

Special Cluster on Gendered Service in Rhetoric and Writing Studies:

I. Transforming the Value of Gendered Service through Institutional Culture Change

Jennifer Heinert and Cassandra Phillips

Abstract: *Using the lens of feminized labor, we argue that the ways in which the academy defines success are misaligned with the service that is required to fulfill the mission of our institutions and meet the learning needs of students. Those who perform feminized labor and service, particularly in Composition, are at a disadvantage in every way “success” is measured in the academy (teaching, professional development, and service). Transforming how feminized labor is valued involves reexamining institutional missions and then redefining service, research, workload, and expertise in a way that aligns labor with institutional values. This process includes a) redefining and assessing labor and workload in terms of how it supports the institutional mission; b) defining and assessing professional development as work that supports the institutional mission; and c) valuing, supporting, and developing the expertise that is required for sustaining the labor of institutions.*

Keywords: *Feminized labor, service, gender, composition*

Every month, there is another career advice piece on “how to succeed” in higher education that makes the rounds on social media. These pieces often tell overcommitted faculty that the path to success involves learning to say no: *Chronicle* blogger Natalie M. Houston offers specific advice about how and when to say no in “Five Guidelines for Saying No” and “Should You Say Yes or No?” Likewise, in “To Find Happiness in Academe, Women Should Just Say No,” Rena Seltzer defines a “strong research profile” as the “prize” for increased happiness in academia (see also Wilson). A refrain of these pieces is “beware of service commitments.” Especially for women faculty, service is painted as an adversary to success and promotion. These advice articles highlight the service paradox of labor in higher education. On the one hand, it is clear from data about labor and the profession (see Massé and Hogan, Modern Language Association) that service commitments are holding women back

from advancing in higher education. On the other hand, the labor of service is increasingly necessary to support institutions and has a significant impact on student learning and success. Moreover, service work can be an important form of faculty development, as it helps faculty better understand students, which also contributes to becoming better instructors and citizens of the institution. Finally, service can be an important avenue to effect change, which is needed to challenge the gendered ways that labor is valued in academia. We should not solely be talking about how to avoid doing this work; rather, we should be talking about how to value that work in the context of institutional missions. We need to make the value of this service work visible to our institutions and our departments in order to change the (problematic and gendered) historical narrative of faculty professional success.

The “learn how to say no” directive from publications or well-meaning colleagues is indicative of why inequity continues to plague higher education, because it is representative of a larger problem about the way labor by marginalized groups other than the white cis-male population is valued in academia. While MLA, ADE, and AAUP have tracked data on gender and race in higher education and the discipline, there is less data about the ways in which such have been impacted by service work. However, others have been calling for attention to this problematic dynamic and the feminization and devaluing of the labor of these populations for decades.¹ As institutional models of higher education continue to change and shift more labor onto faculty (see Ginsberg; Schell), the service paradox continues to grow. While cautioning faculty about their service load is important advice as they work toward tenure, it is even more important that tenured faculty work to change a system of values that ignores the labor of service, its functions in an increasingly exploitative labor

1 See “The New Old Labor Crisis,” where Tressie McMillan Cottom writes that African-American scholars are 50 percent more likely to end up off the tenure track and that black faculty and students have been protesting the “ghettofication of black scholars in adjunct roles” since the 1960s. See also Gutierrez y Muhs et al’s collection *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, specifically the chapters in Part V: Tenure and Promotion.

environment, and the expertise required to sustain institutions of higher education.²

The root cause of inequity is that the labor that supports institutional missions, specifically feminized labor, has been and continues to be devalued in higher education—and often at the expense of students. This problem is a systemic one, and it is shaping the labor conditions in higher education, and more acutely in English. The national (AAUP) and disciplinary (MLA) data, provided by Schell, Massé and Hogan, and others, have shown that gender inequity correlates to the amount of service women in the academy do. In 2011, Karen Pyke called for these changes in *The Profession*: “Nothing short of a dramatic cultural shift in the meaning and value given to service labor is necessary if we are to forge gender equity among faculty” (86). When it comes to gender inequity, we seem to be good at identifying the what (through national data and reports on the status of women), and even the why (through the lens of feminized labor), but we have not been able to identify and make effective changes to reduce these inequities.

In this article, we argue that the key to transforming how feminized labor is valued is to use institutional missions to redefine service, research, workload, and expertise in a way that realigns labor with institutional values. We draw from our experience in various faculty and administrative roles at a two-year access institution to demonstrate both the problems with and the need for this transformation of values. We argue that this process of transformation includes a) redefining and assessing labor and workload in terms of how it supports the institutional mission; b) defining and assessing professional development as work that supports the institutional mission; and c) valuing, supporting, and developing the expertise that is required for sustaining the labor of institutions. Instead of unstated hierarchies that privilege traditional patriarchal values, values which have feminized Composition within English departments, we need clearly defined values and rewards that are directly connected to the missions of institutions and those who perform labor.

2 In a qualitative study on women associate professors, none of the women talked about changing the value structures that had created the barriers they faced (service, particularly), nor did the researchers point that out in their analysis. The interviews very much reinforced the values implicit in “just say no.” (see Terosky et al).

