

RELATIONALITY IN AN AGE OF MEASURABLE OUTCOMES:  
TEACHING, TENURE, AND COLLEGIALLY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EDUCATION

MAY 2017

By

Mary K. Chang

Dissertation Committee:

Hannah Tavares, Chairperson  
Eileen Tamura  
Baoyan Cheng  
Sarah Twomey  
Roger Ames

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Having inquired in-depth about relationality, I realize the extent this dissertation emerged from the valuable interactions I have had with so many people, all of whom have enriched my work and my life in immeasurable ways.

Profound thanks to Hannah Tavares, the Chair of my committee, who read my writing closely and whose insightful comments challenged me to continually question my assumptions. Her support and belief in me has been sustaining. Eileen Tamura, committee member and mentor, sat down with me countless times to listen to or read about my developing ideas; I am grateful for her generous attention, sharp-grammatical eye, and straightforward advice. I want to thank my committee member Baoyan Cheng for always having her door open for a conversation and reminding me to articulate the connections between the theorizations I ruminate about. Warm thanks to my committee member Sarah Twomey whose consistent kindness and confidence in me, which emerged even in chance conversations, always made me feel hopeful and encouraged. My deep gratitude goes to Roger Ames, an exemplary University Representative and teacher, for those critical conversations that occurred in person and in his thoughtful responses to my chapter drafts—both inspired my inquiry about relationality to be more extensive and bold.

I must mention the Department of Educational Foundations ‘ohana—all faculty, staff (especially Marsha Ninomiya), and students—who made it an invigorating and caring place to be a doctoral student. I thank my supportive collegial communities: The College of Education Doctoral Student Association, the Classical Chinese Philosophy Writing Group, and my Hale Kuahine friends. I am appreciative of Xu Di for her encouraging advice and for introducing me to Les and Lorna Pang, who led us on stunning and nourishing hikes through O‘ahu’s many forests. My friends Asha John, Katherine Gould-Martin, Gentaro Shishimi, and Jennifer Phillips, among others, have motivated me. Janet and Ned Trombly have enthusiastically and continuously encouraged me throughout the process.

I am thankful for the unwavering support throughout my life from Johanna, Peter, Margaret, Lawrence, and Stephen. This journey has been as much theirs as mine. And, to my husband Jonathan, who has lived this process with me, I am immensely grateful for the loving support, keen and inspiring conversations about the project, and steadfast good humor. I am in constant awe of his insight, patience, and attentiveness.

## ABSTRACT

Market-oriented language and principles influence universities' aims, activities, and values. Yet such an outcomes-oriented framework tends to obscure the vast complexity of relationships involved in university function. This inquiry offers a concept of relationality, a process-oriented theoretical framework that foregrounds the notion that educational endeavors continually emerge from complex interactions that may refuse delineation. I use relationality to reevaluate existing aspects of higher educational institutions that, through the cultivation of collegiality, support the development of teaching. Drawn from the classical Chinese philosophical text *Zhongyong*, relationality situates people as necessarily interdependent and prioritizes attention to relation. Reading research and examples of faculty learning communities through the lens of relationality, collegiality emerges as a valuable outcome that enriches faculty networks, generates collaborative projects, and reimagines notions of value in unpredictable ways. In addition, the concept situates reflective pedagogical research, for example by educator Elizabeth Ellsworth, as a form of personal cultivation that is relevant across disciplines. This inquiry encourages administrators and educators to continually question normative academic practices, to ask what is missed by the pursuit of market-oriented principles to construct institutional directions and tenure/promotion guidelines, and to consider the extensive value of the cultivation of faculty collegiality for higher education communities.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Neoliberalism’s Influence on Institutions of Higher Education .....	4
Support for Teaching through Cultivation of Collegiality.....	11
Juxtaposition as Method .....	20
Formations of Relation.....	22
2 MIXED MESSAGES ABOUT TEACHING AND RESEARCH AT A UNIVERSITY .....	29
To Prepare Workers and Create Jobs .....	33
Situating Faculty as Producers of Research.....	41
Juxtaposing the Two Documents.....	46
To Situate Teaching.....	53
Institution as Assemblage .....	62
3 POLITICS, EXAMINATIONS, AND BECOMING VISIBLE: A GENEALOGY OF CONFUCIAN TEXTS .....	65
The Examination .....	69
A Genealogical Approach .....	75
Use of the Exam Process to Legitimize Rule and Create Social Stability.....	77
The Contested Nature of the Exams and the Texts.....	81
Spectacle and the Increased Concealment of Political Power.....	85
Increased Inflexibility of Normative Interpretations of the Texts .....	88
Texts as Cultural Products.....	90
Reading as Participation in a Flexible and Changing Tradition .....	93

4	RELATIONALITY: INTERDEPENDENCE, PROCESS, AND THE EXTENSIVITY OF PERSONAL CULTIVATION .....	100
	People as Events .....	103
	The Performativity of Relationship from a Processual Worldview .....	108
	The Quality of Relationship Matters .....	113
	The Work of Personal Cultivation Through Relationships .....	116
	The Extensive Impact of Relational Personal Cultivation .....	118
5	DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGIALITY IN FACULTY LEARNING COMMUNITIES .....	121
	A Concept of “Communities of Practice” .....	124
	Learning from the Contexts of Everyday Practice .....	125
	Practices Imply Goals .....	126
	Practices and Identities .....	127
	The Development of Collegiality as Process/Support for Teaching .....	130
	Faculty Learning Communities as Method to Foster Communication .....	135
	Re-envisioning Community: A Relational Framing of Dynamic Interaction .....	137
	Making Time: Encouraging Participant Commitment and Reciprocity .....	138
	Thriving Learning Communities Constituted by Dynamic Interaction .....	140
	Relational Personal Cultivation .....	142
	Extensive Influence of Personal Cultivation .....	143
	Multiple Forms of Faculty Learning Communities .....	145
	No Periphery .....	151
	The Extensive Value of Faculty Learning Communities .....	153
6	A TURN TO PARADOX IN THE CLASSROOM .....	156
	A Relational Approach to Situate Pedagogy .....	161
	A Processual Orientation .....	163
	Ellsworth’s Case for Analytic Dialogue .....	166
	Destabilization of Teacher Student Roles .....	170
	The Juxtaposition of Theoretical Frameworks .....	174
	Resonances and Differences .....	179

7 THE UNIVERSITY AS LEARNING COMMUNITY..... 187

BIBLIOGRAPHY .....202

APPENDICES

A University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions, 2015-2021 .....209

B Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application University of Hawai'i  
at Mānoa September 2015 .....219

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

This inquiry has both general and specific aspects. The broader aim is to reconsider the value of the relationships that constitute higher educational institutional function. The complexity of interactions and relationships necessary to engage in the activities of teaching, learning, service, and research is often overlooked by administrators and educators in part due to the pervasive use of market-oriented language and organizational ideals to describe and actualize the goals of higher educational institutions. While attempts to realize institutional trajectories can require considerable resources, attention, and measurable evidence of institutional success and effectiveness, it can be easy to forget that it is people in relation, whose unpredictable actions cannot be wholly measured or understood, that generate such institutions. I explore how engagement with a concept of relationality, which situates people as interdependent and envisions the world as processual, suggests that relationships cannot be taken for granted or assumed, and can, when attended to, enrich university communities in ways that are unpredictable.

This project is also specific in that I engage a relational concept to reevaluate existing aspects of educational institutions that prioritize consideration of relationships. Relationality can bring to the forefront the value of the cultivation of collegial relationships and reflective pedagogical research at universities. For example, initiatives that foster the development of the craft of teaching persist in various forms throughout a university. Faculty learning communities provide faculty members with contexts to discuss new approaches to teaching. Educators, such as Elizabeth Ellsworth, examine the complexity of classroom dynamics and question normative assumptions about teaching and learning by attending to

her students' responses to her teaching. While such initiatives and research may be categorized as part of the scholarship of teaching and learning, or curriculum studies, a relational perspective suggests they are relevant more broadly to a university community. In particular, the methods used to achieve the goals of support for the development of the craft of teaching often foreground the importance of relationships. Faculty learning communities cultivate collegiality in order to encourage faculty members to openly discuss their teaching experiences. Ellsworth undertakes a process of relational personal cultivation, from my perspective, in her critique of pedagogical approaches when her theoretical work considers her students' classroom experiences. A reevaluation from a relational perspective encourages administrators and faculty to see the extensive collegial contributions from faculty learning communities and reflective pedagogical research.

I hope the general and specific aspects of this project can encourage administrators and scholars to continually question normative academic practices, to ask about the limits of engaging a neoliberal approach to construct institutional directions, and to consider the importance of the cultivation of collegiality. A question that informs this project is how does engagement with a relational concept situate the value of phenomena that support the development of teaching through the cultivation of collegiality? My aspiration is to inquire about how a process of relational personal cultivation for faculty members and the development of collegiality can theoretically enrich a university community in extensive and unpredictable ways. For example, how might notions of an educational community change when we consider people not as separate but interdependent? How do institutional documents such as strategic directions and tenure/promotion guidelines reflect a product-orientation? How do faculty learning communities and reflective pedagogical research influence university communities more broadly? How does a concept of relationality



challenge educators to reflectively consider normative academic practices of research and teaching and imply the responsibility of a university to support the cultivation of collegial relationships?

A concept of relationality is constructed from reading a translation of the *Zhongyong*, a classical Chinese philosophical text, and informed by the work of comparative philosophers such as Roger Ames, David Hall, Li-Hsiang Lisa Rosenlee, Sor-hoon Tan, Henry Rosemount Jr., and Thomas Kasulis. These scholars have written extensively about the differences between substance-oriented and process-oriented worldviews and the impact they have on the construction of people's identities. In particular, they examine the implications of envisioning people as interdependent rather than as individuals. Some also suggest that a Confucian tradition is relevant to contemporary philosophical discussions and should be situated as a flexible tradition that continues to change when people read classical Chinese philosophical texts within their particular spatial and temporal locations.

The broader impulse to explore a concept of relationality and its relevance to educational constructs is informed by the research of feminists, or those who share similar concerns. Hannah Tavares, Lynda Stone, Jane Bennett, Judith Butler, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre, and Elizabeth Ellsworth, among others, articulate the importance of affect and a need to look beyond substance-oriented notions in order to situate people in relation. In particular, they suggest that inquiry about positionalities destabilizes assumptions about identities through engagement with a notion that so-called "knowledges" are constructed and always partial. To explore relation is a feminist response to patriarchy that contributes more broadly to a critique of a notion of universal, essential, and fixed truths.

By drawing on the theorizations of some comparative philosophers and feminists, I explore relationality more specifically in the context of university communities and ask how it can be used as a resource to read contemporary educational institutional constructs. This endeavor is limited in that I do not conduct in-depth qualitative or quantitative research about specific faculty learning communities or conduct my own pedagogical classroom research, but instead examine the research and writing of others to theoretically situate these phenomena in order to read them with a lens of relationality. In this project, I seek to:

1) Consider how public institutional documents reflect a neoliberal orientation.

2) Construct a notion of relationality from a translation of the *Zhongyong*, a text often referred to as Confucian.

3) Apply a lens of relationality to read research about faculty learning communities and the work of Elizabeth Ellsworth.

4) Consider how a concept of relationality can be productively juxtaposed with other theoretical constructs.

5) Deliberate the implications an engagement with a relational construct has for universities more broadly. The intent here is to explore the relevance of a concept of relationality to consider educational institutions and the role of relationships.

### **Neoliberalism's Influence on Institutions of Higher Education**

Researchers and educators continue to discuss with alarm how a neoliberal orientation influences contemporary university structures, directions, and values. The rationality of neoliberalism, expressed as a relationship between a country and its citizens that is primarily economic and product-oriented, dominates current social, political, and

educational constructs (Biesta, 2010; Brown, 2015). This market-focused framework strongly emphasizes a free-market and deregulation orientation in regard to government policies and situates people and institutions in a consumer-oriented relationship. Educator Gert Biesta (2010) argues that to situate the state as a provider of public services and citizens as consumers depoliticizes and formalizes their identities and limits their relationship with each other. Such a construct, which narrows and simplifies the relationship, suggests that the relationship can be understood in financial terms, and that the value of particular activities can be measured. From this perspective, managerial accountability is necessary to provide, as Biesta calls it, “quality assurance” of institutional activity to ensure that perceived needs of its stakeholders are met. Such a market orientation influences what educational institutions value and the directions they take.

Political scientist Wendy Brown (2015) warns that the reach of neoliberalism, as a rationality and language, extends toward marketizing areas of life that have been traditionally noneconomic such as educational fields. In other words, it frames all aspects of life from a market-related perspective in a way that suggests that people should be situated as entrepreneurs (Fitzsimons, 2002). This framework has an intimate impact on how people see themselves and influences the choices we make. Patrick Fitzsimons (2002) describes neoliberal or “enterprise” culture as one where a market orientation is reflected in people’s beliefs, notions of self, and institutional and personal activities. It reflects a status-oriented attitude that infuses all aspects of life such as choice of partners, friends, and hobbies, among others. While these choices may not necessarily be assigned a dollar value per se, they can be seen as a way to raise a person’s status in the perceived eyes of future employers. In particular, such an orientation situates people as necessarily autonomous and is reflected by an interest to foster competition between “individuals.” He suggests that

neoliberalism is also an ethic that implies market operations are a value in and of themselves, and need not be connected to the actual production of goods and services. Such a perspective means that to engage a market orientation is to strive to determine value according to its principles even in regard to complex processes or phenomena where such categorizations may seem incompatible, such as the activities of educational institutions.

What does such a product-orientation mean for higher educational institutions? Fitzsimons suggests that a neoliberal culture has two major tasks. The first is that all institutions need to be reshaped in the form of commercial enterprises that are consumer-oriented. For universities, this means universities should be organizationally structured like corporations and operate using business practices. Higher educational institutions already employ a heightened level of bureaucracy in regard to their organizational structures in that they share interdependent and normative so called “mediums of exchange” such as diplomas, transcripts, and certificates that allow people to move between institutions and allow institutions to control participant entry (Green, Ericson & Seidman, 1997). Institutional mission statements and strategic plans, which publicly articulate a university’s values and goals, openly express their interest in becoming more business-oriented. For example, the University of Hawai’i’s Strategic Directions for 2015-2021, cites as one of its four goals the development of a “high performance mission-driven system,” committed to “accountability, transparency and managing costs by leveraging our unique status as a unified statewide system of public higher education.”<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, for each of the four goals, the document

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Hawai’i. (2015). *University of Hawai’i strategic directions, 2015-2021*. Retrieved from <http://blog.hawaii.edu/strategicdirections/files/2015/01/StrategicDirectionsFINAL-013015.pdf>.

identifies specific “productivity and efficiency measures associated with these outcomes [to] provide clear, measurable goals and the ability to effectively monitor progress over time.”

The institution’s strategic directions showcase a market orientation not only through its articulation of institutional goals but also in the structures and processes it uses to evaluate its activities.

The use of business language to describe institutional purposes and goals is not only evident at the University of Hawai‘i, the institution I will sometimes refer to as a case example, it is common in many universities and colleges, public and private, across the United States. For example, at the University of California, Berkeley, a strategic academic plan refers to the university as an “academic enterprise” tasked with “maximizing the potential for interdisciplinary synergy...to ensure our investments in both academic programs and physical improvements...”<sup>2</sup> At the University of Michigan, the president’s office lists six areas of interest on its webpage, each with a link to its own strategic directions that describe strategies for “recruitment, supporting innovation, and creating equity.” For example, the area of “Academic Innovation” works closely with the “Academic Innovation Initiative Steering Committee” during the 2016-17 academic year to “assess the constraints that inhibit academic innovation and explore ways to overcome them”; “propose designs for structures and systems that enable ongoing academic innovation across the U-M”; and “propose a transformational approach for leveraging academic innovation to shape the future of education and further realize our mission,” among others.<sup>3</sup> At Harvard, the president and fellows of Harvard are known as the “corporation,” an entity that “engages

---

<sup>2</sup> University of California, Berkeley (2002). *UC Berkeley strategic academic plan*. Retrieved from <http://vpsafp.berkeley.edu/media/Strategic-Academic-Plan-02.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (2016). *The academic innovation initiative*. Retrieved from <http://ai.umich.edu/events/ai-initiative/>.

with both questions of long-range strategy, policy, and planning as well as transactional matters of unusual consequence. It serves as a confidential sounding board for the President on matters of importance...and is responsible for approving the University's budgets, major capital projects, endowment spending, tuition charges, and other matters."<sup>4</sup> Such market and consumer-oriented language suggests the importance of economic considerations in numerous higher educational institutions and reflect market-oriented perspectives in regard to institutional directions.

