and Burg, D. (2018) *Women professors as intellectual leaders,* Report for the Leadership Foundation in Higher Education, London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Massy, W.F., Wilger, A.K. and Colbeck, C. (1994) 'Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality', *Change,* 26: 11-20.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E. and Agiomavritis, S. (2011) 'The ivory ceiling of service work', *Academe,* 97(1): 22-26.

Montesinos, P., Carot, J.M., Martinez, J-M. and Mora, F. (2008) 'Third Mission Ranking for World Class Universities: Beyond Teaching and Research', *Higher Education in Europe*, 2-3: 259-271.

Turner, C.S.V. (2002) 'Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality', *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1): 74-93.

University of York (2017) *Promotion of Academic, Research and Teaching Staff*. http://www.york.ac.uk/about/departments/support-and-admin/registrars-secretary/academic-promotions/ [accessed 5 April, 2017].

Author biographies

Bruce Macfarlane

Bruce Macfarlane is professor of higher education and head of the School of Education at the University of Bristol, UK and distinguished visiting professor at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. He has previously held chairs at a number of universities in the UK and Hong Kong. Bruce's publications have developed concepts related to values in higher education such as academic freedom, the ethics of research and teaching, the service role, and academic leadership. His books include Freedom to Learn (2017), Intellectual Leadership in Higher Education (2012), Researching with Integrity (2009), The Academic Citizen (2007) and Teaching with Integrity (2004).

Damon Burg

Damon Burg is a research fellow at the University of Southampton. He has held previous appointments at Yongin University and Hanguk University of Foreign Studies, South Korea. His research is centred on international higher education. More specific research interests lie in internationalisation in higher education, university partnerships, the impact public policy has on universities, the academic profession, academic citizenship, higher education leadership and diversity in higher education. Within these areas, his research has explored how government policy has led to university international strategies, the economic impact of academic partnership on individual universities and women professors as academic leaders. ◼

Bruce Macfarlane, **University of Bristol** and Damon Burg, **University of Southampton**

Peer House
8 -14 Verulam Street
London WC1X 8LZ

T 020 3468 4810
F 020 3468 4811
E info@lfhe.ac.uk

Contact us at

info@lfhe.ac.uk

or connect with us

🐦 @LF4HE

f /LF4HE

in /LF4HE

W lf4he.blog

🏠 www.lfhe.ac.uk

Inspiring Leadership

Leadership Foundation
for Higher Education