Misaligned Institutional Values: How Feminized Labor Makes Service Invisible

Since its inception in *Composition*, the feminization metaphor has provided a useful lens through which to critique the way labor is valued in English and in academia. It has also been used as a theory to examine the kinds of work that are privileged and rewarded in higher education. Composition theory in the early 1990's identifies how the work of composition instructors is feminized (see Flynn, Miller, Stuckey). In 1992 Schell articulated three hallmarks of feminized labor in composition: the "service course" intended to teach, the "drudge" work that is labor-intensive and low-paying, and the predominance of women performing the labor. The continued existence of these hallmarks, over 20 years later, underscores how entrenched we are in a values system that has done little to support the work of writing teachers. For example, an MLA and Association of Departments of English (ADE) report shows how those in feminized positions lag behind their counterparts: while the number of women in English is almost equal to the number of men, men continue to outnumber women in positions of privilege and prestige and women continue to outnumber men in the more feminized positions in our discipline (26). These inequities point to larger problems within the discipline of English itself: it is not just a gender inequity that is visible in these patterns, but an inequity in the way the labors of the profession are valued. Likewise, the significance of feminized labor has grown beyond the strict constraints of gender and represents how the labor of marginalized populations is systemically devalued.

Inherent in these gendered inequities are the outdated and static values of a discipline steeped in patriarchy. For example, within the discipline of English, Composition courses are still considered "skills" courses, and their teaching (and therefore staffing) is not a priority for many departments; they are a service that faculty tolerate, or that are essentially "contracted out" to contingent laborers. Members of the CCCC Status of Women Committee³ discuss how service is synonymous with teaching composition and rhetoric courses:

First-year writing courses are "service courses." These offerings are often (mis)understood as non-specialist, non-major, "content-less" courses that serve students by preparing them to meet the writing expectations of other faculty. They also are considered to "serve" the university by providing students with academic writing instruction. Importantly, these courses also generate massive student credit hour production and tuition. Writing teachers (predominantly women and

3 This committee was changed to a standing group in 2016, the "Feminist Caucus."

instructors working in contingent positions) serve students as university gatekeepers. Writing teachers thereby serve higher education in material and ideological ways (Adams et al).

In other words, despite over two decades of research and criticism of feminized labor in the academic workforce, its value remains unchanged, and the classification of this work as unimportant service in practice has codified its value as such within departments and institutions alike. For all of these reasons, the work that women do in Composition as well as for their institutions continues to perpetuate their inequity.

Indeed, the teaching of Composition remains one of the lowest paying and least prestigious types of work in academia, whether it exists in standalone programs or under the umbrella of an English department. Composition's increasingly contingent workforce of adjunct instructors and graduate assistants demonstrates its diminished value. English departments that were built by and for experts in Literature often have neither fully accepted nor understood the importance of Composition as a distinct and equally (perhaps even more, depending on the institution) fundamental part of teaching, research, and scholarship in the discipline of English.⁴ If Composition instruction and scholarship are not valued by departments, then English perpetuates Composition's vulnerability as a non-essential, and therefore feminized, discipline. As tenure-track positions have become an increasingly smaller percentage of instructors at all types of higher education institutions, departments have also had fewer opportunities and resources to incorporate Composition into their extant organizations. There is no reason to hire experts, especially with increasingly less financial resources to do so.

Finally, the majority of writing courses continue to be taught by women. The issue of gender equity in English departments is a common problem at higher education institutions across the country. As the data shows, 70 percent of part-time instructors at Associate's institutions are women, while only 44 percent of women are full-time tenured faculty at Doctoral institutions. Therefore, the percentages of employed women in English increase as one moves from research institutions and toward two-year colleges, and also as one moves from full-time to part-time employment. While the overall number of women in English implies gender equity, a breakdown of the data reveals that less prestigious, less secure, and more labor-intensive positions are overwhelmingly held by women. These statistics bear out in our English

4 With the declining number of English Language and Literature majors across the country, it has become even more critical to reexamine the structural implications of housing Composition in English. See U.S. Department of Education et al.

department at our access institution—female faculty outnumber male faculty 19 to 12, and female instructional academic staff outnumber male instructional academic staff 39 to 23.

Despite the many women working in academia, inequity continues to dog institutions, with little to no success in identifying the root cause for inequity. In 2013, 67 female faculty in our own institution, University of Wisconsin Colleges, were given salary adjustments after an external study on salary compression revealed that women's salaries were significantly lower than those of their male counterparts. Our institution took the well-traveled path to addressing inequality: instead of investigating the reasons for the problem, the administration superficially addressed inequity by creating a formula based on rank and years of service, and adjusting select salaries based on that formula. The salary adjustments resulted in a wide variety of reactions across the institution, and may have created a bigger divide and more misunderstanding about inequity, forcing many to focus on who was receiving a salary increase rather than the reasons for those differences in the first place. Our administrators' messages repeatedly assured us that this inequity was "inexplicable," revealing both the naivete and privilege of those in positions of power.⁵ There was, of course, anger and shock from many women among the faculty upon realizing that they had been making significantly less money for no apparent reason. Many of us were stunned to hear how bad the disparities were. We also felt hopeless to effect change on our own because such a large level of sustained inequity seemed to be the only reason for change. This reaction is not uncommon across academia. Chronicle Vitae columnist Kelly Baker wrote about how she was "overwhelmed by the evidence of bias against women in higher education" and that the process of researching this topic made her "profoundly weary and sad." The amount and extent of sexism can contribute to a feeling of paralysis when thinking about how to make change. In our case, we felt we understood the ways we were impacted by sexism, but these salary inequities made visible layers of inequity that made any kind of transformation of values seem impossible. The denial of explanation and investigation into its causes did little to reassure us the matter was resolved; rather, it made us see that if we wanted change, we would need to be proactive.