How does a neoliberal orientation influence what higher educational institutions value? In such a culture of measurement that prioritizes a product-orientated view of educational endeavors, administrators and policymakers tend to value perceived measurable outcomes, and deemphasize those deemed not relevant to achieving specific goals. For example, in the University of Hawai'i's strategic directions document, one "tactic" noted for the goal of a "high performance mission-driven system" is to "implement world-class business practices to advance efficiency, transparency and accountability with sound risk management." Biesta (2010) points out that discussions and research about educational function, which impact institutional directions, necessitate judgments about desirable expectations. If administrators emphasize the construction of efficient institutional processes and standards to evaluate institutional developments, then they may overlook those aspects of educational endeavors whose outcomes are difficult to quantify in economic terms. As a matter of fact, Fitzsimons (2002) suggests that the second task of a neoliberal culture is to background or even reverse any initiatives that do not contribute to the development of "enterprise." Administrators would tend to value the activities that fit

---

<sup>4</sup> Harvard University (2017). *Harvard's president & leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.harvard.edu/about-harvard/harvards-president-leadership>.

more cleanly into this economic-driven frame, while undervaluing those aspects deemed to complicate specified goals.

Although the frame of a culture of measurement can be useful—it provides data on educational phenomena for faculty, administrators, and policy-makers—it has limitations as a dominant paradigm for educational considerations because it can obscure the vast complexity involved in educational initiatives. For example, how would one calculate the value of constructing a deeper understanding of a concept that one learned in a class decades ago or encounter with a classmate who inspired one to consider a different perspective? How can one really measure learning—an ongoing process that one may not be completely aware of oneself—when there may be multiple desired outcomes? How does one quantify or describe “quality” or “expert” teaching? The complexity of educational endeavors may be impossible to usefully characterize in terms of measurement.<sup>5</sup> To participate unquestioningly in a normative culture of measurement can be problematic because such an orientation conveys a sense of false confidence that one can understand or describe educational endeavors and their value completely with such a framework.

Furthermore, and more troubling, the dominating influence of a culture of measurement on educational institutions informs and limits how people view each other. A formal economically-framed relationship between state and citizen resonates in the relations between state officials and educational administrators, departments and faculty members,

---

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth Ellsworth (1997) goes so far as to argue that if teaching is envisioned as the transfer of information from one person to others, then it is “impossible” because teachers cannot control what students will hear and think, and should not assume that they can. She suggests that an acknowledgment that teaching is impossible opens up new possibilities. It does not mean one does not try to teach, but rather, teaching with awareness that one cannot expect to have complete control over what others hear and how they’ll react influences how one approaches and what one expects from the activity of teaching. This is an example of how it may be impossible to wholly comprehend the complexity of educational endeavors.

and faculty members and students. For example, faculty members and administrators may determine the breadth of student learning based mainly on test scores, a focus which may overlook and even devalue the learning that may have occurred outside of an evaluatory scope. Administrators and colleagues may determine faculty members' instructional success largely based on end-of-semester evaluations from students, a limited measure of the complexity and impact of teaching. Not only do the terms of a culture of measurement shape peoples' views of each other in a product-oriented way, they also influence our expectations of and behavior toward others. A product-orientation limits consideration of phenomena such as relationships and experiences in more complex ways. As such, institutions can overlook important aspects of educational function such as support for the development of faculty members' collegial relationships and attention to the value of reflective pedagogical research.

A neoliberal ideology and rationality influence contemporary higher educational institutions in multiple embedded ways. For example, they are expressed in the language of institutional strategic documents and directions. The emphasis of framing educational initiatives and endeavors with a market orientation also impacts how aspects of educational institutions are structured and valued. In particular, those aspects that can be directly situated as relevant to the market-oriented goals of an institution will tend to receive more institutional attention and resources. Such an orientation actively deemphasizes or strives to reverse those initiatives that challenge the impulses of a neoliberal orientation. The troubling outcome of the engagement of such a dominant orientation in higher educational institutions is that it impacts how people relate to each other as part of an institution and overlooks those complex aspects of educational endeavors. The use of such a dominant paradigm not only eclipses the complexity of educational phenomena and gives a false



sense of confidence regarding understanding such phenomena, but it also lacks interest in directing questions and inquiry towards the influences and limits of the frame itself. If a culture of measurement that shapes educational institutions tends to encourage participants to value what can be measured, then such an approach more easily overlooks the quality and richness of participants' interactions and experiences that may be difficult to measure.

### **Support for Teaching through Cultivation of Collegiality**

A few years before I pursued doctoral study, I had the opportunity to teach in an intensive three-week writing program for incoming students at a liberal arts college. In order to teach in the program, new faculty members were required to participate in a weeklong course led by the program director. In the course, she modeled the various pedagogical practices we were to use with our students by situating us as students. We read the texts the students would read and tackled typical assignments. What I found unexpected and compelling about this experience was not just the value of learning about a new teaching approach, but the strength of the collegiality that developed amongst the new faculty. Through the hours of writing and reading together, through having to write essays as our students would be expected to, we developed a rapport that stretched past the training course and into the intensity of teaching in the program. We expressed this collegiality through openly discussing our class plans and even decided to collaborate at times by joining each other's classes. Our classes were enhanced by the conversations we had with each other outside of the classroom about ways to approach various texts and the difficulties we encountered in our classes. While as faculty we bonded over the activity of learning together, our collegial relationships continued to develop through our experiences

teaching in the program. In reflecting on the experience, what surprised me was that this approach to support the development of the craft of teaching through the cultivation of collegiality was not more commonly viewed as valuable by the college's administrators or at other higher educational institutions more broadly.

A neoliberal framework may overlook the value of support for the development of the craft of teaching because teaching is a complex, relational process. While universities ideally envision teaching as an integral part of scholarship, for example in mission statement calls for academic rigor, it is an activity administrators may find difficult to practically engage and support because faculty members will have multiple teaching approaches, which may be considered "successful" in their own particular contexts. A teaching approach that one faculty member feels comfortable using may not be useful in the context of another's and student reactions will always be somewhat unpredictable. Educator Ernest Boyer (1990) calls teaching "a dynamic endeavor" that involves thinking and learning; he argues that while a critical part of a conception of scholarship involves conducting research, so should reflection on connections, communication with others, and consideration of the links between theoretical constructs and teaching practice. But institutions may minimize support for teaching in part because it is a complex and ongoing process that can be difficult to situate within a neoliberal framework.

How does a neoliberal framework situate classrooms and the roles of teacher and student? It likely views the processes of teaching and learning in a reductive manner. Fitzsimons (2002) credits Jean-François Lyotard when he suggests that it situates the function of a teacher as a consumer of cultural products in order to reproduce them for consumption by students with the goal of producing a labor force. The function of students is to consume content along with the various social hierarchies embedded as part of the

schooling process. In other words, teaching, from a neoliberal perspective, is something that happens pro forma as part of educational institutions. The experience that I described earlier might be considered from a neoliberal perspective somewhat unnecessary to the broader function of preparing students for the labor force. Interest to support the development of program quality or effectiveness would likely be connected with graduation rates rather than experiences of teaching and learning. And what would be the value of the cultivation of collegiality amongst faculty members? In regard to all the other aspects of institutional function, it might garner less attention, despite its being a vital way to enrich a university community. For example, it has the potential to broaden collegial networks and foster the potential for collaboration in ways that elude easy description. What gets missed from a neoliberal perspective, when there is a narrow characterization of roles, is the value of the development of collegiality that emerges from faculty members actively working together to reflect upon and discuss varied approaches to teaching.

While teaching expectations are generally a key component of instructional faculty job descriptions, faculty members face multiple institutional expectations. University tenure and promotion guidelines, which readily identify the importance of improving teaching, also establish expectations for faculty members to conduct innovative research and engage in service. These expectations can place new faculty members in a difficult situation to make choices about how they use their time, especially when they earn tenure and gain prestige in their fields more readily through the production of research publications than by contributions made in the classroom. While the tenure and promotion guidelines for instructional faculty at many higher educational institutions, such as public and private research universities and colleges, may tout the importance of teaching, the tenure process is often interpreted to value research and scholarship over teaching. A long time faculty

member observes that those who excel in teaching while producing few publications will not receive tenure but a mediocre teacher with many publications will.

Because a culture of measurement tends to define faculty and student roles in hierarchical and fixed ways, it can confound an institution to situate faculty as teaching *and* learning, especially given the impulse to identify clear goals and provide evidence for effectiveness of activities. How does one make quantifiable distinctions about a view that situates scholarship as a process that integrates teaching and learning? When does one teach and when does one learn? To complicate the issue, quality teaching is difficult to adequately demonstrate. While mid-point and end-of-semester teaching evaluations can provide some indications of student satisfaction with instructors' course facilitations, they are not a reliable measure of teaching quality. Students' performances in particular courses, and other factors not related to instructors' teaching quality, such as class size, attendance policies, student motivations for attending college, students' relationships with previous professors, and students' popularity with other students, among others, influence what students write in their instructors' teaching evaluations (Germain & Scandura, 2005; Ozcan, 2013). Moreover, techniques such as teaching evaluations provide limited insight about envisioning teachers as learners.

Another reason support of teaching has been traditionally overlooked by American universities is due to the influence of a German model of the university that prioritizes research development. Throughout the mid-to-late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Americans who went for short trainings and courses in Europe returned home to influence the development of universities in the United States. Specifically, ten thousand Americans studied in Germany between 1815 and 1914 (Marsden, 1994). Their visions of American universities featured the notion that the pursuit of academic freedom, without interference by government, could

best be achieved through the use of the scientific method. This vision reflected in part a predominant feeling that intellectuals should seek to develop knowledge for its own sake and the belief that specialized research could solve practical problems (Glyer & Weeks, 1998). In universities in the United States, professionalization based on research productivity and ideals, such as the importance of the pursuit of knowledge, generated a growing scholar community that became socially mobile (O'Boyle, 1983; Glyer & Weeks, 1998). Prestige and status became aligned with research productivity, and, as a result, these normative beliefs influenced the structures of universities and became reflected in promotion requirements, salary structures, and governance/administrative lines, among others. As areas of research became more specialized and research productivity became a marker of expertise, the bureaucracy of the university also became more complex as more departments were created.

While the emphasis on the production of specialized research at universities highlights the importance of graduate education as a way to prepare and certify future scholars in the United States as in the German university model, universities are expected to educate undergraduates too. The approaches between teaching undergraduates and graduate students, who are for the most part serious about their disciplines and have a sophisticated level of expertise in their fields, can differ widely. Graduate students, generally more resilient and independent learners, tend to be confident in their own skills and familiar with the disciplines in which they will conduct their own research, while undergraduates may have varying motivation levels and expertise in particular disciplines especially before having chosen a major. Unfamiliar with the norms of specific disciplines and the important developments in specific fields, they may lack basic knowledge of how to conduct research and meet expectations for college-level work. As such, some faculty members may need to

use more comprehensive and flexible teaching approaches to teach undergraduate courses. Approach to teaching undergraduate courses is important because student-classroom experiences can have a broad impact. For example, undergraduates' course experiences can dissuade or persuade students from pursuit of further study in particular disciplines, and even shape how they perceive subjects as relevant to their lives post formal education. How faculty members envision, value, and approach teaching can have a pronounced impact directly on some students' experiences, their classroom relationships and interactions, and their lives.

Educator William Profriedt (1994) argues that support for learning about teaching can be critical to the development of the craft of teaching. Simply reading about research on teaching and learning may not be enough to support teaching development in a thoughtful way: "Broadly educated teachers do not simply apply rules derived from the correlational studies of researchers; they activate and generate complex understandings about their work based on their own perspectives and experience" (p. 5). Teaching is an ongoing practice that emerges through experience, reflection, and experimentation, and involves ongoing learning. It is not uncommon for educational theorists to situate people who teach as learners and even characterize them as artists. John Dewey (1916) makes the point that in educational contexts, subject matter cannot be separated from method: "The method of teaching is the method of an art, of action intelligently directed by ends" (p. 170). With an expert understanding of materials and tools, painters must learn how to use them. "Attainment of this knowledge requires persistent and concentrated attention to objective materials. The artist studies the progress of his own attempts to see what succeeds and what fails" (p. 170). Learning to teach is a process and a practice.

Teachers, like artists, Dewey argues, embrace the challenge of shifting contexts and conditions by continually learning through experimentation in ways that can be transformative. Donald Schön (1983) views those who teach as professionals and experts who give artistic performances in their practice of teaching: “his artistry is evident in his selective management of large amounts of information, his ability to spin out long lines of invention and inference, and his capacity to hold several ways of looking at things at once without interrupting the flow of inquiry” (p. 130). Roger Ames (2016) suggests that teaching and learning are abstractions of educational endeavors, which could be envisioned as an enmeshed activity of what he calls “holistic” learning.

One way to support the activity of teaching-learning for faculty members is through discussion and reflection about classroom experiences with their colleagues. Faculty learning communities develop in part due to interest in finding ways to support teaching in an academic culture where the practice of teaching is often perceived as a so called “private enterprise” that is not often subject to open discussion, peer review, or constructive criticism (Glowacki-Dudka & Brown, 2008). Jason Ritter (2011) points out that because higher educational institutions assume that institutional support for teaching is largely unnecessary, new instructional faculty may feel reluctant to ask for assistance. For some faculty members, seeking assistance feels improper and uncomfortable because it is a move that positions experts in particular areas of study as learners. This can evoke emotions of vulnerability and uncertainty about how to make sense of and respond to events in classrooms (Pinnegar, 1995). Michelle Glowacki-Dudka and Michael Brown (2008) posit that when faculty do seek to improve their teaching craft, they often turn to campus centers for teaching that offer short workshops on developing specific teaching techniques. While these workshops may be useful to address some aspects of teaching, the experiences may

not encourage the development of a thoughtful teaching philosophy and a comprehensive teaching methodology that might emerge as part of a more interactive and collaborative setting. Faculty learning communities that encourage the development of philosophies of teaching and learning through the cultivation of collegial relationships, on the other hand, provide a space for the exchange of ideas between colleagues.

The concept of the faculty learning community emerged from descriptions of student learning communities by Alexander Meiklejohn (1932) and John Dewey (1933) that suggested that shared study and collaborative inquiry were keys to active learning (Cox, 2004). In particular, the notion of cohorted study included the practice of having groups of students take courses together throughout a program. Some higher educational institutions found that participation in learning communities increased student retention because it helped students adjust socially and personally to university cultures and deepened their intellectual engagement. Faculty learning communities are constituted by faculty members of varied disciplines (generally between 6-12 or so in each group) who voluntarily participate (Furco & Moley, 2012). The generally cohort or topic-based gatherings tend to be goal-oriented and create an environment where faculty members feel comfortable to discuss their classroom experiences. Groups meet regularly for a designated period of time and may discuss shared readings that foster reflection about teaching experiences or learn about new teaching approaches, among other activities.

While research about faculty learning communities describes the effectiveness of group activities to support the learning of teaching innovations, it often misses the broader value of the development of collegiality that emerges. If we consider a relational perspective of the development of collegiality, in which relationships are prioritized, it has an extensive impact on a university community. As mentioned briefly earlier, relationality situates people



as necessarily interdependent and the world as processual and changing. Efforts to develop collegiality through participation in faculty learning communities whether more formal or informal can enrich relationships beyond the scope of the learning community. Rather than a need to fix outcomes, a relational perspective values the cultivation of relationships to consider what is possible.

Engagement with reflective pedagogical research is another way that supports envisioning teaching as ongoing practice. When institutions see the value of reflective pedagogical research as broadly relevant to various disciplines in a university, they support the notion that teachers are learners. For example, educator Elizabeth Ellsworth has written books and articles that reflectively explore her theorizations about pedagogy that emerge from her experiences in the classroom. She examines the complexity of the classroom space and the relationships between participants and situates herself as continually learning. In particular, she offers a critique of critical pedagogical approaches, examines the importance of destabilizing notions of student and teacher, and suggests that communication in the classroom should not be viewed as a matter of direct transfer of information but rather as a conversation that might return the unexpected. Ellsworth's research reflects, in my view, an undertaking of a process of relational personal cultivation in a classroom context, which could be seen as relevant to instructional faculty in various disciplines.

While a culture of measurement may seek to describe quality teaching in quantifiable terms such as "products" and "outcomes," teaching is too complex a process to adequately and comprehensively describe in quantifiable ways. As a result, it may be difficult to prioritize support for teaching from a neoliberal perspective because the practice of teaching is so contextual and changing. What may be left unexamined is not only the value the

development of collegiality might offer to support the enrichment of particular classroom interactions and experiences but also how learning about teaching, whether it be through a process of personal cultivation undertaken in a class one teaches or with colleagues as part of a faculty learning community, can enrich a university more broadly.

### **Juxtaposition as Method**

I use Elizabeth Ellsworth's (1997) conception of juxtaposition as a method to invite questions about the texts and concepts that I examine. It is a practice that destabilizes assumed perspectives that develop from reading texts. Reading a text in juxtaposition with another generates similarities and differences between them. Questions about the texts that remind me that the act of reading is specific, partial, and contextual, emerge from the activity. I suggest that juxtaposition can be used to engage not only texts but also concepts. To ask about the resonances and differences that arise from the activity of juxtaposition broadens the contextual fields of the texts and concepts.

To read is to construct meaning. Through the experience of reading a text or interpreting a concept I generally try to develop a notion of an author's intention. I ask questions about what I read in an attempt to interpret a text but also to consider what it means to me and how I think about it. When two texts or concepts are read in juxtaposition or relation, resonances and differences between them emerge from the experience of reading. To inquire about the similarities and differences is to make visible the assumptions about the two that I may not have noticed while reading them on their own. Ellsworth writes, "Reading two texts side by side can destabilize the sense I have made of each text

separately” (p. 14). To read two texts or concepts in juxtaposition is to construct a relation that compels me to see them differently even if I return to consider them separately.

The point is not to make the differences and resonances match up but to ask what they mean. To undertake a process of juxtaposition highlights the process of reading as a decidedly subjective, ongoing, and generative activity, rather than one that assumes objectivity or considers an act of reading as the uncovering of essential meanings. While a process of comparison and contrast seeks to look for differences and similarities between two texts not as a way to make visible assumptions but rather to see each text more clearly as an object, a process of juxtaposition, on the other hand, emphasizes the process of reading and interpretation of the texts. Meaning, from a perspective of juxtaposition, is continually constructed.

To juxtapose is to remind that the process of reading is an experience that is specific and always partial because constructed meanings can change. Anything can be juxtaposed with anything else, so the act of juxtaposition insinuates and reminds that texts and concepts are always part of contextual fields that are specific. They do not and cannot exist in isolation. To juxtapose then is to deliberately broaden the contextual fields of the selected texts or concepts through engaging and enriching their relation. This positive or productive activity of construction, contextualization, and reading, creates resonance and disjuncture, and at the same time insinuates what is left out. Why juxtapose this and not that? It is the deliberateness of juxtaposition and also the element of randomness that acknowledges that the question of choice is always there and is an important one. Juxtaposition is intentionally a partial method. It does not seek to provide comprehensive analysis or understanding of a text or concept. It insinuates, suggests, and questions rather than essentialize or fix. To juxtapose is to intentionally choose and leave out. To juxtapose is to inquire.

Throughout the project, I use juxtaposition in varied contexts—documents with other documents, concepts with other concepts, concepts with educational phenomena, research with other research, among others. The intention is to try to make visible the assumptions I have about reading these texts, concepts, and phenomena; to notice resonances and disjunctures that emerge from their juxtaposition and to ask about what they mean; to insinuate the breadth and complexity of the field of educational institutional endeavors; and to inquire about the possibilities that engagement with a relational concept can return in the specific contexts of universities.

### **Formations of Relation**

Formalized educational systems function to organize relations among people (Foucault, 1975/1995). Often from the ages of five and six, if not younger, people are expected to attend school through to the age of eighteen, and often beyond to college and graduate school, if they want access to certain jobs and perceived social status. To draw on the writing of the late French philosopher Michel Foucault (1975/1995), educational institutions are formations that make use of disciplinary methods such as time-tables in the form of schedules, evaluation through examinations, and enclosures in the forms of classrooms and office spaces that are designated for specific functions. The purpose of the use of these methods, from a neoliberal perspective, is to distinguish people from each other in hierarchical and competitive ways in order to make it easier and more efficient for interested parties, such as employers, to identify people as qualified for particular positions. To individualize people via documentation has a productive purpose and such formations can also have a normalizing effect. Educational institutions influence societal notions of

what it means to learn, to teach, and to be “schooled”—even “educated.” Disciplinary methods introduce a scale around norms that influences people’s relations in part because they seek to organize relations.

Engagement of a neoliberal orientation by higher educational institutions defines relations among people more specifically in economic terms. It further reinforces the importance of documentation and evaluation of people for the purposes of realizing institutional goals. The emergent norms suggest that quality research and teaching can be quantified, that grades do reflect what students learn, that retention rates indicate institutional success, among others. A neoliberal rationality provides a power/knowledge construct that further situates people as objects and subjects of power. From a neoliberal perspective, people are objects because reliance on the use of disciplinary methods to organize relations through a process of individualization insinuates that people can at some level be understood or described through those methods. In other words, a transcript or CV, among other documents, reflects an institutional rendering of a person, who a person “is.” People become subjects to such disciplinary methods because the methods influence how people feel about themselves, whether one is “good” at school or a subject, and the extent to which one feels “learned” or “educated.” Norms influence how we behave, relate, think, and judge others and ourselves. Participation in an institution oriented by economic terms and business practices, to some extent, encourages internalization of those terms—and their rationality.

Because power/knowledge regimes situate people as objects and subjects, Foucault suggests that people cannot be autonomous because we are necessarily socially constructed (Bevir, 1999). A notion of autonomy would suggest that a person could exist outside of society. Foucault implies this is not possible because one cannot escape the

influence of some kind of societal normalization because people are born into and live in relation. This is not to say that people cannot become aware of normalizing influences and seek to act in ways that counter them. Mark Bevir (1999) suggests one can engage reason, senses, the development of perspective, reflection, among others, to consider how to act and interact with others within institutions and society. While one's responses and actions may influence how one experiences social constructs to an extent, one cannot be separate or autonomous from these constructs.

A concept of relationality shares the same assumption—that people are not autonomous but necessarily constituted by others—but takes it in a different direction than Foucault does. A framework of relationality drawn from classical Chinese philosophical texts envisions life as processual and, because people are situated necessarily in relation with others, it suggests that relationships are of utmost importance. One has some choice about how one interacts with others in ways that can influence the robustness of a relationship. For example, people who act toward one another with a sense of reciprocity, respect, and care may have stronger, more enriched relationships. While Foucault situates people as objects and subjects of power/knowledge regimes that tend to focus on how societal norms mask the complexity of people, causing oppression and suffering, a concept of relationality suggests that because people can choose to some extent how to relate with others, people can influence norms because they generate and perpetuate them through their activities.

A relational orientation is compatible with the Foucauldian notion that disciplinary methods employed by systems such as educational institutions are a type or modality of power that have strong normative societal influences (like “the Law, the Word (*parole*) and the Text, Tradition” (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 184)). A relational perspective acknowledges institutions for what they are—formations that seek to organize relations and systems that

can generate norms and knowledges, which impact how people act and what they believe. At the same time, this orientation suggests that because relation is primary, institutions exist because people construct and continue to use them. Because institutions exist only because people in relation constitute them, how people relate influences them. In fact, educational institutions could be situated not only as organizing relations between people, but also as generating roles and chances for interaction. While the roles have varied levels of institutional power, from a relational perspective, they could also be perceived as creating opportunities for non-prescribed and even unintended interactions that have the potential to subvert the product-oriented aims of the institution and the construct of people as autonomous individuals. If people are necessarily constituted by others and can affect and be affected by others, then educational institutions may provide people with opportunities to act in ways that change and enrich relationships. In other words, how people relate can destabilize, challenge, and reconstruct normative notions of roles and values in educational contexts.

To engage a concept of relationality is one way to actively inquire about how a neoliberal framework influences the constructs of higher educational institutions by making visible the assumptions and norms such an approach has on notions of teaching, learning, service, and research. Relationality suggests that while institutions may continue to engage a neoliberal approach because it reflects broader political-economic global trends, participants can at the same time strive to be critical of it, and to take care to reconsider notions of what an institution normatively values. It offers a chance to resist neoliberal pressure by situating it not as an essential construct but a constructed one. A participant in an educational institution, a relational framework implies, does not exist as independent from others, but as necessarily already in relation. What is important, from a relational

perspective, is how one relates to others. Such a perspective implies the necessity of a reevaluation of those aspects of educational institutional phenomena that prioritize the development of collegiality such as those that support the development of teaching. Relationality challenges participants to look beyond a predilection to use metrics to measure a quality university community and to see it as constructed continually by people's interactions in ways that cannot be fixed or wholly described or quantified—and do not need to be.

This project seeks to inquire about how a concept of relationality can be used as a resource to reconsider the value of those aspects of institutions—such as faculty learning communities and the reflective pedagogical research by Elizabeth Ellsworth—that prioritize the consideration of relationships. In chapter 2, “Mixed Messages about Teaching and Research at a University,” I ask how university documents express a neoliberal framework and what they insinuate about what a university values. In particular, I juxtapose an institution's strategic directions document with instructional faculty tenure/promotion guidelines and consider how, although the purposes of the two documents differ, they express a product-orientation in different ways that deemphasize support for teaching and the development of collegiality.

Next, I provide some context about the *Zhongyong*, a text from a family of so-called Confucian texts, and discuss why it may be considered a resource to contemporary educational constructs. In chapter 3, “Politics, Examinations, and Becoming Visible: A Genealogy of Confucian texts,” I address the notion that classical Chinese philosophical texts, which were used as content for the civil service examinations that took place over much of the last two millennia, are sometimes normatively viewed as reflective of a



patriarchal, authoritarian, and out-dated tradition that is inflexible. I insist that such perspectives should not discourage engagement with the texts and their translations, and undertake a limited Foucauldian genealogy to consider how such normative interpretations of the texts emerged from their use as part of the civil service examination process.

In order to construct a concept of relationality that situates people as events that are necessarily constituted by others and life as processual, in chapter 4, “Relationality: Interdependence, Process, and the Extensivity of Personal Cultivation,” I draw on a translation of the *Zhongyong*. I discuss how a process of personal cultivation can theoretically have an extensive and enriching impact on a community in ways that may be difficult to trace.

How can a concept of relationality be used to reconsider the value of phenomena that prioritize support for teaching? In chapter 5, “Development of Collegiality in Faculty Learning Communities,” I situate faculty learning communities from a perspective of relationality. In particular, I analyze three research articles about faculty learning communities in order to consider how their product-orientated focus on the outcomes of the groups overlooks the value of the development of collegiality that emerges as part of group interactions. I also discuss a range of faculty learning communities from one university to consider the persistence and extensiveness of such groups, and explore how a concept of relationality emphasizes the importance of aspects that might seem from a product-orientation to be peripheral.

In chapter 6, “A Turn to Paradox in the Classroom,” I discuss how engagement with a concept of relationality highlights the value of reflective pedagogical research by Elizabeth Ellsworth to a broader university community. I suggest that her thoughtful willingness to adjust her pedagogical approaches in response to her students’ experiences in her

classroom situates her as undertaking a process of relational personal cultivation. More broadly, I suggest that a framework of relationality can be used in juxtaposition with contemporary frameworks such as feminism productively.

Lastly, I ask what are the implications of a relational framework for a university? In chapter 7, "The University as Learning Community," I discuss how a relational framework that foregrounds the importance of relationships emphasizes the value of the cultivation of relationships and personal cultivation because they enrich a university community in numerous ways, which includes increasing the potential for collaborative opportunities and broadening collegial networks. I suggest that a concept of relationality emphasizes the importance of envisioning every university as specific and encourages participants to be critically reflective of normative academic practices. What it does is to expand notions of value and suggest that they can be specific to particular people, and that they need not be universalized or overlooked.

People continually generate educational institutions. Engagement with a concept of relationality can remind administrators and educators of this by showing the inadequacy of a market orientation to comprehensively frame educational endeavors. It suggests that aspects of institutional function that strive to prioritize the development of collegiality amongst faculty and attend to the importance of relationships can enrich university communities in immeasurable ways.

## CHAPTER 2

### MIXED MESSAGES ABOUT TEACHING AND RESEARCH AT A UNIVERSITY

Institutional documents do not reflect the views of a particular person but an abstract level of social structuring that emerges from negotiation (Ayers, 2005). Universities often make materials such as mission statements, strategic plans, and tenure/promotion guidelines, which reflect authoritative perspectives that construct particular institutional identities and priorities, publicly available on their websites (Morphew & Hartley, 2006; Bennett & Khanna, 2010; Sirat, 2010). Closer consideration of the language and content of such documents can provide some indication not only of the way they express dominant theoretical paradigms and ideologies but the extent of these influences. In the case of contemporary universities, scanning these documents for expressions of a neoliberal orientation can elucidate an institution's values and insinuate those aspects of educational function that receive less attention. A juxtaposition of documents at a university alludes to whether a product-orientation is a seamless, uniform force or whether there are misalignments in its expressions and related expectations. It also suggests the complexity of institutional functions and infers the limits of a product-oriented framework to situate educational endeavors.

I juxtapose two documents: "University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions, 2015-2021," which describes the strategic goals for the public higher education system, and the "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application University of Hawai'i at Mānoa September 2015," which are the guidelines for tenure and promotion for faculty members at the major research campus. According to the institution's research and analysis office, in 2013 the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa had 1,547 instructional faculty members for

approximately 20,000 students. Because all institutions have particular evolving narrative contexts, I use one institution as a case example to provide an in-depth consideration of how institutional educational endeavors are framed by a product-orientation. I often use the phrase “product-orientation” to refer to a neoliberal paradigm to emphasize the aspect of a market orientation that prioritizes the end-goal/product focus of organizational function and that seeks to frame educational endeavors in terms of specific goals and measurable outcomes. I ask how the documents express a product-orientation, describe how they situate people, and discuss the importance of support for the development of the craft of teaching. I argue that although the two documents strive to reinforce a product-orientation, the differences between them show the limits of the framework. I find that the differences in terms of purposes, audiences, contexts, and language of the documents heighten the inadequacy of a product-orientation to reflect the complexity of interactions and aspects of institutional function that are difficult to measure, such as quality teaching or the time and effort needed to be a mentor. I insist that such an orientation cannot situate people and their actions wholly as “products.”