But our experience in academia told us that we would have to look outside of the more traditional strategies to achieving success. We knew that the reasons for inequity are often, and accurately, attributed to the economic and

5 See Terosky et al for discussion of how "accumulated disadvantages" affect women's progress and increased disparity (60). See also Clark, Corcoran and Lewis; Cole; Valian; and West and Lewis.

social realities of women's lives (see Baker). In their research study examining gender disparity in service loads, Guarino and Borden conclude that there is a "pervasive gender effect. . . transcending departmental context, suggestive of a deeper sociological difference between men and women in relation to service tasks or simply the effects of discrimination" (690). We also saw a parallel to the labor dynamic at work in our extensive service commitments, reflecting how women are often told they are not participating in the systems of academia in the right ways and are spending time on service and teaching instead of on more valuable work like research. But the research on feminized labor also reveals that the root cause of inequity is the way the academy defines success. While we can acknowledge that the external realities of women's lives inhibit traditional measures of success, this explanation ignores the current value structure of academia. Guarino and Borden suggest that service inequities could be addressed through mentoring women to "show more selectivity in their service-related choices and cultivate their ability to say no to requests" (690). Not unlike Houston and Seltzer's assertions, this study suggests that solutions to service inequity rely on women learning to better navigate a problematic system. It is ineffective, even damaging, to posit academic enculturation (that women should become more literate in working within the academy's current inequitable structure) as a solution.

As we will show in the next section, the lens of feminized labor also reveals that institutional values built on gender inequity can influence everyone's labor environment negatively. When institutions rely on dated and unrealistic definitions and expectations of the labor and expertise required to effectively support their educational missions, they fail to reward and value the work that sustains them. Instead, they replicate the "gendered bureaucratic structures" that contribute to inequity (Bird 205).

The Problem of Feminized Service

The lens of feminized labor allows us to see a systemic problem in the way that value systems are structured in academia. Those who perform feminized labor and service, particularly in Composition, are at a disadvantage in every way "success" is measured in the academy (research, teaching, and service). Just as the MLA and ADE data reveal that the work women do is undervalued, research on the labor of service further shows a clear relationship between service and gender, employment status, and promotion. In our experience, there are three problematic perceptions of service that contribute to the devaluing of this work. These perceptions are what enable a large portion of an institution's labor economy to remain invisible and undervalued. As a result, we need to rethink the criteria on which we assess success in order to transform the value of that work.

The first problematic perception of service involves the “just say no” approach that we discussed in the opening of this article. This advice is problematic and often ignorant of institutional needs—it implies that saying no to service in its many forms is how “real” work gets done. In a sense, it is true—saying no to service work (if one is privileged enough to have the power to be able to say no) is a way to free up time for research and publication. However, this advice ignores the essential value and contributions of service work and undermines the work itself, forever marginalizing service in the academy, regardless of institutional mission. In some ways this advice is an institutional form of victim-blaming and internalized oppression.⁶ Women are both asked to and expected to do disproportionate amounts of service, and then blamed and punished for “making a choice” to perform this labor (see Misra et al). Institutions and departments need to ask themselves the following questions:

- Why is saying no to research and publication not an option?
- What are we losing as an institution by continuing to send the message that service should always come after research and publication?
- How can we critically assess the decision to say no to service—especially that which comes without compensation or time?

There are consequences for colleagues, students, and institutions when someone avoids service. And depending on the institutional context, those consequences may be more serious than saying no to more traditionally valued forms of labor like research. For example, a typical form of invisible service like building resources for and mentoring new writing instructors would have a significant impact on our institution: there are few instructors with the background required to effectively mentor or build writing program resources, so saying no means that work will either not be done or will be concentrated on the few who are qualified to do that work. Like English departments at most institutions, we regularly hire new instructors (some even at the last minute), many of whom have little to no experience teaching writing to the academically at-risk students we serve. Without a set of comprehensive resources or an experienced mentor to assist them through their first semester or year, they are on their own to design, draft, and prepare curricula. These instructors teach the greatest number of writing courses and students, and the effects of having neither resources nor mentoring are significant. In our institution, the students in these classes (lower-quartile students) are ineligible to transfer to four-year institutions until they successfully complete our writing program or improve their grades. For the most part, when they are not retained at our access institution’s two-year campuses, they are not retained

6 For further discussion see Armstrong et al.

to higher education. Because mentoring and support of instructors falls into a category of service, saying no has a potentially significant impact on student learning and retention.

In addition, the ability to say no to service correlates directly with one's privilege. It is considered acceptable, even encouraged, to say no to service when working on research or publications. But the consequences for tenure-track faculty and students can be much more severe when the choice is the other way around (see Payne; Schell). It is worth asking what happens when research goes unpublished or is completed in a longer time-frame: while it may directly impact retention and promotion of faculty, it most likely would have little impact on students at a two-year institution like ours. While we are not diminishing the critical role of research, we think it is important to interrogate its proportionate value, especially when the majority of advice columns in our disciplinary publications tell women to focus on achieving a goal that may or may not contribute to their institutional missions. In many cases, the gendered bureaucratic structures of institutions have already made traditional research time, resources, and publishing trajectories more than difficult: we should reconsider why we continue to privilege it above other labor. As Park argues, "[T]he notion that women should improve their research productivity by refusing anything more than minimal teaching and service responsibilities arises from a masculine perspective that mirrors sexist attitudes that exist outside the academy" (61). Depending on the institutional context for the work, research may be valuable to only an individual or to a much smaller group of people, yet its elevated importance perpetuates a value structure that contributes to gender inequity.

The second problematic perception shared by many in academia is that service is a chore to be completed, an item to be checked off a list, or a requirement that needs to be fulfilled in order to meet the minimal expectations of the job. As such, service is usually recorded in list form on faculty assessment documents. As a result, quantity is often valued over quality, and those who are assessing the quality of service often are uninformed (or do not consider) the amount of work required for different service obligations. Moreover, quantity can be misleading: it is possible for faculty to serve on multiple committees and do very little work, while others can serve on just one committee that requires a great deal of commitment. In our institution, annual review forms or promotion documents do not ask faculty to describe how their service contributes to their teaching, research, department, or institution. Without that description, both the quantity and quality of service are obfuscated and the actual labor of service remains invisible or inaccurately understood.