Juxtaposition of the two documents provides insight into how an institution aligns its external publicly-articulated values (strategic directions) with the internal institutional expectations for a major part of its employ (tenure/promotion guidelines). In other words, the two could be considered, as Roger Ames described it as a “distillation of persisting values” of an institution (personal communication, June 6, 2016). While a strategic directions document is a carefully constructed product created by academic and administrative leaders and vetted by various committees to serve as a guiding text for institutional directions over a period of time, tenure/promotion guidelines and expectations articulate the conditions for faculty members’ employment at an institution. Tenure/promotion guidelines

are just as important and revelatory because faculty reward systems also reflect institutional and administrator predilections (for example, increased scholarly output) or their concerns (not enough scholarly output) (Gardner & Veliz, 2014). Those who are perceived to meet the desire for what is valued are rewarded with tenure and promotion, while those who do not may have their applications denied. The criteria used to evaluate faculty members for tenure/promotion can reflect normalized notions and interpretations of institutional directions and expectations.

While the documents address different audiences for different purposes, they provide particular indications of what an institution normatively values. When considered together, their resonances can be viewed as reinforcing those values and perceived disjunctures provide an opportunity for inquiry. Institutional documents in their published form may not reveal the complex processes involved in their development or represent all the viewpoints of those engaged in those processes.<sup>6</sup> For example, both documents have been drafted and reviewed by varied committees of faculty members and staff, and approved by the university's administration before their publication on a university website. They also are drafted in consideration of the goals and interests of various groups such as a board of regents and faculty unions. Such documents emerge from negotiations and compromises. Made publicly available, the documents do more than speak to particular audiences for specific purposes; the resonances and disjunctures that emerge from their juxtaposition provide some insight into how dominant institutional ideologies function and their tensions.

For faculty members, institutional initiatives require their attention even if they do not find a particular initiative or idea personally compelling. Documents such as

---

<sup>6</sup> Hannah Tavares, personal communication, March 8, 2016.

tenure/promotion guidelines have institutional authority and, although faculty members may not agree on the value of the content, they likely feel pressure to attend to the guidelines. In other words, while faculty members have choices in regard to how they construct their dossiers, the process of evaluation of the dossiers determines their “academic life or death,” as Ames starkly puts it. As a result, the guideline expectations must be “valued” by faculty members who seek tenure and promotion in that they require faculty members’ attention, which impacts their activities. To clarify, I read value not primarily in an abstract cognitive moral sense, but in terms of aspects of institutional educational constructs that garner attention and related activity from participants. In other words, what is valued becomes valuable because of attention paid to it by participants of a system (faculty, staff, and students) in a functional way and not because it has some essential or inherent importance. For example, a product-orientation tends to frame aspects of educational constructs in terms of a language of measurement. As a result, more easily quantifiable aspects attract more attention simply because they are more measurable, not because they are necessarily more valuable (Biesta, 2010).

Although I consider one case example institution here, the juxtaposition of the two documents provides an example of how disjunctures that emerge from reading institutional documents can insinuate what an institution values and what it deemphasizes. An approach that delves into such specifics can be useful to identify tensions amongst varied aspects of institutional function within particular contexts even when a dominant paradigm such as a product-orientation becomes increasingly manifest, as is the case with higher educational institutions generally.

## **To Prepare Workers and Create Jobs**

The construction of strategic directions contributes to the continual generation of institutional identity and directions. Such inquiry can lead to the production of a deliberated document that seeks to realize specific goals and ideals. A strategic directions document, even if it contains abstract ideals, engages participants in institutions by asking them to interpret the guidelines through reflection and expression of the goals. While these documents can seek to be unifying and motivating forces, they also implicitly contribute to forming normative notions of educational function and institutional identity. Because they can have such a powerful influence, it can be important to ask questions about how such a document situates people and learning, and for what purposes? What are the implications of the strategic directions goals and for whom? And, significantly, what is left out? I suggest that while a forceful, confident market-oriented language pervades the University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions document, the content is at the same time decontextualized and abstract in its description of the specific actions and resources needed to realize the goals, and notably leaves out identification and consideration of who is supposed to do the work of achieving the goals.

The Strategic Directions document seeks to provide a guide to institutional priorities for six years “to achieve the outcomes” directed by the Board of Regents, a group that oversees the institution for the state. Representatives of various university governance groups including faculty, staff, and students, formed the 16-person Strategic Planning Committee to vet and measure the progress of the development of the priorities. The university's office of the vice chancellor for academic affairs published the ten-page

document on its webpage to accord with a timeline for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) re-accreditation process. The introductory section of the document identifies two key imperatives for the university: being an “indigenous–serving institution” and “advancing sustainability.” It also states that “the university stands firmly committed to advancing these directions in concert with core values of the institution: academic rigor and excellence, integrity and service, aloha and respect.” The body of the document describes four strategic directions/goals, each accompanied by a paragraph-long description, followed by a number of so called “action strategies” and bulleted “tactic” points. Each goal description closes with a “productivity and efficiency measures” section constituted by a list of progress indicators. (See Appendix A for full document.)

I want to acknowledge at the forefront that I take an inquiring approach, if not a critical one, to reading the document and that it is my concern about the influence of a neoliberal orientation on educational institutions that spurs me to choose to parse it. That said, I want to clarify that I do not discount the value of administrators and faculty collaboratively discussing and reflecting on the directions of an institution. In fact, I think such a process is extremely valuable to institutional function because it is a move that recognizes the disciplinary power of institutions and the intentions to express such power responsibly. Guidelines even if abstract or unrealistic can be useful from an institutional perspective in that they can and do provide some notion of direction or goals that can influence the activities of participants of an institution. I also realize that higher educational institutions do not operate as isolated entities and are part of a broader and complex societal, political, and economic field that influences how they choose to construct their identities through public documents. But I point out that my focus here is to inquire about how such a document may be interpreted and consider the influence it may have on faculty



members who must address multiple institutional expectations. Through reading the document and attending to its language, I discuss how the document can have an authoritative and normative impact.

The content of all four of the articulated goals situate the university, to some extent, as a job creator and preparer of the workforce for the state. The first goal aims to prepare students perceived to be low-income and from underserved regions to succeed in “the workforce and their communities.” The goal suggests that to attract such students to the institution, and to ensure they graduate, is a way to increase what it refers to as “educational capital.” This term implies that the function and activities of educational institutions can be framed in economic terms and more specifically suggests that students can gain better employment with more schooling. The paragraph that follows states, “An educated labor force and engaged citizenry are essential in today’s global, knowledge-based economy.” It goes on to articulate the university’s commitment to assist the state in raising the percentage of working age adults with two and four-year degrees from 43 to 55 percent by 2025. The second goal in the document directs the university to “create more high quality jobs” in order to “diversify” the state’s economy. The description states that the creation of an “economic sector” related to research and innovation is something that the university, as part of the state community, has a responsibility to undertake. While the first goal specifically discusses the importance of preparing students to be workers, the second goal focuses on the importance of bolstering areas of industry that could employ graduates and tasks faculty members with job creation. The two goals situate the university as a job and workforce creator as well as a contributor to the development of an industry of research and innovation that would create jobs and prepare people for employment.

The third and fourth goals, while they may not directly request the institution to create jobs and prepare workers, indirectly support those goals. Goal three involves modernization of facilities and the campus environment “to be safe, sustainable and supportive of modern practices in teaching, learning and research.” While the renovation of buildings is not in and of itself a goal that fosters the action of creating workers, they provide spaces most conducive to educational and research activities. Finally, the fourth goal supports the development and use of “efficient” and “cost-effective” practices to ensure institutional financial viability and sustainability. Support for the development of a labor force is envisioned, in this goal, as best realized through the creation of a “high performance mission-driven system,” which is accountable and transparent. Such a system achieves “higher performance” by helping students find various ways to enter the process of schooling, streamlining administrative support, making more efficient use of facilities, and using better so called “metrics” to account for productivity and efficiency. These goals, when considered together, generate an image and identity of an institutional system that uses business practices to operate an efficient system that will maximize the creation of jobs for the state and prepare its workers. People are largely situated as “producers” or “products” in this process.

The Strategic Directions document uses “business language” to convey the goals. The language style, confident in its forcefulness and specificity, expresses a sense of productivity and efficiency that bolsters the linear structure of the document. For example, the first words of each tactic read like the descriptive, active verbs used in resumes, making use of words such as “integrate,” “develop,” “support,” “improve,” and “create.” Directive and action oriented, the sentences reflect the first action strategy of the fourth goal that requests the institution to “employ best practices in management, administration and operations,” and

whose first tactic is to “implement world-class business practices to advance efficiency, transparency and accountability with sound risk management.” The goal, its action strategies, and list of tactics clearly state that business practices should be used to structure and administer the university.

The structure of the document reinforces a product-orientation in that the outcomes and action-result trajectories are prioritized over inquiry about the purposes and the complexity of processes. As mentioned earlier, after each goal, a list of action strategies and bullet-pointed “tactics” follow, closing with a productivity and efficiency measures section, which describes specific progress measures to evaluate productivity. For example, for the fourth goal of a high performance mission-driven system, the productivity and efficiency measures include educational related expenditures, instructional faculty FTE, number of programs with low numbers of graduates per year, and classroom usage. The specific measures that close each section make the emphasis on productivity clear and imply causal connections between the various sections.

Notably, while the fourth goal of the document expresses an institutional commitment to seek financial sustainability and viability through the fostering of accountability and transparency in administrative operations, it has an extensive reach. While the position of being fourth implies by its sequencing it has lesser importance than the other goals, the impact of the high performance mission-driven system initiative addresses the operations and management of an institution. This goal is unique from the others because it suggests a method by which to situate many institutional functions.

While the Strategic Directions document conveys an explicit image of the institution as very much product-oriented, I notice that the language, even given its attempts to be forceful and clear, can at the same time be quite abstract. Even under some gentle

questioning, words that intend to assist in the activity of situating aspects of educational endeavors in quantifiable terms become hard to understand in part because they are largely decontextualized. For example, the first action strategy of the fourth goal is to employ best practices in management, administration, and operations. One of the listed tactics is to “create effective and efficient organizational structures that leverage the advantages of centralization and decentralization to maximize efficiency and responsiveness to internal and external stakeholders.” Yet, what do the words “leverage” and “efficiency” mean in the stated context? What assumptions are being made about specific contexts and whether a committee or a person in a leadership position would be most suited to making decisions about them? When I try to connect the stated action strategies and tactics with their implied productivity and efficiency measures, they do not quite align. For example, when considering the relation between the productivity and efficiency measures that are part of that same section, I am left to wonder whether “Education and related expenditures per completion” or “FTE Students/FTE Executive/Managerial ratios,” identified as a bullet-pointed measures, are the intended focal connection. Questions emerge about what it means to “create effective and efficient organizational structures” and for what purposes, and who is to determine whether an organizational structure is effective and efficient? What is the role of faculty to engage these goals? Although the language strives to give the impression of confidence and specificity, more questions emerge when closely considered. As a result, the intended meaning of the decontextualized tactics becomes less clear.

Given that alignment of the goals with action strategies in order to reflect the productivity and efficiency measure would require a great deal of resource and energy to realize and that the goals, when taken together, are quite broad, the question of whether or not the institution is in a position to commit to such goals is a genuine one. Is it possible for

an educational system to achieve the goals of increasing graduation rates for low income students, diversify the state's economy by leading development of a \$1 billion innovation in research education and training, modernize facilities, and implement a high performance system based on best business practices in six years? With a product-orientation as the dominant framework expressed in the document, on further questioning, the limits of the framework's purview and mindset become clear. I suggest that not only is the mindset problematic, but the needed resources, energy, and research required to actualize each production-oriented goal could be quite overwhelming.

While each goal is not impossible to actualize, to realize them in terms of their productivity and efficiency measures would require considerable resources. For example, an initiative to engage students and their parents to promote preparation for college is no small undertaking if seriously considered. In alignment with the logic of a product-orientation, extensive research would be needed to study and quantify how best to engage students and parents, and what kinds of sustained promotion would be most effective. Additional and specific action strategies would need to be generated and followed up on; progress measures would need to be set and data collected to ensure progress was made. To ask how these goals might be realized raises more questions: How important is a particular goal in consideration to others, and what is the level of detail and commitment expected from such an initiative? How does this goal fit in with the stated "core values" of the institution, which includes academic rigor and excellence, integrity and respect? In fact, besides the mention of the core values in the introduction section of the document, they are not directly referred to again, nor are their connections to the stated goals, action strategies, and tactics articulated. How are readers supposed to understand how the generation of

revenue from land assets and the reduction of costs support the development of academic rigor?

The lack of emphasis on relating the core values with the strategic directions has broader implications for how learning is situated at the institution. A product-oriented perspective that situates students as future workers, such as in the goals of the Strategic Directions, tends to view learning as “training,” which implies learning has a particular productive purpose. This view differs from situating learning as “education” as in the case of the core values, which views a university education as a way to provide students with strong intellectual skills applicable to any field and a sense of social responsibility. To consider learning as education situates a student more broadly as a person, rather than more narrowly as a worker. It is this distinction between consideration of learning as “training” or as “education” that indicates potential complications and limitations of the use of the Strategic Directions document to inform institutional development. While institutions may view students largely as workers, is this how students view themselves? How does this perspective of students inform the way faculty approach how they teach? While public higher educational institutions may feel pressure from the public and politicians to justify their activities for request-for-funding purposes, and address the language and content of strategic direction goals toward these stakeholders, such an orientation can have profound implications for numerous aspects of educational function that include how faculty and students situate learning, and institutional support for the development of the craft of teaching and the development of collegiality. The differences that emerge from situating learning as “training” or as “education” matter especially when questions arise about why the core values have a limited role in the articulations of the goals of the strategic directions.

Another complicated question: who is expected to develop these initiatives? Even though a one-page matrix that accompanies the Strategic Directions document identifies “planning and implementation task forces” and “work groups” to initiate each goal, goal actualization relies in large part on the faculty who directly interact with students, create curriculum, and use the classrooms. While various institutional entities have their own interpretations of the Strategic Directions document and create their own strategic directions to try to realize the broader goals, it is faculty across-the-board who would ultimately be expected to maximize classroom space usage, to align curricula with community and workforce needs, and to “integrate entrepreneurship and innovation...for students across the system.”<sup>7</sup>

### **Situating Faculty as Producers of Research**

Juxtaposition of a Tenure/Promotions guidelines document for instructional faculty and a Strategic Directions document describes the depth to which a product-orientation is manifest and valued (especially by those who create and vet such documents) at the university. While the Strategic Directions document conveys an image of an educational system with a product-orientation, questions about the actions required to actualize the

---

<sup>7</sup> I want to point out that there is some resistance. In a letter to the co-chairs of the research campus’s strategic directions committee, the chair of the committee on academic policy and planning, which is part of the faculty senate, noted the importance for the administration to recognize the centrality of faculty to institutional endeavors, and suggested the need for increased support for faculty and students to “achieve excellence” in terms of academic quality in addition to attempts to actualize the more practical goals of retention and graduation. The chair wrote, “By supporting faculty we do not necessarily mean financial support, although that would be nice, and do not mean artificial workshops to tell faculty how they should teach, but changing the climate of the university so that there is a general sense of the key role of faculty, as well as their inclusion in key decision-making on all of these matters.”

goals stated in the document indicate a more complex situation. While no accurate reflection of a product-orientation may be possible, one would expect the same dominant paradigm to be reflected by the alignment of the goals described in the Strategic Directions document and tenure/promotion expectations for an institution's faculty because faculty members, theoretically, would be responsible for the cultivation of the core values and strategic direction goals.

The "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application" document made available on the university's "Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal" webpage provides criteria and specific instructions for employee promotion applications for 2015. It seeks to provide details and practical directions in regard to the construction of dossiers for faculty members who seek to apply for tenure or promotion. The requested dossier would detail a faculty member's institutional contributions, which would be reviewed at several administrative levels (department, department chair, college dean, university-wide tenure promotion review committee, chancellor, and board of regents) as part of an evaluation process; the Tenure Promotion Review Committee is a campus committee that evaluates dossiers and makes recommendations to the chancellor. While the Tenure/Promotion document provides criteria and guidelines for tenure and promotion for all faculty including researchers, specialists, librarians, and extension agents, in order to focus the scope for the purposes of this project, I primarily consider the ones for tenure for instructional faculty. What I find is that the guidelines imply the importance of research publications foremost.

While the tenure criteria for instructional faculty are noted numerically, there is no direct articulation of how evaluation committees might weight the criteria in relation to the evidence requested. The criteria include four points detailed in two pages:



- 1) The university must have a need for a faculty member with the particular qualifications of the applicant.
- 2) A demonstration of “a high level of competence as a teacher” is necessary.
- 3) Scholarly achievement in comparison with peers in one’s discipline.
- 4) Service activities in the profession and general community.

While the criteria are noted numerically (one could, from consideration of the sequence argue there is a slight indication of the importance of each criteria), there is little direct indication articulated about how these criteria should be scaled or compared to one another.<sup>8</sup> Detailed dossier expectations include a request to applicants to follow specific formatting requirements, a statement of endeavors, and other specifics in regard to providing supporting materials. The guidelines for dossier preparation suggest that to provide “evidence” of one’s contributions is critical. Accomplishments should be documented “with as much objective evidence as possible” and that letters from colleagues and students should “evaluate specific contributions or achievements rather than those which simply express support for your case.” (See Appendix B for full document.)

The request for evidence of a faculty member’s contributions and achievements for tenure consideration suggests a pronounced product-orientation. The tenure and promotion application section states: “The tenure/promotion application is the means by which you convince those involved in the review process of your achievements and ability.” In other

---

<sup>8</sup> As a side note, while I suggest that the tenure/promotion guidelines foreground a product orientation that weights research publications and anecdotes from faculty support this, in a phone conversation, the university’s assistant vice chancellor of academic personnel suggested that she believed the opposite—that teaching quality and scholarly achievement (research contributions) should be weighted equally for the purposes of evaluating instructional faculty tenure/promotion applications. This shows that there is some tension between an administrator’s intentions and the predominant way faculty members interpret such guidelines more broadly.

words, the university expects faculty members to show evidence that they are productive. In consideration of this product-oriented request, the tenure/promotion criteria most easily quantifiable would be the third one, evidence of scholarly achievement through documentation of research publications.

While the bibliography/research section is sequenced after teaching and before service expectations in the Tenure/Promotion guidelines, the length of the description of the section implies its primary value. The format includes the directive to separate published works, conference presentations, and manuscripts into at least 14 categories, including books of original scholarship, chapters in books, edited volumes, textbooks, articles in international or national referred journals, among others. Within each category, the guidelines note that the list of works should be sequenced with the most recent first. Also, for co-authored works, the guidelines suggest that applicants describe the extent of their contributions. The level of detail the guidelines require, expressed through the delineation of very specific categories, implies the importance of research publications to dossiers. Michel Foucault (1975/1995) points out that documentation that seeks to describe people in order to distinguish them from others is a disciplinary method that institutions use to influence people's behaviors that can have normalizing impacts. That faculty members must delineate their research in such a categorical way strongly implies its institutional value, whether or not they buy into this imposed value.

Additionally, external input by scholars at other research institutions, the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, and Dean are sought to "evaluate the applicant's work" in regard to its perceived significance within a person's discipline. These written evaluations again indicate the importance of provision of evidence of research productivity to applications for tenure and promotion for instructional faculty. Specifically, the guidelines

state that, “the purpose of the request [for external evaluations] is to obtain an opinion about the scholarly contributions which the applicant has made...” The guidelines imply that the university determines the reputation and value of an instructional faculty member in large part based on the perceived quality and quantity of publications, and the evaluation of one’s research by peers within one’s department, university, and at other institutions.

If an institution foregrounds a product-orientation, one would expect the Tenure/Promotion guidelines to reflect similar resonances as the goals of the Strategic Directions document. One could argue that the point of a strategic directions document, given its brevity and purpose, is to think big and avoid getting mired in details. Although it directly appeals to an external audience, at the same time, it addresses the employees of the institution because realization of the goals requires the cooperation and attention of the institution’s faculty and staff. In fact, one could say that the institutional call for the university to prepare workers and create jobs is largely within the purview of faculty who interact directly with students. In the case of the Strategic Directions document, the goals suggest the university should prepare workers for the state and create jobs through contribution to the economic sector via research and innovation, implying that faculty members need to take part in realizing these goals.

Do the Tenure/Promotion guidelines reflect these same interests? Not quite. While the Tenure/Promotion guidelines express a product-orientation through their call for evidence to show a faculty member’s contributions and achievements, especially in regard to research, the purpose of research is not situated as narrowly as in the second goal of the Strategic Directions document where research is situated as an “enterprise.” In other words, research should strive to create high-quality jobs to diversify the state’s economy through advancing “innovation” and “entrepreneurship” within the university and community. In

particular, there should be a focus, as stated in the productivity and efficiency measures section of the second goal, to increase the number of “invention disclosures, patents, licenses and start-up companies and jobs.”

### **Juxtaposing the Two Documents**

I use juxtaposition to look reflexively at the two documents and find the activity both challenging and productive. With each pass, I see something more or slightly different. I notice and wonder about the disjunctures more and more, while I keep in mind that aspects of the two documents will not ever match up. Why are there misalignments? What do they mean? What do these say about the extent to which a university uses a product-orientation to frame institutional educational function? While both documents express a product-orientation in different ways, I suggest that a product-orientation is not an adequate frame for institutional educational endeavors because it has difficulty quantifying one critical aspect—human beings.

Both documents deploy a product-orientation, but in different ways. The Strategic Directions document expresses a product-orientation quite openly in its content, structure, and language, conveying an image of the university as a job creator and preparer of future workers. The Tenure/Promotions document reinforces a product-orientation in a more implicit way—the dossier itself is a product that is examined as part of the evaluation process. In particular, the specificity of the research portion of the guidelines suggests that research production is of primary value for instructional faculty members while also situating faculty themselves as “products” in that they are considered publication creators. Both documents situate people as “products” and “producers” in some ways. In the Strategic Directions document, students are situated as future laborers and faculty are situated as job

creators and educators of workers. In the Tenure/Promotions guidelines, faculty members create products—research—that will be reviewed and evaluated, and at the same time, they are situated as products themselves in that their ability to produce research is prioritized. But there are differences as to how the documents seek to situate people as products.

One difference between the two documents is that the language of business practices that pervades the fabric of the Strategic Directions is largely absent in the Tenure/Promotions guidelines document, which does not include any direct discussion of education of a “labor force” or engagement of “citizenry” or how “essential” they are in “today’s global, knowledge-based economy.” Rather, the language and structure of the guidelines express a product-orientation in a diffuse way. For example, before listing the criteria for construction of the dossier, the document provides rationale for granting tenure and discusses the review process. Structurally, rather than the use of repeated lists of bulleted points, the document includes explanations under each heading and subheadings of the various sections.

One could attribute the differences in content and language to the differences of purpose—the Strategic Directions looks ahead and outward through the articulation of institutional goals and is addressed primarily to the public, while the Tenure/Promotion guidelines, while made public, are intended to be read closely by faculty members because their interpretation could have consequences for their employment status. The difference in language style and content between the two documents could reflect the types of relationships the institution has with its target audiences. Given that the university perceives WASC accreditors as a major audience for the Strategic Directions, a largely external yet

influential group, the confident language openly displays a product-orientation.<sup>9</sup> Faculty members are the target audience of the Tenure/Promotion guidelines and the institution, situated in a position of power, can afford to express its product-orientation in a more diffuse way. It requires faculty to sift through the discussions of requirements and rationale in order to interpret and determine the institutional values. As I pointed out earlier, the guidelines themselves do not articulate how the various criteria are weighted against each other. While both documents target their audiences differently, using varied content and language styles, they both situate and portray people from a product-orientation although their differences reveal a far more complicated field.

The Strategic Directions document situates people from a product-oriented perspective in that it assumes that people's activities can be controlled and quantified despite the fact that it may be quite difficult to do so. For example, goal one seeks to increase the participation and graduation rates of students within higher educational institutions, and the tactic under the first action strategy states, "engage K-12 students and their parents statewide early and often to promote and encourage them to prepare for college." Earlier, I questioned the extent of interest the institution had toward actualization of such goals especially in regard to the amount of resources it would necessitate to achieve the noted goals, and whether the goals would be considered a priority. For example, one could argue that the stated core values, processes that require immeasurable time and effort to realize, might be considered contradictory to situating educational institutions as organizational systems that prioritize efficiency and the production of workers. Initiatives

---

<sup>9</sup> Morphew and Hartley (2006) point out that public higher education institutions often construct documents such as mission statements to appeal to taxpayers and legislators because they compete for public funding with such groups as social service agencies and prisons who often do not "share the burden of proving their relevance to the state" (p. 468).

designed to react to a call to “engage K-12 students” to “promote and encourage them to prepare for college” could have varied outcomes that may not at all be efficient or effective. An additional concern is that the goal seems to assume that to engage students to prepare them for college would necessarily correlate with an increased number of degrees and certificates, the corresponding productivity and efficiency measure. Such an assumption leaves out the consideration of other factors that may deter students from preparing for college. If we consider that people cannot be completely situated as products, that our behaviors and contexts are complex, difficult to measure and predict, then this raises questions about the assumed correlations between the various stated goals, their action strategies, tactics, and productivity and efficiency measures.

The Tenure/Promotions guidelines situate faculty members as producers of research through the implied suggestion that evidence of scholarly achievement is more important than the other noted criteria due to its extensive reporting requirements. (The other criteria are much more difficult to provide concrete evidence for.) At the same time, the guidelines acknowledge the subjective process of evaluating applications. Although the guidelines state that the evaluation of evidence of contributions and achievements is largely left up to the judgment of review committees, the process of evaluation is ambiguous. The instruction section states:

The general reasons for granting tenure are that the University has concluded that you are and will continue to be a productive and valuable member of your department, school/college, and campus, that your pattern of continuing professional growth is positive, and that the University anticipates a long-term need for your professional specialty and services. This is a matter of judgment, and there may be

honest differences of opinion based on fair and thorough consideration of the evidence.

This statement suggests tenure and promotion decisions are normatively made and in part dependent on how the “evidence” is evaluated.

Rather than try to establish specific “productivity and efficiency measures,” review committees reserve the right to make a decision about tenure and promotion based on the judgment of those on the committees.<sup>10</sup> Because the Tenure/Promotions guidelines do not (perhaps cannot) describe specific productivity and efficiency measures in detail, the process of judgment relies on contextual determinations regarding the value of scholarly work. The criteria section states that faculty members should demonstrate “a level of scholarly achievement appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers active in the same discipline.” Because it does not specify particular benchmarks or quantifiable evidence of achievement, the document suggests that the university values a notion of contextual quality that involves continual attention and effort. Such a subjective description of achievement differs in tenor in comparison to productivity measures mentioned in the Strategic Directions document. For example, one stated measure in the Strategic Directions document aims to increase the percentage of working-age adults with degrees to 55% by 2025. While such a statement of a specific quantifiable goal could eclipse questions regarding the importance of the quality of education that those students receive, the naming of a specific number suggests there is some way to evaluate the success of such an endeavor.

---

<sup>10</sup> Departments also have their own tenure and promotion guidelines and criteria, which are drafted and reviewed by their faculty and may indicate metrics (for example, number of publications). Often times the criteria are interpreted and based on the guidelines drafted by the board of regents and faculty union agreement.



Tenure and promotion evaluation processes cannot be objective because a process of “judgment” relies on the perspectives and views of those on the review committees and the writers of the letters of evaluation. In the words of the Strategic Directions document, while faculty are expected to be productive, the productivity and efficiency measures to determine a person’s contributions and achievements are left up to how a person or group interpret the Tenure/Promotion criteria and guidelines. The problem is that providing evidence for teaching and service activities is far more difficult than providing evidence of research productivity. Teaching and service activities are complex, contextual, and relational processes, which do not lend themselves to being easily or accurately quantified in standardized ways. Given that it is difficult to provide any sort of objective evidence for such processes, the difficulty of the evaluation process is compounded. Because the guidelines implicitly and normatively weight publications, it is likely the committee will do so as well, although the specifics of the interpretation may be somewhat arbitrary depending on the particulars and beliefs of the participants on an evaluatory committee.

For faculty members, the ambiguity of the Tenure/Promotion guidelines and evaluation processes place them in a difficult situation. While the guidelines ask for evidence of contributions and achievements, it can be difficult to provide standardized or clear evidence of the complex process of teaching and mentoring. On the other hand, research accomplishment can be relatively easily gauged in terms of publications produced. Because it may be easier to provide clear evidence of research accomplishment, those who seek tenure/promotion may feel pressure to focus on the production of publications. Also, faculty are often informally told by colleagues that publications are given more value than teaching and service. Because the guidelines have an implied product-orientation whose

specifics may be hard to pinpoint, faculty may choose to err on the side of focusing on publishing, rather than on the other criteria.

The uncertainty of the evaluation process is exacerbated in part because unquantifiable aspects of the promotion process do not mean that they are any less important. For example, faculty members cannot underestimate the importance of the quality of collegial relationships and the role they play, although not quantifiable or easily visible, as part of the tenure and promotion process. While tenure/promotion committee members are expected to recuse themselves if they know the applicants they will be evaluating, colleagues such as department chairs and personnel committee members make “written assessments of your strengths and weaknesses...” The quality of applicants’ collegial relationships could influence their co-faculty assessments. The Tenure/Promotions guideline’s acknowledgement of the contextual, relational, and opinion-part of the evaluation process suggests that while a product-oriented frame may seek to quantify and simplify aspects of institutional function in terms of productivity and progress measures, it is a complex and abstract process. While the guidelines may try to situate people as products, on a closer look, the uncertainty of the evaluation process mentioned in the guidelines implies that it is difficult to do so.

While a product-orientation may dominate educational institutions, the tensions between the two documents that emerge from their juxtaposition show the complexity of its expression. While the Strategic Directions document openly suggests that students are future workers and faculty are job creators and preparers of workers, the Tenure/Promotions guidelines reinforces a product-orientation implicitly by situating faculty as producers of research, which in turn positions faculty as products to some extent themselves. The points of disjuncture that emerge in regard to language, structure, and

content between the texts serve to heighten awareness of the misalignments and tensions within the texts themselves. While the dominance of a product-orientation emerges in both texts, the tensions also remind that people, who cannot be situated completely in terms of a product-orientation, constitute educational institutions.

### **To Situate Teaching**

Although the Strategic Directions document states that scholarly qualities, such as academic rigor and excellence, and character-related qualities, such as integrity and service, are institutional core values, it is difficult for an institution who foregrounds a product-orientation to practically justify support for the development of qualities that resist easy measurement. Given that attentive teaching is an important way to help foster the stated core values, an institution that overlooks aspects of educational endeavors that reflect the *importance* of relationships, contexts, and experiences, will likely not prioritize support for the development of scholarly teaching. The institutional lack of emphasis on teaching and support for the development of the craft of teaching becomes clear, as I will soon show, when I interrogate the ways in which the two documents situate teaching.

One could point out that I use a research university as a sample institution, a type of institution that normatively emphasizes the importance of research, which suggests it might be a common expectation at such institutions to weight evidence of publishing more than teaching and service. While this may be so, that universities do normatively tend to emphasize research, I would respond by pointing out that this does not mitigate the possibility that undergraduate students at a university would likely benefit from participation

in classes facilitated by faculty who feel they have support to develop the craft of teaching and who are open to mentoring them. More broadly, support for the development of teaching and acknowledgment of the time and effort it takes to undertake mentoring would benefit faculty teaching at any type of institution in that it would support the development of an institutional climate open to discussion about how to practically achieve those aims of academic rigor and excellence, and to consider what such notions mean in different contexts.<sup>11</sup>

The Strategic Directions document addresses the issue of support for teaching in limited ways. In fact, it mentions a direct focus once and alludes to it a couple of times under the term “professional development” in the support of other goals that contribute to situating the university as a job creator and workforce preparer. The most direct mention of support for teaching occurs under the second goal of modernizing facilities. In the description, it argues that updating facilities is critical to “support modern teaching, learning, innovation and scholarship.” It goes on to say that the facilities should be “fully digitally enabled” as well as maintainable and supportive of national and global collaborations, implying that good teaching requires modern settings.