Another consequence of how we (do not) assess service is that acts of service are seen as unspecialized work, as though it could be done by any faculty member rather than one with specific experience, training, or expertise that makes one more qualified to complete that job. While publishing an article can reward the writer with tenure, promotion, additional release time, or grant funding, completing quality service work often only leads to more service. When the academic environment does not openly acknowledge the expertise required to complete certain service tasks, faculty with that training or expertise who perform those jobs often become pigeon-holed into keeping such service as an expected, and often uncompensated, part of their workload. If that expertise is not valued in policy or evaluation criteria, that work is devalued, and often considered something that particular faculty member likes to do because they are good at it. For example, in our institution, mentoring is not listed in our policy documents as an example of campus or institutional service, despite the labor required and its important role in effective teaching. Because such a small percentage of faculty are qualified or willing to provide effective mentoring, very few people in a position of authority understand the labor and skill required to do this work when it comes time for evaluation or promotion. Instead, the few people who are effective mentors are rewarded with additional mentees, while those who do not do it well or at all have little to no consequences. In our department, like many other departments, the irony is that while service tasks are seen as interchangeable, the same group of faculty keep doing them.

Problematic perceptions of service begin even before one is hired. Because service expertise is not a priority when hiring faculty, the process contributes to the problem of devaluing service. Many of the service tasks that are required to run an institution and/or department require background or training in specific fields as well as leadership, organizational, and communication skill sets, yet job requirements for faculty positions emphasize academic credentials and the labor related to research and teaching. When we were hired as faculty six years apart, neither of us had a clear expectation of what our service requirements would entail, not unlike other faculty hires. (For a somewhat typical explanation of the service expectations for a faculty job, see the Council of Graduate School's "Faculty Roles and Responsibilities," which identifies service expectations as service to "the institution, the external community, and the larger academic community," varying slightly depending on the type of institution). This vague concept of service perhaps contributes to gender inequity in that women often aren't aware of the service discrepancies between men and women until they are told or until they research the disparity themselves (see Flaherty 2017). The invisibility of gendered service, coupled with the fact that there are very few training and professionalizing experiences

for graduate students, future faculty, and new faculty, ensures that the cycle of devaluing and de-prioritizing service is repeated. When hiring new faculty, rarely does the job requirement include background or training in important service areas, nor a discussion about how that expertise is important to serve the mission of the institution.

An additional problematic perception of service is perhaps the most obvious—service that is highly visible within an institution is much more valued than the service that isn't. Labor-intensive and uncompensated work including mentoring; creating and building resources; conducting workshops; drafting and editing documents and materials; curricular revisions; and course policy changes tend to be focused and disciplinary; and often seen by a limited number of people. If people in the institution are unfamiliar with the work, it will be rewarded less in evaluations processes. When work isn't compensated with time or money, it automatically is seen as less valuable by those who don't understand that work. For example, it is not uncommon for many two-year institutions to engage in long battles to convince administrators to support a writing program coordinator position (see Klausman). At our institution we have to make the case to keep our Writing Program Administrator position, with no travel budget or funding for curricular and professional development, even though this position serves over 100 instructors and 14,000 students, 13 campuses, and an online program.

These problematic perceptions of service are only a few of the ways that the labor of service is obfuscated. Service is defined neither clearly nor consistently during graduate study and preparation for work in higher education, during the hiring process, and service and its value remains unclear throughout the stages of the tenure process and beyond. Without a clear way of defining and assessing this work, the implicit and inequitable demands for devalued labor create and maintain a gendered service divide.

Transforming Begins: Assessing the Institutional Mission

In many ways it is difficult to imagine what it looks like when feminized labor is valued in a university setting. The history of service indicates that the changing structures of the university mitigate the way we review, reexamine, and even revise institutional missions. Bird acknowledges the disjunctures between university-level missions and the complex system of colleges, departments, and/or divisions that arise from them. It is often from these disjunctures that values become misaligned with labor, and usually at the expense of service work that is integral to the institutional mission.

Both Ward and Bird acknowledge that examining and possibly revising institutional missions is an important step in the changing landscape of the university. As Ward says:

The administration must be clear about campus mission and the role that service and engagement play in this mission. Is there a clear call for service in the campus mission statement? How is it defined? Does the mission statement need to be rewritten? How does the campus use the mission statement? How does faculty work play into it? How do students fit? How does the campus relate to the community? Campus conversations need to take place regarding the mission and scope of engagement initiatives. Campuses need to be aware about the ratio of lip-service to action. Are faculty being encouraged to do service and getting rewarded for it? Has there been ample opportunity for faculty to have a voice in how the mission is shaped? (153)

Ward's list of questions demonstrates how complex the task of defining missions is, and different types of institutions may have very different answers to these questions. Of course, because feminized labor is indeed invisible, not all administrators are aware of the labor of the university in its entirety. What is more, it seems daunting to ask those in administration to invest time and labor into a process that could unseat power structures that support their own positions.

For example, if we look to our own state and the UW System, we can see how institutional missions do and do not align with the labor of the respective institutions. The University of Wisconsin System has long been synonymous with the Wisconsin Idea, that "the boundaries of the university are the boundaries of the state" ("The Wisconsin Idea"). Ward refers to the Wisconsin Idea as ". . . one of the most relevant developments with regard to the state university and its role in service" (43), as its main goal is to "serve the state" (44) and "improve people's lives" ("The Wisconsin Idea") by extending university resources outside the borders of the campus.