The document alludes to the importance of support for teaching in a couple of other places. It makes an oblique mention in the first goal under the first action strategy that focuses on improving college readiness and attendance in K-12 levels. The sixth out of

---

<sup>11</sup> In fact, I suggest that liberal arts colleges, which often articulate as part of their public identity the importance of teaching, tend to have similar tenure and promotion expectations and structures to research universities in that they also, in addition to teaching, expect their faculty to undertake research and service. Because they face the same difficulties of finding evidence for quality teaching, evaluation committee members (who often receive their doctorate degrees from universities) may also unintentionally, implicitly and normatively, weight research more than other aspects in instructional faculty tenure and promotion application evaluations.

seven tactics states that university support to K-12 teachers is important: “Enhance professional development for K-12 teachers and counselors in support of student preparation for higher education.” Although it may be a stretch to link professional development with teaching, there’s an assumption here that professional development can include support for the craft of teaching especially in regard to helping prepare students for college-level academic work. While this tactic implies the importance of teaching, it targets K-12 teachers, rather than faculty teaching at the university level.

The business-style language, as mentioned previously, while its aim may be to be clear, can also convey a sense of abstractness in the context of educational endeavors. If we consider the tactic from a person and relationship orientation, complicating questions emerge such as who is to enhance professional development for these teachers and counselors? What kind of professional development is expected here—based on whose perspective? While the tactic identifies the importance of professional development for K-12 teachers and counselors, its broader purpose is to support the goal of increasing the number of graduates.

Another mention of teaching occurs as part of the last goal of establishing a high performance mission-driven system. Under the first action strategy of using best practices “in management, administration and operations,” tactic number four out of six, is to “provide professional and leadership development for faculty and staff.” The notion of professional development implies teaching in part. But, given the context of the stated goal, it more likely refers to a notion of professional development that provides faculty members with opportunities to learn about and use administrative practices that assist with “sound risk management.”

While support for teaching and its importance may be assumed throughout the Strategic Directions document, it is, when mentioned, expressed indirectly not as a goal in and of itself. It is mentioned in the service of other goals (increasing retention rates and modernizing facilities, which support the framing of the university as job creator and workforce preparer) and implicit as part of professional development that is mentioned in the context of best practices in the management, administration and operations action strategy, and as a way to improve an assumed “pipeline” between K-12 and higher education.

The Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application document, for instructional faculty, mentions the expectation of improvement in teaching as the second of four criteria, just after the sections about departmental need and before research. The guidelines state that

The faculty member must have demonstrated a high level of competence as a teacher during the probationary period. In the rank of Assistant Professor, there should be evidence of increasing professional accomplishment as a teacher...In all cases, the evidence should include summaries of student evaluations, how your classes contribute to programmatic and institutional learning outcomes, or other objective assessments of a significant sample of the course taught during the probationary period.

Demonstration of competence is a key concern, and teaching evaluations serve as the major evidence of teaching quality: “Teaching ability is usually documented by means of teaching evaluations. These should reflect a representative sample of all of the courses you have taught in recent years.” Eileen Tamura points out that statements such as a need to demonstrate a “high level of competence as a teacher” are extremely vague (personal

communication, May 7, 2016). What does “high level of competence” mean? Additionally, the guidelines request the notation of teaching awards and discussion of documented evidence of “teaching ability” and of “contributions to the curriculum,” including materials from courses that one has created or modified. The guidelines also request that applicants list “innovations in teaching or teacher training” such as textbook development or creation of educational materials.

While the Tenure/Promotion guidelines situate descriptions of evidence of teaching ability and development prior to the description of research, the level of detail needed to describe an applicant’s development in teaching pales in comparison to the detail requested for the bibliography section. One can see the difference simply by looking at the amount of space each section takes up in the guidelines. The description of the bibliography section and preferred formatting details use one-full page while the section on teaching takes up slightly over one-third of a page.

While I do not imply that one needs to read much into the amount of space each description takes up, the broader point is that in terms of a product-orientation, the bibliography section can be situated easily from such a perspective because it is already product-oriented. According to the guidelines, the bibliography section “provides an invaluable objective record of your scholarly activity.” Teaching is much harder to situate from a product-oriented perspective although the guidelines request it: “you must have documented evidence of your teaching ability and of your contributions to the curriculum.” The guidelines discuss product-oriented objective expectations for both research and teaching, yet the processes required to determine the evidence between the two differ greatly.

Faculty members and administrators, in general, respect and use the peer review process as a way to provide evidence of quality research. Reputable academic journals ask multiple reviewers familiar with the subject of a submitted work to evaluate it with author-identifying information removed. For authors, it can be an arduous process that may involve requests for revision before a journal accepts and publishes a piece. Academics generally view the process of peer review as established and mature, and while not a perfect process, agree that it is adequate to determine the quality of research contributions in their fields for tenure and promotion application reviews.

But how would one describe a process to consider the quality of teaching? A process to evaluate an applicant's quality of teaching similar to a rigorous peer review process for research publications does not exist in a broadly accepted way. Besides supposedly "objective" teaching evaluations, applicants must provide the additional documented materials themselves. The guidelines note that, "Evidence of progress over the years in the scope, depth and effectiveness of your teaching may be helpful to reviewers in evaluating your maturity as an instructor." But what should this evidence look like? How would one provide evidence not only for the teaching that occurs in the classroom but also the mentoring that happens outside of it? How might one characterize or quantify the value of meeting with students outside of class to go over their papers or talk about their schooling experiences or respond to their varied questions? While an applicant could write a detailed narrative or tally up the hours spent mentoring, such "evidence" might still be inadequate to show the quality of one's interactions with students and peers in a standardized way. Also, as noted previously, scholarship regarding teaching evaluations shows a disjuncture between the intended purposes of the evaluations and what they actually describe. In other words, evaluations have less to do with understanding teaching



quality than students past schooling experiences, their perceived performance in a class, and the quality of interactions they have with their peers. They may also have little to do with consideration of whether faculty members sought to promote the core values stated in the Strategic Directions document, or for that matter, whether they tried to prepare students to be workers.

While faculty members' contributions to creating curriculum and modifying materials from classes are important, these activities may have only an indirect influence on the development of teaching practices, and may provide limited acknowledgement of the time and energy needed to undertake mentoring. The evidence requested for the teaching section is quite subjective and broad especially in comparison to the specificity of the bibliography section. Additionally, while some institutions have introduced innovative ways to evaluate teaching, such as the construction of teaching portfolios for tenure and promotion purposes, such initiatives often have a limited impact on faculty members' motivation to improve teaching if there is no additional institutional support for teaching and mentorship (Liston, D. D., Hansman, C. A., Kenney, S. L., & Brewton, C. C., 1998).

To be clear, I do not argue that there should be a rigorous peer review process for evaluating teaching. Teaching is hard to evaluate and is a process that involves interactions between faculty and students inside and outside of the classroom space. Rather than try to continue on the path of emphasizing outcomes, for example, such as evaluation of faculty members by correlating student test scores with teaching quality or other such product-oriented measures, administrators and educators need to ask how adequate a culture of measurement suits the activity of evaluation of teaching and other difficult-to-measure aspects of institutional educational function that are just as important.

While the intention of those who created the Tenure/Promotions guidelines document may not have been to situate evidence of publications as more valuable than evidence of teaching, it ends up having such an impact in part because a culture of measurement prioritizes outcomes and a product-orientation frame for educational function.<sup>12</sup> The notion that publishing is valued more than teaching is one that may also be reinforced by faculty members. One faculty member mentioned that colleagues told her to focus on publishing over teaching and that workshops she attended about tenure and promotion focused on discussing the importance of publications and conference attendance and less about teaching. While the process of producing scholarly research may be difficult and complex, institutions can consider publications that result from such processes as quantifiable products; an institution would find it much more difficult to situate the impact of quality teaching in the same way.

The activity of scholarly teaching itself may be difficult to adequately evaluate for tenure and promotion purposes because it occurs contextually, complexly, processually, and relationally. Teaching involves multiple dimensions. It can include not only classroom teaching, but also mentoring and advising students, aspects that are extremely difficult to quantify or provide evidence for. These relational aspects of teaching that have to do with the importance of the quality of the relationships faculty members may have with their students and the time and effort it takes to develop such relationships can be easily overlooked by a tenure and promotion process that values quantifiable evidence of faculty members' contributions. This also includes missing the value of the development of collegiality amongst faculty members that might assist in reflection and learning about

---

<sup>12</sup> A long-time faculty member mentioned anecdotally that tenure/promotion committees tended to award tenure and promotion to “mediocre” teachers with many publications than “excellent” teachers with an average number of publications.

teaching. Additionally, the Tenure/Promotion guidelines document implies that the various activities of research, teaching, and service are separate activities, whereas the reality for some faculty may be that the activities inform each other. For example, for some faculty, teaching in the classroom and working through content influences their research and informs their relationships with their students. The activities of teaching and research do not exist in isolation. Ames said in response to an earlier draft of this chapter, “I don't think these are two separate areas, but are coterminous and mutually entailing. Graduate seminars are laboratories for faculty.”

Some of the most central aspects of educational endeavors, as implied by the core values stated in the Strategic Directions document, which describe academic and character qualities, do not quite fit into the culture of measurement. In other words, a culture of measurement is inadequate to frame aspects of educational endeavors that are contextual and ongoing, like support for the development of the craft of teaching, and do not lend themselves to clear measurement. If this is the case, then construction of a relational framework that emphasizes the importance of process, collegial relationships, and support for the development of the craft of teaching, would help institutions acknowledge that teaching and mentoring cannot be wholly evaluated, and may not need to be, in a product-oriented way. For example, if an institution seeks to create the conditions for a broader discussion regarding teaching and to foster a culture that values teaching, then a focus on a need to quantify quality teaching in some sort of evaluatory way may simply be less or not necessary. At the very least, institutions could recognize the limits of a product-oriented framework and evaluation processes rather than deny or overlook their shortcomings.

## **Institution as Assemblage**

I have juxtaposed two institutional documents from a university to consider how a product-orientation situates people as products in different ways. I suggest that a neoliberal orientation has limitations in educational institutions because people cannot be situated wholly as “producers” or “products.” This becomes clear when I ask how the core values stated in the Strategic Directions resonate with the four strategic goals, and in the Tenure/Promotion guidelines when I ask why evidence of teaching and mentorship should be described in the same ways as scholarly contributions. While the institution might find it useful to see students as future workers and faculty as job creators and producers of research in order to determine the future directions and development of the institution, this view is difficult to reconcile with the notion that people become university students for multiple purposes and that the normative lines between teaching, research, and service may not be so clear-cut for faculty members. A product-orientation tends to rely on evidence to determine the value of activities. But some aspects of faculty employment, like teaching and mentorship, resist easy quantification. As a result, the value of the effort and time expended in these areas may be overlooked as part of the tenure/promotion process. Misalignments between the two documents reflect the limits of a product-orientation to frame major aspects of educational function that are more relational and contextual. How can we make sense of these misalignments theoretically?

Ian Hunter (1996) suggests that current schooling milieus are assemblages constituted by varied historical influences that include political rationality and Christian spiritual discipline. Assemblages, suggests political theorist Jane Bennett (2010), have what she calls “emergent properties” that can have a force greater than the sum of the

materialities, which are intertwined and can be in tension, that constitute it (p 24). Parts of an assemblage might be considered agentic on their own but coexisting with and mutual dependency on other parts means that their behavior within the construct of an assemblage may be unpredictable. Hunter (1996) points out that the earliest schools in the country developed as a way to promote Christian discipline through teaching practices that encouraged acts of personal reflection in the hopes of “creating” people who are in Hunter’s words “self-reflective ethical subjects” in order to “save their souls.” Another key influence of what he calls the “bureaucratic character of State schooling” is the creation of an organization and system of mass education to achieve governmental objectives, depersonalizing schools. The result is a system of schooling whose “theological moorings” has been lost but retains its impact in the expectations that schooling provide a “secular moral education” (p. 163). Hunter points out that both “bureaucratic administration” and “pastoral-disciplinary pedagogy” are key features of current school systems and educational institutions.

The tensions that result from the two echo in the institutional documents that I have tried to parse. The Strategic Directions document that situates students as workers and faculty-scholars as job creators reflects the bureaucratic administration that situates students as, in the words of the Strategic Directions, “citizens,” and learning as “training.” At the same time, the stated core values of “academic rigor and excellence,” “integrity and service,” “aloha and respect,” reflect the expectations of a secular moral education that suggest that growth is personal and that schools should build character implying that learning is “education.” While tension may be inevitable, the notion of assemblage implies that development of an awareness of the various historical influences and tensions that

constitute institutional educational endeavors are important to acknowledge because they suggest a changing complex set of interwoven relations that structure institutional function.

A complementary process-oriented framework to the dominant product-oriented one is needed not only to make clear the limits of a product-orientation but also to provide a way to see the value of those aspects of the system that are relational and contextual without a need to quantify them. A framework that recognizes the importance not only of outcomes but the educational processes that exist as part of institutions can assist with the characterization and description of the value of relationships and their role in educational function. Such a framework would also be valuable as a way to shape institutional directions. To suggest that a process-oriented framework lays bare the limits of a product-oriented one is not to suggest that such a framework needs to be imposed. Rather, I posit that such a framework would contribute to the acknowledgment of the complex assemblage of a university institution that currently exists. Relationships, contexts, judgments, and processes *already play* important roles in university function. Construction of a process-oriented framework that accedes this would contribute to reevaluation of relationships and their importance in education institutional endeavors.

## CHAPTER 3

### POLITICS, EXAMINATIONS, AND BECOMING VISIBLE: A GENEALOGY OF CONFUCIAN TEXTS

On campus one afternoon, I stopped to chat with a neighbor, a PhD student in linguistics. When I told her about how I had been reading the *Zhongyong* to construct a process-oriented framework of relationality to consider aspects of contemporary educational systems, I was surprised to see her shake her head. She said that such classical Chinese philosophical texts represent a traditional Chinese culture that she found authoritarian and patriarchal. When I noticed that she was not the only one to have such a reaction, I began to think about how such texts, which constituted the material for the civil service examinations during much of the second millennium, can bear normative social stigmatization in ways that influence how or whether people engage with them.

If some believe that the so-called Confucian texts, including the *Zhongyong*, have limited relevance toward understanding contemporary educational systems because the traditions of which they are a part are sometimes framed in a stereotypic manner as authoritarian, rigid, and hierarchical, then such generalized and static views overshadow the possible use of the texts as insightful resources. I realize I must address this in order to contextualize my own use and reading of the text in order to construct a concept of relationality, which I'll do in the next chapter. But first, in order to make a case for the value of engagement with texts such as the *Zhongyong* to construct a concept of relationality, I provide some historical contextualization of the texts through a process of genealogy to emphasize the point that normative interpretations do not emerge in isolated ways but, in the case of these texts, it is important to consider how they have been influenced by their

deployment by imperial powers as part of the civil service examination process. In other words, the texts are cultural products whose normative meanings have in part been shaped by the process and ritual of the examinations and should not preclude active engagement with the texts by educators. This perspective suggests that textual meanings change depending on who reads a text, an activity influenced by readers' particular locations in time and place. Similarly, Hannah Tavares (2016) referencing art historian Costanza Caraffa suggests that material objects such as photographs have "several biographies" and will continue to have them in the future. Meanings often attributed to the objects themselves actually emerge from acts of reading and interpretation. In fact, if educators consider how the texts and their meanings change through continued interpretation, then they might also consider how reading the texts contributes to a dynamic tradition.