While all UW institutions share the Wisconsin Idea, they all serve the state in different ways. The mission of the UW Colleges, the two-year transfer institution of the system, emphasizes preparing students for success and providing access to an affordable general education:

The University of Wisconsin Colleges is a multi-campus institution committed to high quality educational programs, preparing students for success at the baccalaureate level of education, providing the first two years of a liberal arts general education that is accessible and affordable, providing a single baccalaureate degree that meets local

and individual needs, and advancing the Wisconsin Idea by bringing the resources of the University to the people of the state and the communities that provide and support its campuses. ("Mission, Goals, and Vision")

In contrast, the mission of UW Madison, the research university flagship of the system, emphasizes the creation of knowledge as a way to transform the world:

The primary purpose of the University of Wisconsin–Madison is to provide a learning environment in which faculty, staff and students can discover, examine critically, preserve and transmit the knowledge, wisdom and values that will help ensure the survival of this and future generations and improve the quality of life for all. The university seeks to help students to develop an understanding and appreciation for the complex cultural and physical worlds in which they live and to realize their highest potential of intellectual, physical and human development. ("Mission Statement")

Inherent in these two missions (as well as the range of missions among the other 12 UW institutions) are the different kinds of labor required to support them. It makes sense, then, that the way work is valued at an institution should depend on institutional contexts. Instead, institutional value systems tend to be static across contexts, and are often influenced by research institutions.⁷ Likewise, as Ward notes, from the beginning of the twentieth century then-President Van Hise struggled to enact teaching, research, and service roles while serving the people of Wisconsin (45). This structure has been in conflict with a service mission for quite some time, even at a research institution such as UW-Madison. Adhering to this value system at an access institution like ours means that we end up rewarding labor that that does not support the mission, often at the expense of the work that does.

Instead, institutions of higher education should work to create their own value systems that support their own missions. Developing contextual value systems allows research universities to value and reward work differently than access institutions. In "Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service As Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions," Kerry Ann O'Meara argues that "institutions with strong teaching and service missions which develop faculty reward systems that favor research will likely experience a fragmentation of sorts, characterized by faculty dissatisfaction with the disconnection

7 Indeed, data from the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure (2005-6) shows that expectations at research universities often "creep" disproportionately into the expectations at other institutions.

between and among institutional mission, faculty interests, faculty workload, and rewards” (3-4). This disconnection is evident at an institution like the UW Colleges, which structures tenure, promotion, and merit around the triumvirate of “research, teaching, and service.” With the majority of courses offered at the freshman-sophomore level, and the average student not meeting ACT benchmarks for College Readiness, emphases on retention, pedagogical support for instructors who work with academically at-risk students, curricular development that supports student learning, and support for the emotional labor required to teach these students should heavily influence the way work is valued and rewarded. Instead, we experience disjunctures as faculty and administrators work within a value system that conflicts with the service mission of the institution. As we will show in the next section, changing this value system involves a major transformation of how academic work is defined.

Transforming the Value of Research and Teaching

While the missions of higher education institutions vary widely from vocational to research, the values used to assess and reward faculty performance, or to define success, are quite similar. In 1996 Park published “Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn’t Women’s Work Count?” in *The Journal of Higher Education*, in which she identifies the skewed values of success in academia and argues for an integrative approach to scholarship. Park builds on the work of Ernest Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered*, in which he calls for seeing and valuing the multiple integrated scholarships that comprise faculty work: Discovery, Teaching, Application, and Integration. Park uses the following table to illustrate the criteria and the traditional hierarchical value structure that corresponds to them in institutions of higher education (50):

TABLE 1
Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Research	Teaching	Service
Publishing professional journals professional books monographs applied pedagogical		
Publishing textbooks instructional materials		
Conference presentations	Classroom performance graduate undergraduate upper division lower division	
Editing/reviewing for a journal		Professional service University service administration committees student clubs
	Advising/counseling students	

Research, teaching, and service are not only seen as distinctly separate aspects of the work that faculty do, but also as a hierarchy of values with research at the top and teaching and service at a distant second and third place, respectively. Park identifies many of the assumptions that underpin this hierarchy, such as “everyone teaches and serves, so research is what sets individuals apart,” “research enhances institutional reputations,” and “research is the creation of knowledge.” Park, like Boyer and Bird, deconstructs many of these assumptions and calls for a new paradigm of defining, valuing, and assessing

Nevertheless, these assumptions persist throughout higher education. While research and publishing are valuable in many institutional contexts, the value placed on publishing and independent research is altogether too uniform across different types of institutions of higher education. For example, the “Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion” demonstrates how the hierarchical value system Park identifies is being replicated and intensified at all types of institutions in the discipline of English:

the demands placed on candidates for tenure, especially demands for publication, have been expanding in kind and increasing in quantity. While rising expectations have been driven by the nation’s most prestigious research universities, the effects ripple throughout all sectors of higher education, where greater emphasis has been placed on publication in tenure and promotion decisions even at institutions that assign heavy teaching loads. (Modern Language Association)

Indeed, working for an access institution while managing a 4-4 teaching load and service obligations can and quite frequently does preclude the time and resources that independent research requires. Valuing independent research at a teaching institution is complex and can have a ripple effect that impacts other areas of work. For example, if a faculty member privileges research and publishing at the expense of effective teaching and performing their share of service, their work could be at odds with the mission of the institution.⁸ In addition, independent research is often not valued in context: research that advances the career/interest of the researcher may even be privileged over research that advances the mission of the institution. A problem we encounter at our teaching institution is how to assess research and publications that are disconnected from the mission and curriculum of our institution. While sometimes the work is a clearly-articulated disciplinary contribution. Valuing research equitably is not the same as valuing it equally. In

8 See Payne in this issue for a discussion of how Boise State has reduced workload and evaluation with its institutional mission.

"Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Promotion and Tenure," O'Meara questions this very phenomenon:

why hasn't the [engagement] movement pushed back and suggested that all scholarship—including theoretical work in journals and basic science—be considered for issues of impact, relevance, and contribution to public issues? Why are there not more faculty asking of their colleagues, "Who will use this research?" or "How will it make a difference?" (285)

O'Meara's questions will not be addressed until the hierarchical structure of values changes. For example, given the mission of our institution, research and publication that supports student learning and effective teaching should be valued above research and publication that specializes in areas not directly connected to engaging and advancing students at the institution. At the same time, we acknowledge that engagement in the profession and the many disciplines that fall under English is the way that we maintain our credentials and expertise. Thus, research's value and valuation are problematized in institutions like ours that require immense teaching and service workloads. To address this problem, our department has worked to articulate research and professional development standards that value peer-reviewed publication on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as much as peer-reviewed disciplinary research. By doing so, we hope to acknowledge that in an institution such as ours, research related to teaching practices is more closely connected to our mission. Moreover, privileging research that is connected to the mission offers a more equitable way to support professional development that directly impacts students and pedagogical growth.

As Park and Boyer's work demonstrates, research should not be seen as separate from teaching and service—each informs the other in a way that helps an instructor understand best practices, students, and the classroom and institution in which they work. Teaching should be valued in proportion to its labor, the measure of which depends on institutional contexts (and may vary greatly within institutions themselves). In the case of a teaching institution, faculty members who can demonstrate their teaching effectiveness should be rewarded accordingly. The work of teaching is labor-intensive and requires ongoing professional development, especially in process-driven courses like composition. While the specific pedagogies vary across the disciplines, the research on effective teaching points to student-centered learning.⁹ These practices that support student learning are time-consuming: ongoing

9 See Weimer's *Student-Centered Learning: 5 Keys Changes to Practice*; Susan Ambrose et al's *How Learning Works*.

self-assessment and revision of curricula, in-class activities and formal assignments that assess student learning, and multiple levels of feedback to guide learning. In addition, reflective instructors who develop and revise their courses rarely do so (or will not be able to do so) without the support of service; that is, they benefit from working with mentors, colleagues, instructional resources, assessment coordinators and/or committees, professional development activities, and peer feedback on classroom instruction¹⁰. This service work, as we have shown above, relies on both disciplinary expertise and institutional research—in many ways, this service work is the research work of an access institution.

Ultimately, to transform the value of research, teaching, and service and move toward an integrative culture of faculty work, institutions must articulate clear learning goals, foster the pedagogies that support student learning, and then create a culture of accountability, assessment, and feedback that rewards instructors for effective teaching practices. But such a culture is only possible if we articulate how service plays an integral role in effective teaching and learning and interrogate assumptions about the value of research in our institutional contexts. As we show in the next section, the traditional value system is one that disconnects service from the important contributions that it makes to effective teaching. The hegemony of such a system keeps the status quo in place by marginalizing service rather than seeing its work as informed by expertise.

Valuing and Leveraging Expertise

In addition to valuing research, teaching, and service in relation to the institutional mission, it is important that we give attention to the training, expertise, and scholarship that informs and supports the labor of service. From ad-hoc committees, to shared governance, to administrative tasks, to student support—"service" covers a broad array of labor at any given institution. Some tasks come with visibility, even accolades, along with compensation in the form of release time or stipends, while some are virtually invisible. As a result, it is difficult to capture the qualities of expertise required to perform this work effectively. Nevertheless, if the labor of service is going to be valued appropriately and in accordance with institutional missions, the expertise required to do the work well should be defined and acknowledged. This acknowledgement is what moves service from the realm of unskilled, interchangeable, and inessential labor and more toward a "scholarship of engagement" that Boyer outlines in *Scholarship Reconsidered*. In this section we outline strategies to transform the value of service.

10 See Giordano, Hassel, Heinert, and Phillips.

One way to value the labor of service is to clearly define the relevant skills and expertise that it requires. An abiding assumption that service is unskilled labor works to devalue it. While this type of service may exist, it is much more common for service to require at the very least experience, and more often, expertise. Service related to the writing program requires disciplinary expertise (knowledge of national standards, familiarity with research on writing pedagogy and theory, and facility with disciplinary resources) developed from graduate coursework, disciplinary engagement, and/or teaching experience that reflects changing national disciplinary standards. Only a handful of our faculty and instructional staff have terminal degrees in writing, and only half of them might meet these criteria of expertise. Among faculty alone, that percentage is even smaller. It is not a coincidence that those with expertise are also the few who perform almost all of the department's service related to the writing program.

An obvious but increasingly rare way to support the disproportionate service load in our discipline is to find ways to compensate it. Keeping track of the responsibilities, time, and other costs and expectations is a way to argue for compensating this work with a course release or a stipend, while also increasing the visibility of the work. In our institution, this strategy helped us secure a Developmental Reading and Writing Coordinator and a somewhat tenuous Writing Program Administrator position. While this strategy may be more of a long-term goal, it is important to consider how to transition critical service roles from uncompensated to compensated by building the work into positions (or creating positions out of the work). In the face of a changing student population, administrators might be more receptive to the creation of positions that allow them to deal directly with the pressures to address cost-effective learning and a decreasing number of faculty positions.