During the later part of the first and much of the second millenniums, many of those who wished to become government officials in China were expected to have mastered the *Four Books*, which are classical philosophical texts, and Southern Song philosopher Zhu Xi's (1130-1200 CE) interlinear commentaries about them in order to pass the civil service examinations. Zhu Xi organized the *Zhongyong*, one of the *Four Books*, whose original content is attributed to Confucius's grandson Kong Ji (481-402 BCE), into 33 chapters and wrote extensive commentary about it. Imperial examination test-taking hopefuls would have been expected to recite the *Four Books*, which made the language of the texts a common vocabulary for intellectuals (Ames & Hall, 2001). Roger Ames and David Hall (2001) point out that those who studied the *Four Books* would be expected to first master the *Great Learning*, which is thought to be the more accessible text. Next, one would study the *Analects* to gain an understanding of the basics of the Confucian tradition. The *Mencius* would provide a scholar with a historical sense of how the tradition developed. The



*Zhongyong* was generally considered to have a special pedagogical place in the tradition and was studied last “as a means of gaining access to its mysteries” (p. 3).

The exams had a number of social impacts. While their content and format changed throughout their use, the institution of the examination had a formidable social dimension. Communities would support the education of some local children with the hope that their success would benefit their communities. If they did well in the exam process and were awarded official positions, they might contribute to their hometown’s economic development and pride. Mastery of the texts came to represent success and was viewed by many as a way to realize a desire for officialdom and power, although those who succeeded were few. While the use of exams might give the impression of a fair way to select civil service employees, historians point out the often contested process created and administered by the imperial powers supported their power structures in practical, political, and social ways, and actually reinforced people’s social statuses. Another impact that the examination process had was to keep society relatively stable. It served as a check on imperial power while also giving elites pathways into government. Furthermore, because the focus of the exams was literary studies, it limited military power by giving the top leadership positions to civilians. As the examination process developed, it became a greater force in society, which also influenced the status and normative interpretations of the Confucian texts that were used as the basis for the exams.

Inspired by a Foucauldian approach to write history as genealogy and his discussion of how disciplinary methods can be used as a form of coercive control, I argue that the increase in social visibility of the texts from their use as content for Chinese civil service examinations throughout much of the last two millennia correlates with the increasing *invisibility* of the imperial powers, which influenced the development of the texts’ normative

interpretations. I explore this argument first through consideration of how imperial powers used the examination process to legitimize their power and create social stability. While the examination process that included expectations to master classical texts served a practical purpose to identify qualified people for office, it also became a convenient way for imperial power to destabilize the authority of local elites who had relied on family connections to gain government positions.

I then discuss how classical philosophical texts that provided the content for the examinations also became more visible and contested. Because imperial powers institutionalized the examinations for political purposes, different factions sought to influence exams and the way the texts were used. This resulted in changes to the structure and content of the examinations throughout the centuries.

As the use of civil service examinations became increasingly popular, examination halls and their surrounding areas became sites of spectacle. Whereas the spectacles of the pre-and-early first millennium directly and visibly connected the emperor as all powerful and a benefactor of the people, the public displays of the civil service examinations of the late imperial age shielded the emperor from view and shifted the focus instead to the exams, the texts, and the test-takers.

As the texts became more normatively visible through the ritual and spectacle of the examination process, textual interpretations became more inflexible. Whereas Confucian texts might have been situated initially as ideals and suggestions towards governance and the realization of harmonious living and personal growth, later interpretations were at times expressed as rigid rules.

New interpretations of these cultural products may provide imaginative ways to situate aspects of contemporary educational institutions and systems. Exploration and

awareness of how these texts have been historically deployed as part of the civil service examination process by imperial powers encourages educators unfamiliar with the texts to view them not through fixed or normative interpretations, but as resources that challenge them to consider direct engagement with the texts. In particular, to engage with the texts in order to continually develop interpretations of them is to participate in the construction of a dynamic Confucian tradition, one that can be referenced as part of imaginative conversations with contemporary philosophical constructs and traditions.

### **The Examination**

The examination, according to Foucault (1975/1995), is a method of disciplinary control, which makes people visible from one another for the purposes of differentiation, classification, ranking, and judgment. In other words, exams identify and create differences between people for competitive and hierarchical purposes. While such a process makes exam-takers visible, it is also a mechanism, especially when institutionalized, that tends to normalize and hide power. Institutional bureaucracies can conceal those who design and make changes to exams. Highly ritualized, the examination functions to connect power with what Foucault calls “the formation of knowledge” (p. 187). In fact, he considers disciplinary methods a type of power. Power shapes knowledge—specifically, what is considered knowledge and how it is deployed. For example, those who decide test content can to some extent frame for others a notion of what kinds of actions, beliefs, and ideas are regarded as normatively valuable. As a result, the examination, one of numerous disciplinary methods, through the combination of “hierarchical surveillance and normalizing judgment,” situates “people as objects and subjects of power” (p. 192). I suggest that the use of classical

Chinese philosophical texts as part of the civil service examination for several centuries increased their social visibility and also influenced their normative interpretations.

I want to point out that I do not propose that examinations do not have their productive uses. In the case of the civil service examination, one could argue that it was an effective way to stabilize a society by providing pathways for elites to participate in governing. It also served as a mostly peaceful and useful check on ruling and military powers by giving civilians leadership positions. In a society, institutional and centralized processes with hierarchies can function to generate stability. Power differentials amongst institutional roles could be envisioned as necessary toward a broader goal of establishing efficient societal function. Foucault writes,

We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (p. 194)

For Foucault, power emerges from formations that seek to organize relations and conduct. It creates. That said, when there are complex systems at work in organizing a society, the emergence and manifestations of such systems can directly impact the lives of the specific people of a particular society. They influence interactions, behavior, and shape normative beliefs and practices. In my discussion of the civil service exam as a disciplinary method, my purpose is not to evaluate the phenomenon of the exam in and of itself, but rather to consider the exam's broader influence on how classical Chinese philosophical texts were culturally and normatively situated.

Foucault points out that disciplinary methods, constituted by “a multiplicity of often minor processes, of different origin and scattered location, which overlap, repeat, or imitate one another” (p. 138), can be considered a general method which is deployed by schools, hospitals, and military organizations. Subtle disciplinary methods emerged from monastic traditions that include the creation of strict timetables, the use of enclosures for specific functions, and institutionalized processes to distinguish people from each other such as examinations and supervision (Foucault, 1975/1995). While such methods may have been adopted in some situations to address particular crises and social developments such as to stem an epidemic disease or to increase industrial innovation, their use reinforces a relationship between power and knowledge that situates people as objects and subjects. Furthermore, Foucault suggests that people have literally become objects when we consider how the use of disciplinary methods has helped forge the development of human sciences that attempt to understand and explain people, such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology. These disciplines situate a person “as an object of knowledge for a discourse with a ‘scientific’ status” (p. 24). The notion that people’s activities and behaviors become invisible and thus explainable through scientific research frames people as discrete populations that can be separated into supposedly meaningful categories. This notion overlooks the complexity of people and our interactions and what meanings that can be derived from them through engagement with scientific, analytical, and logical approaches—modern forms of power.

These methods continue to exist alongside other methods by contemporary institutions to control and coerce bodies and beliefs through their influence on people’s “movements, gestures, attitudes, rapidity” (p. 137). For example, in his book *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, Foucault (1975/1995) describes how soldiers in the

eighteenth century were cultivated to be forceful objects of power and at the same time subjects of power. Soldiers' bodies, through continual supervision, could be trained to be more physically forceful through exhaustive exercise and control of their minute movements. Foucault suggests that it is in this way that bodies can be appropriated for efficient use, but at the same time, enter a relation in which they are dominated:

Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an 'aptitude', a 'capacity', which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection. If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination. (p. 138)

In other words, the more peoples' actions are shaped by purposeful disciplinary methods, the more easily influenced they may be by those people and the institutions that deployed the mechanisms. For example, basic military training may make soldiers more powerful physically but, at the same time, they are trained to be obedient so that their power can be used by a government to wage war, an activity that may not necessarily take into account a soldier's best interest as a human being.

Similarly, Foucault discusses how disciplinary methods have been used to control and punish inmates. In his genealogy of the development of prisons, Foucault finds that punishment, once made public in France through spectacles of torture and execution, where bodies were literally marked and destroyed by executioners, has in the last centuries moved toward being hidden from view in prisons where inmates' bodies and lives are strictly

controlled. These methods include the confinement and separation of people from each other, restrictions on how they spend their time, continual surveillance, and the creation of specific identities through administrative documentation to “capture and fix them” as part of a massive bureaucracy (p. 189).

The increased use of disciplinary methods as a way to control and dominate people makes power increasingly invisible and people more individualized. Disciplinary power is “exercised through its invisibility” (p. 187), and what this means in the case of prisons is that those responsible for meting out punishment are not immediately clear (judges, laws, guards, politicians, citizens, society, the methods themselves?). At the same time, those being punished via disciplinary methods are situated as continually being controlled and surveilled. As a result, inmates become objects of power because their bodies are literally controlled through confinement and restrictive schedules. The control of their bodies influences their attitudes and beliefs about themselves and impacts how others see them. When these beliefs become normalized more broadly, people are subject to power.

Disciplinary methods, then, depending on how they are used, can become political instruments, or as Foucault calls them, “formulas of domination.” They have had an extensive impact on contemporary society. For example, he suggests that the expression of disciplinary power through punitive methods gives punishment a “complex social function” because it is framed as a “political tactic,” which has shaped normative societal notions about human activity and behavior more broadly and in a judgmental way (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 23). Foucault argues that disciplinary methods are a “technology of power,” and points to both the history of penal law and the development of the human sciences as examples because they have evolved to situate bodies as “invested by power relations” (p. 24).

While Foucault focuses his exploration of the extensive influence of disciplinary technologies on people, I would like to extend his inquiry to consider how such methods, such as the civil service examination, influenced interpretations of the Confucian texts that provided the basis and content of the exam for centuries. If the civil service exams were often conflated with the texts, then how did the use of texts for the exams influence the normative interpretations of the texts themselves? I suggest that because classical Chinese philosophical texts provided the content of the exams, the examination process shaped broad normative interpretations of the texts in at least two ways. First, the examination process is an extreme context to situate the texts that necessarily influences why and how one might read the texts. By making mastery of the texts part of the civil service exam system, engagement shifts from a personal one to one that becomes politically charged because it has material outcomes determined by others (most simply: pass the test—earn position/fail the test—no position). How one reads a text for the purpose of test-taking may look quite different from the engagement with a text for one's personal interest or other purpose.

Secondly, the examinations increased the sheer numbers of people who encountered and studied the texts. Because employment, wealth, and social status, were at stake, preparation for the exams required that serious test-takers spend inordinate amounts of time to study the texts. As a result, mastery of the texts came to signify notions of achievement—it came to represent the desire for success through test-taking and also increased awareness of the texts in the nation's broader social consciousness. While those who prepared for the exams engaged with the texts directly, the family members and neighbors of the scholars, while they may not have read the texts themselves, would have



known something about them, enough to develop notions about the texts and their content. The exam process normalized interpretations of the texts more broadly.

While people were situated as subjects and objects of power through the examination process, the process also influenced normative notions about the philosophical texts themselves. The texts gained a strong social presence, but at the same time, also became objects of power, interpreted and evaluated for particular purposes. While manifestations of power in regard to the design and use of the civil service examination may necessarily emerge from the activity of trying to organize society and government, consideration of the function and effects of power can provide insights about how the texts that were used as part of the exam influenced how people perceived them more broadly.

### **A Genealogical Approach**

Genealogy is a tool used to conceptualize the present by asking questions about what we value and why (Foucault, 1977). It is a historical approach that considers not essences but processes especially as they are influenced by power. It also suggests that notions of the past continue to change depending on how they relate to the present.

If history, Foucault (1977) suggests, emerges “reasonably from chance” and from people who attempt to address their conflicts with others, then to write history is not an objective act. Notions of history that assume a linear and causal sequence of events often articulate narratives from the perspective of those who are able to spin their personal conflicts by using reason, in Foucault’s words, as a “weapon” to situate their views as “truth”; such renderings of history smack of fiction. He argues, as mentioned earlier, that power produces knowledge: “power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is

no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 27). If particular notions of history are conveyed as knowledge, then it is important to ask who constructed those notions, for what purposes, and to whose benefit.

Foucault provides an example of how knowledge shaped by power can function when he calls the concept of liberty an “invention of the ruling classes” and questions the notion of personal autonomy (Foucault, 1977, p. 142). It is a useful myth that distracts people from questioning normative beliefs that emerge through the disciplinary methods deployed by institutions and governments. He suggests, instead, that people cannot exist as autonomous from each other but instead are produced from social formations; people are social constructs. In other words, society determines the values and practices by which people live, and these are shaped by pastoral power. Such so-called “soft” power works through disciplinary methods such as institutions through the internalization of laws, rules, and norms so that people regulate themselves (Bevir, 1999).

For Foucault (1977), historical analytical approaches, such as genealogy, can be used to trace the influence power has on knowledge through the construction of fragmented notions of past. Genealogies do not seek to identify origins but rather to “cultivate the details and accidents that accompany every beginning” (p. 144). Foucault suggests there are infinite beginnings “whose faint traces and hints of color are readily seen by an historical eye” (p. 145). He credits Nietzsche with the creation of such a framework to consider history in ways that posit provocative questions about the origins of “moral preconceptions.” Nietzsche suggests that if one “listens” to history, one will find that it is not a causal and logical progression of events constituted by essences: “What is found at the historical

beginning of things is not the inviolable identity of their origin; it is the dissension of other things. It is disparity” (p. 142). Genealogy, then, is a form of analysis that encourages exploration of multiple traces of these disparities and considers their social impact; it is an approach that constructs historical accounts driven by the notion that power shapes knowledge.

I use a genealogical approach to explore how imperial power influenced the civil service examinations and normative interpretations of the classical texts. In particular, I consider why the exams were created, how they persisted, and changed, and the impact the exams had on how the texts were socially perceived.

### **Use of the Exam Process to Legitimize Rule and Create Social Stability**

Imperial powers instituted and maintained the process of civil service examinations during much of the second millennium because it supported the imperial social structure in practical, political, and social ways. For example, governments used the civil service examination process largely for practical purposes like finding qualified people to work as part of the government. One of the earliest uses for an examination process was to select imperial librarians. During the Han period (202 BC-220 AD), a person who had textual expertise on a particular classic could gain an appointment as “erudite” in the Han Imperial Academy, which was formed to support and protect the transmission of “orthodox texts” under imperial sponsorship (Elman, 2000). Benjamin Elman (2000) points out that records show that around 134 BC those who completed study in the Academy underwent oral examinations about their knowledge of classical texts before being granted such

government positions. He suggests this process was a forerunner to the imperial examinations that emerged during the Tang (618-907) and Song (960-1279) periods.

While the examination process served a practical purpose to identify qualified people for office, imperial powers used it at the same time for political purposes. It increasingly became a convenient way for imperial power to destabilize the authority of local elites who often relied on family connections to gain government positions. Empress Wu in the Tang period (618-907), Elman notes, found that officials chosen via examination “served as a countervailing force to entrenched aristocrats in capital politics” (p. 7). The exam process gave the Empress a way to interrupt the authority of families who had continually maintained footholds on the staffing of some official positions. While the introduction of the examination process as a way to choose civil service servants did not deter the elites from attempts to make their way into office through identifying and then bribing civil examiners, the process began to limit elites’ influence. When the government learned about the pressure elites put on their examiners, they created in response a new department, the Ministry of Rites, to make sure those that proctored the exams were not the same as those in the Ministry of Personnel who made the civil service appointments.

While imperial powers sought to limit the elites’ power, the examination process, an astute political move, also gave the elites just enough access to official positions to curb their collective interests as a group to revolt. Elman writes that the examination process itself served a largely political function because rulers used it to gain the support of gentry elite in order to stabilize and legitimize their power. For example, Northern Song rulers (960-1126) used the promise of access to government positions through the examination process to draw in the sons of elites from newer territories in Southern China to serve in official capacities.