Changing the service landscape also involves helping our peers develop the expertise required to perform it. One way is to provide faculty development related to the writing program—if there aren't many people in the department who are experts in writing studies, then departments should provide opportunities for them to become so. In our department, reading circles, workshops, conferences, training, research projects, and grants, all work together as professionalizing opportunities. Department members who are trained, and therefore understand the labor of effective writing pedagogy, can help contribute to a culture shift that allows us to make progress. It also increases the number of people who are able to perform service tasks that require writing expertise. The drawback is that these kinds of professional development experiences often require a lot of (often uncompensated) work to create and sustain. However, through hiring, professional development, and

mentoring, our department is approaching a critical mass of people who recognize and value writing studies expertise and the service that supports it.

Another way to value expertise is to ensure it informs the governance structures of an institution. Unfortunately, existing governance structures may be reinforcing an outdated value system. As Bowen and Tobin argue in *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education*, an institution's ability to address problems facing higher education today are increasingly hampered by an outdated system of governance practices (1). In order to make changes, then, we need to make changes to governance, or "the location and exercise of authority" (ix).

We must ask whether it is reasonable to expect a century-old structure of faculty governance to enable colleges and universities of all kinds to respond to new demands for more cost-effective student learning. Will institutions that educate growing numbers of students from first-generation, under-represented, and disadvantaged backgrounds be able to make the organizational and pedagogical changes that preserve higher education as an engine of social progress? (4)

In our case, while we have made some progress with isolated goals, we know that sustainable change is not possible without addressing institutional culture and the way labor is valued in relation to our mission. Therefore, as Bowen and Tobin show, governance structures need to transform as part of a larger institutional culture-shift (205). While governance at all levels has long been the job of faculty alone, changing structures to allow for representation from and for contingent faculty and non-traditional students is vital to transforming governance. This means changing the charges of committees, who should comprise their makeup, how they are elected and/or appointed, and how they conduct their work. Perhaps it means creating entirely new committees based on a revised institutional mission. Ultimately, it means that the very way in which governance has operated needs to change to allow for inclusive representation, or at the very least representation that more accurately represents the workforce at the institution.

When employed collectively, these strategies have the potential to greatly impact institutional culture and values in critical ways. However, enacting culture change is a form of labor in itself, and it is important to anticipate the toll of the inevitable challenges and backlash. As a result of shifting value structures to privilege student learning and teaching over more traditional measures of success, those who have achieved success under those traditional measures will likely feel threatened. Bowen and Tobin discuss how faculty frequently claim "academic freedom" as a reason to reject change (201). Instead, they argue, faculty are bound to the twin responsibilities of professional expectations

and freedom: autonomy is not autonomy from disciplinary knowledge about teaching and learning, but autonomy within disciplinary knowledge about teaching and learning (202).

We continue to find ways that traditional values have a stranglehold on our institution: there is a dearth of diversity represented in the leadership and administrative positions in our institutions; the problematic traditional values we have discussed above still dictate faculty hiring as well as promotion and merit decisions; we experience a great deal of pushback trying to implement change and disciplinary standards in first-year writing; and, of course, the majority of uncompensated service is still performed by women. Nevertheless, we must continue to work toward a transformation, not of the surface-level structures, but of the values that underpin the labor of our institution. These transformative practices are the only way to make sustainable changes to the persistent inequities on which academia is built.

Saying Yes to Valuing Service

After decades of research on gender and the service economy in higher education, it is clear that we cannot expect to challenge the gendered bureaucratic structures that reinscribe service's low status without challenging and redefining institutional values. Instead of a universal set of new values, values should be derived from institutional-specific contexts and missions.

Instead of advising our colleagues to "learn to say no" to service, we should advise them to ask, "how does this work support the mission of my institution?" and to seek out work that does. We should not be training a new generation of faculty who say no. We should be training a new generation of faculty who know how to effect change, who understand the mission of the institution of which they are a part, and who value the work that supports it accordingly. In addition to mentoring our colleagues as they work toward the increasingly rare opportunity of tenure, as tenured faculty we should use the privilege that tenure conveys to change the problematic values and structural inequities of institutions. This includes creating a tenure that is an indicator of meaningful work in support of the institutional mission. In other words, an important part of transformation is learning how to advocate for and create sustainable equity—learning how to say yes to undertaking the challenges presented by the changing labor landscape of higher education.

Works Cited

Adams, Heather Brook, Holly Hassel, Jessica Rucki, and K. Hyoejin Yoon. "Service." *Peitho*, vol.18, no.1, 2015, pp. 45-50.

- Ambrose, Susan, Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, Marie K. Norman, and Richard E. Mayer. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., Laura T. Hamilton, Elizabeth M. Armstrong, and J. Lotus Seeley. "Good Girls: Gender, Social Class, and Slut Discourse on Campus." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 2, 2014, pp. 100-122.
- Baker, Kelly J. "Writing about Sexism in Academia Hurts." *ChronicleVital*, vol. 9, 2014, chroniclevitae.com/news/750-writing-about-sexism-in-academia-hurts. Accessed 10 October 2017.
- Bird, Sharon R. "Unsettling Universities' 'Incongruous, Gendered Bureaucratic Structures': A Case Study Approach." *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2011, pp. 202-230.
- Bowen, William G. and Eugene M. Tobin. *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education*. Princeton UP, 2015.
- Boyer, Ernest. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Clark, Shirley M., Mary Corcoran, and Darrell R. Lewis. "The Case for an Institutional Perspective on Faculty Development." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 57, no. 2, 1986, pp. 176-195.
- Cole, Jonathan R. *Fair Science: Women in the Scientific Community*. New York, Free Press, 1979.
- Council of Graduate Schools, "Preparing Future Faculty." www.preparing-faculty.org/PFFWeb.Roles.htm. Accessed 29 October 2018.
- Flaherty, Coleen. "Relying on Women, Not Rewarding Them." *Inside Higher Ed*, vol.12, April 2017. www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/12/study-finds-female-professors-outperform-men-service-their-possible-professional?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=5bea54615f-DNU20170412&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-5bea54615f-198448677&mc_cid=5bea54615f&mc_id=558784fe09. Accessed 5 January 2018.
- Flynn, Elizabeth. "Composition Studies From a Feminist Perspective." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*, edited by Richard Bullock and John Trimbur, Boynton/Cook, 1991, pp. 137-154.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. Oxford UP, 2011.

- Giordano, Joanne, Holly Hassel, Jennifer Heinert, and Cassandra Phillips. "The Imperative of Pedagogical and Professional Development to Support the Retention of Underprepared Students." *Retention, Persistence, and Writing Programs*, edited by Todd Ruecker, Dawn Shepherd, Heidi Estrem, and Beth Brunk-Chavez, UP of Colorado, 2017, pp. 74-92.
- Guarino, Cassandra M. and Victor H.M. Borden. "Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?" *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 58., no. 6, September 2017, pp. 672-694.
- Gutierrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. Gonzalez, and Angela P. Harris. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. UP of Colorado, 2012.
- Houston, Natalie. "Five Ways to Say No." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 28 August 2014, www.chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/five-ways-to-say-no/57959. Accessed 19 November 2017.
- . "Should You Say Yes Or No?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24 January 2013, www.chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/should-you-say-yes-or-no/45607. Accessed 21 November 2017.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. "Mapping the Terrain: The Two-Year College Writing Program Administrator." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 35, no.3, 2008, pp. 238-251.
- Massé, Michelle A. and Katie J. Hogan. *Over Ten Million Served*. SUNY, 2010.
- McMillan Cottom, Tressie. "The New Old Labor Crisis." *Slate*, January 2014, slate.com/human-interest/2014/01/adjunct-crisis-in-higher-ed-an-all-too-familiar-story-for-black-faculty.html. Accessed 29 January 2019.
- Miller, Susan. "The Feminization of Composition." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*, edited by Richard Bullock and John Trimbur, Boynton/Cook, 1991. pp. 39-53.
- Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hikes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *American Association of University Professors*, vol. 97, no.1, Jan-Feb 2011, www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work#.XFH3Dc9KjBI. Accessed 18 October 2018.
- "Mission, Goals, and Vision of the UW Colleges" University of Wisconsin Colleges, www.uwc.edu/catalog/about/mission. Accessed 21 November 2018.
- "Mission Statement" University of Wisconsin—Madison, www.wisc.edu/about/mission/. Accessed 22 November 2018.

- Modern Language Association. "Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion." *Profession*, New York, MLA, 2007, pp. 9-71. www.mla.org/content/download/3362/81802/taskforcereport0608.pdf. Accessed 15 October 2018.
- Modern Language Association and the Association of Departments of English. "Education in the Balance: A Report on the Academic Workforce in English." Modern Language Association, 31 Oct. 2011. www.mla.org/content/download/3362/81802/taskforcereport0608.pdf. Accessed 20 October 2018.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. "Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship: Promotion and Tenure." *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship: Contemporary Landscapes, Future Directions*, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 271–293.
- . "Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service As Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions." New England Resource Center for Higher Education Publications, paper 22, 2001, pp. 1-30. scholarworks.umb.edu/nerche_pubs/22/. Accessed 24 November 2018.
- Park, Shelley. "Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 67, no. 1, January/February 1996, pp. 46-84.
- Pyke, Karen. "Service and Gender Inequity among Faculty," *The Profession*, January 2011, pp. 85-87.
- Schell, Eileen. "The Feminization of Composition: Questioning the Metaphors that Bind Women Teachers." *Composition Studies/Freshman English News*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1992, pp. 55-61.
- Seltzer, Rena. "To Find Happiness in Academe, Women Should Just Say No." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 19 July 2015. www.chronicle.com/article/To-Find-Happiness-in-Academe-/231641. Accessed 25 November 2018.
- Stout, Patricia, Janet Staiger, and Nancy Jennings. "Affective Stories: Understanding the Lack of Progress of Women Faculty." *NWSA Journal*, vol.19, no. 3, 2007, pp.124– 144.
- Stuckey, J. Elspeth. "The Feminization of Literacy." *Composition and Resistance*, edited by C. Mark Hurlbert and Michael Blitz, Boynton/Cook,1991, pp. 105-113.
- Terosky, Aimee Lapointe, KerryAnn O'Meara, and Corbin M Campbell. "Enabling Possibility: Women Associate Professors' Sense of Agency in Career Advancement." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, vol. 7, no.1, 2014, pp. 58–76.

- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), "Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred" surveys, 1970-71 through 1985-86; Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:91-99); and IPEDS Fall 2000 through Fall 2015, Completions component, September 2016. nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_322.10.asp?current=yes. Accessed 21 November 2018.
- Valian, Virginia. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. M.I.T. Press, 1998.
- Ward, Kelly. "Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report" *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, col. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Weimer, Maryellen. *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice*. Jossey-Bass, 2013.
- West, Martha S. and John W. Curtis. "AAUP Gender Equity Indicators 2006." AAUP, www.aaup.org/reports-publications/publications/see-all/aaup-faculty-gender-equity-indicators-2006. Accessed 20 December 2018.
- Wilson, Robin. "How Saying No Helps Professors Find Their Focus." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 August 2012. www.chronicle.com/article/How-Saying-No-Helps-Professors/133313. Accessed 30 January 2019.
- "The Wisconsin Idea." University of Wisconsin—Madison, www.wisc.edu/wisconsin-idea/. Accessed 15 September 2018.