From the rulers' perspective, the examination process also served to restrict military power. Ichisada Miyazaki (1976) argues that the content of the examination system with its focus on literary studies, which promoted the notion of intellectuals as leaders and officials, served to limit military power within government. This framework allowed the ruling group to reserve the most important official positions for civilians. For example, in the Qing dynasty, officers in the military could rise no higher than the rank of unit commander because the posts of minister of war and chief of staff could only be filled by civilians; civilians also served as front-line generals. A government culture developed in which military men were not expected to distinguish themselves in politics, which restrained military power.

Imperial powers also used the examination process to promote social stability. While the institution of a civil service examination process seemed to provide a pathway for those of low income to achieve success through the obtainment of official positions, scholars point out the process in reality largely reinforced class divides. For example, Elman (2000) suggests that the examinations in late imperial China from 1400-1900 were not designed to increase social mobility, but rather, institutionalized a system of inclusion and exclusion, which became manifest in the selection of officials in a public and legitimizing way: "Such selection represented a sophisticated, but not unmitigated or totalistic, process of social, political, and cultural reproduction of the status quo" (Elman, p. xxix). In other words, the examination process favored the sons of literati and merchant elites to obtain official appointments because the educational curriculum and linguistic expectations required scholar-hopefuls to undertake years of resource-heavy preparation, which often necessitated extra expense. The expectation of linguistic mastery of nonvernacular classical texts proved to be a barrier for many of those from lower classes. Some local elites of small townships and counties figured out that, even without real hope of their obtainment of

official positions, they could improve their own and their families' status somewhat through capitalization on the fact they or their sons had participated in the lowest-level examinations—that someone in the family aimed to take the exam attracted some attention and status for the family. But the reality was that the majority of scholar-hopefuls, especially those with less wealth were not likely to pass the examinations to obtain the official positions and status they wished for because it would be difficult for them, and their families, to marshal the resources necessary to support their preparation.

Imperial powers used the exam process for over two millennia because it helped them find people to serve in their governments in a way that promoted social stability and reinforced their legitimacy. As the exam became increasingly institutionalized, the number of applicants who sought positions through participation in the exam process increased. During the Qing (Manchu) period (1644-1911), the number of civil service positions available was about 120 each year, but the population had grown steadily throughout the centuries to about 300 million in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and as a result, competition increased for a limited number of spots (Rosenlee, 2006). The exam became quite visible in society because it offered a pathway to officialdom and wealth. While the rulers sought to use the examination for their own purposes, the institution also provided a check on imperial power. For example, by giving positions to elites, they also included them as part of their government and in essence shared their power. For the government, the exam, it turned out, was a useful disciplinary method in that it had numerous social, practical, and political impacts.

## **The Contested Nature of the Exams and the Texts**

The politicization of the examination meant that the exams and the interpretations of the classical philosophical texts that formed the basis for the exams changed throughout the centuries of their use and were often contested. During the Qing dynasty (1644-1911), the civil service examination apparatus had become extensive (Miyazaki, 1981). Preparation for the examinations began with teaching boys to read and write even from the age of three. By seven years of age, formal education began when boys were sent to village or communal schools staffed by scholars who had failed the examinations or former officials. At such schools, students would be expected to begin to master the classical texts through memorization. Schools prepared students to take a series of examinations, which began with the district and prefectural exams. If they passed, they would take a qualifying examination, then the provincial examination, and finally the palace examination. While imperial powers used the examination process for their interests and political purposes, the structure of the exams and how the texts were used became areas of contestation and change.

Elman (2000) argues that a consideration of the history of civil service examinations shows that both local elites as well as the imperial court sought to influence the government to continually adjust the classical curriculum in order to impact the selection process of officials. The examinations proved to be an arena where many political and social interests interacted. In practice, the use of the exam system and the content of the exams varied widely over different time periods, reflecting the interests of those groups who had the most political power and who often acted in response to perceived threats to their power. Even the canonical texts that formed the basis of the examinations were not always the same.

The Confucian texts used in the Chinese civil service examination between roughly 1200 and 1900, as mentioned earlier, consisted primarily of the *Four Books*, and also the *Five Classics*. The classical texts came to be considered sacred texts in society because they contain the teachings and words of past sages “whose exemplary wisdom and virtue served as an eternal model for the ages” and were used by literati to express “a shared cultural inheritance” (Gardner, 2007, p. xv). Exam takers were expected to have mastered the texts along with the interlinear commentary from Zhu Xi that accompanied the texts.

The examinations relied heavily on the texts. For example, during the Ming period (1368-1644), the first session exam required one composite essay on the *Four Books* discussing several quotations and another regarding a specialty classic that the candidate chose (Elman, 2000). In the second and third exam sessions, test-takers were expected to write discourse essays regarding a quotation about classical filial piety and also pen a response about a particular policy. Additionally, they had to undergo physical and mental tests. Writing poetry was eliminated from the civil service examination during this period as the *Four Books* became increasingly incorporated along with Zhu Xi’s commentaries on the texts.

Before 1200 AD and Zhu Xi’s selection and emphasis of the *Four Books*, the *Five Classics* were considered the main canonical texts. The *Five Classics* of the “Confucian” canon—the *Odes*, the *Documents*, the *Rites*, the *Changes*, and the *Spring and Autumn Annals* implied a direct connection to Confucius (551-479 BC) but were actually quite varied with different emphases and content. Michael Nylan (2001) points out that before the texts had been given the designation of classics and considered “Confucian,” they had percolated in the culture in oral and written forms for centuries, which is why the texts discuss a wide range of approaches to social, political, and cosmic issues. They are thought to have more



historical content than the *Four Books* because they provided specific examples and lessons of Confucian morality, governance methods, and ritualistic practices drawn from the past (Gardner, 2007). Daniel Gardner (2007) points out that the *Four Books* were considered more philosophical and preoccupied with exploring the nature of people and morality, and how people are situated within the cosmos, which contributed to the development of what is today considered Neo-Confucian thought.

The *Four Books* in actuality were not a complete departure from the *Five Classics*. Rather, Zhu Xi selected them from the *Five Classics*. Nylan (2001) points out that although the *Five Classics* constituted the curriculum at the Imperial Academy (124 BC) which began in the Han period (206 BC-AD 220) when state-sponsored classical learning emerged in a limited capacity, the actual texts used in the exams referenced teachings from many thinkers and traditions in order to gain insight about governance. By the Tang period (618-906), there were nine classics, and by the Song period (960-1279), thirteen. The additional texts were thought to elaborate on themes of the original five. The *Analects* and the *Mencius* were included as part of the thirteen; the *Great Learning* and the *Zhongyong* were two chapters from the *Book of Rites*. Zhu Xi selected these four to be a collection that he framed as a subset of classical texts that he felt constituted the core curriculum of the Confucian tradition. He chose them because they were easier to access, had essential teachings about the tradition, and could reach more people (Gardner, 2007).

Gardner (2007) credits the “inward shift” toward an interest in human morality on the part of Song period (960-1279) literati, which resulted in Zhu Xi’s work on the *Four Books*, a concerted response by literati to a feeling that political and social reforms of the time were failing and also due to pressures of cultural and physical threat from non-Han groups (p. xxii). The threats of attack by tribes to the north and northwest were not unfounded—after

the fall of the Tang (617-907), the Song rulers were forced to give land to the Liao. Another pressure that spurred literati to reinforce classical studies, or as Gardner refers to it, the “native tradition,” was the increasing popularity of Buddhism. Buddhism, considered a foreign influence given its, as Gardner describes, “metaphysical interest in human nature,” intrigued those at all levels of society. So the *Four Books* were emphasized by scholars for use in the examinations during the Song period due to a confluence of events including a weak economy, dissatisfaction with government to deal with political and social problems, and society’s developing interest in ideas about human nature due to the influence of Buddhism. The emergence of the *Four Books* as a force served to contribute to identifying the classical Confucian texts as related to traditional Chinese culture.

Imperial rulers did not always fully implement civil service examinations. The process of examination ranged in popularity depending on who was in power, and whether particular rulers saw a need for them. For example, after the Song period, the civil service examinations were suspended during part of the Yuan period (1271-1368) because the Mongol rulers decided to use military strength to keep order (Elman, 2000). Yuan period rulers approved the reinstatement of the examinations in 1313 on a limited basis, and asked candidates to master the *Four Books*, to develop some proficiency in writing ancient style rhyme prose and in the preparation of official documents in decree or memorial style (Elman, p. 33). They also chose to give different policy questions on the examination for those of Mongol ethnicity and those identified as Han Chinese. According to Elman, those with a Mongol background responded to a question on a classical model for how to protect empire, while those of Han ethnicity had to produce a detailed assessment of classical forms regarding imperial powers as related to various types of rulers (hegemon, emperor, king). Candidates also had to write one essay about the *Four Books* and respond to five

quotations from classical sources with answers based on the accompanying commentaries. The examination content was not uniform and not necessarily constructed to be equitable.

While the exam system became increasingly institutionalized, it also came under increasing scrutiny and control, resulting in changes to the exam itself and the way the texts were used.

### **Spectacle and the Increased Concealment of Political Power**

One way the visibility of the civil service examinations, rituals of the late imperial age, became manifest in society was as public spectacles that fostered a “festive marketplace atmosphere” (Elman, 2000). The visibility of these public displays notably emerged as imperial powers increasingly receded from public view.

Before and during the Warring States period (479-221 BC), texts had an important place in ritual connecting power with past and memory (Nylan, 2005). Tomb excavations have uncovered writing on bone, wooden strips, bamboo, and silk, among other materials, usually given special placement in lacquer boxes with other ritual objects such as flutes, oyster shells, and plant branches, which helped establish the status of the deceased. Written and oral texts, critical to ceremonies as much as gesture and dress at the time, were thought to reflect what Nylan (2005) calls “patterned workings” and information about the cosmos: “text and ritual served as ‘framing devices’ within which to interpret the inexplicable changes occurring outside the confines of text and ritual, converting the incoherence and unintelligibility of the mundane and the merely personal into ‘usable’ insights of broader relevance” (p. 10). Those considered masters of text and ritual had

some social status because they were thought able to bring a patterned and meaningful coherence to aspects of life.

The public displays of the classical period, in which texts and rituals had a role to play, served political purposes (Nylan, 2005). For example, Nylan describes how the Qin emperor hosted events, in which the thousands of guests from his newly conquered territories were invited to be part of sumptuous meals and to take home the lacquer serving dishes, to show his generosity:

By the prevailing rationale, the gracious condescension of a superior sharing objects and experiences through public spectacles revealed that laudable self-abnegation, freedom from selfishness, and political transparency that alone could sustain, to the mutual benefit of all, an equitable, stable sociopolitical order. (p. 24).

Display culture conveyed the message that harmonious social behavior benefited all in a community, and reinforced and justified hierarchical constructs. Ceremonial displays, Nylan points out, were meant to build lasting relationships that were based on voluntarism and reciprocity through a process of gift giving and tribute. It was a way for leaders to centralize and reinforce their positions especially during the Warring States period when those who wanted to expand and centralize power had to find a way to appease new populations that they didn't necessarily have hereditary ties with. Leaders needed to gain support especially from the elites in the areas they conquered. Yes, they would collect taxes, but they also wanted to be seen as giving back. The activity of giving would, it was believed, bind people to them.

The Emperor often took center stage at the grandest public spectacles, where he could "most effectively make visible the normally invisible ties binding persons and elevate those public ties as prior to (and more exalted than) any private claims that his subjects

might put forward” (Nylan, p. 26). The creation of spectacle served to be a way to show and reinforce power. Rather than perceived as a way to mark the differences between classes, participation in or witness of a spectacle encouraged people to feel they were part of, as Nylan describes it, a “unified” whole. This spectacle culture had a ripple effect in the sense that local elites would also assert their authority in a similar way. These formalized exchanges through public acts created mutual obligations and protection, which assisted in the provision of security of other social groups; the “circle of gift giving and receiving” as expressed in a display culture, “could, in theory, successfully convert inherent disorderliness of human impulses into a factor for social stability and cohesiveness” (p. 27).

Whereas the spectacle of the pre-and-early first millennium directly and visibly connected the emperor as all powerful and benefactor of the people, the spectacle of the civil service examinations of the late imperial age hid the emperor from view, and shifted the focus instead to the exams, the texts, and the test-takers, who vied for limited civil service positions. The “festive marketplace” of the examinations required great government expense, especially in regard to the provision of personnel—police, clerks, readers, copyists, and examiners—to maintain the examination (Elman, 2000). During a late Ming period prefectural examination that took place every three years, four to five thousand candidates would enter the examination compounds. Elman (2000) describes how outside the compounds, shops sold examination-taking supplies, friends and relatives of the candidates crowded about, clerks sounded gongs and horns to mark the beginning and end of the examination periods. While the most prestigious ceremonies would take place at the imperial capital examination hall, there was “pomp and ceremony” (p. 177) everywhere during Ming period provincial examinations: “the provincial compounds became venues simultaneously for cultural rituals, the deployment of police, and the testing of Ch’eng-Chu

learning” (p. 178). Nylan (2005) writes, “The great social theorists of Warring States and Western Han times, after all, had sold public display as a way to balance hierarchy with reciprocity” (p. 33). The civil service examination process itself became an expression and embodiment of this practice.

The spectacle of the examinations increased the visibility of the exams, the texts, and test-takers. Such public displays implied the magnanimity of the imperial powers while at the same time kept the imperial powers, which included those who vied to influence the content and structures of the exams, from direct public view.

### **Increased Inflexibility of Normative Interpretations of the Texts**

The spectacle of the civil service examination process, which increasingly kept the emperor from public view and at the same time made candidate scholars more visible, also increased the visibility of the examination itself and classical Chinese philosophical texts. Disciplinary methods, Foucault suggests, function to make people visible by way of influence on their activities, which can have a normalizing effect on beliefs and practices. Similarly, in the case of the civil service examination, the exam itself was a contested site that was scrutinized and controlled. This heightened attention also influenced the way the philosophical texts were more broadly perceived because of their use as content of the exam.

During the Qing (Manchu) period (1644-1911), the scope of the examination questions had become quite narrow (Rosenlee, 2006). Li-Hsiang Lisa Rosenlee (2006) writes that scholar-hopefuls complained that the standardized essay format, the “8 legged essay,” which had been instituted in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century limited the scope of creativity of

candidates; and, the examination questions themselves had shifted from the stress on an ability to write social policy to mainly provide explication on the meaning of the *Four Books* and their commentaries. Recitation of the classics became the focus rather than detailed responses to questions related to state affairs. Rosenlee notes: “The kind of *Ru* that the Qing court produced through the standardized examination format and the narrow scope of the orthodox *Ru* learning was more of a specialized vessel or bureaucratic clerk than a high level advisor fully participating in governance” (p. 32). The examination increasingly had little to do with discussions of governance, and became more focused on candidates’ mastery of the texts, their ability to write in the style of official documents, and their candidates’ ethnicity. Elman (2000) points out that the examination became increasingly oriented towards mastery of classical knowledge, even though most civil service positions, such as tax collection, did not require such rarified knowledge for a person to perform their duties.

Whereas Confucian texts might have been interpreted initially more commonly as ideals and suggestions toward governance and the realization of harmonious living and personal growth, later normative interpretations were at times expressed as rigid rules meant to control peoples’ actions. According to Sor-hoon Tan (2003), these “sometimes ended up as social shackles that oppressed the heart and paralyzed the mind” (p. 88). For example, that normative dictates such as “always listen to authority” overlook textual content that suggests the importance of reciprocity and responsibility in relationships. Tan notes that Confucian ritual practices over the centuries lost their flexibility. As an example, she juxtaposes a passage from *Mencius* that suggests that genders refrain from touching each other as a matter of courtesy (except within relationships between parents and children, between spouses, or in situations of danger) with a, “severe admonition” from Cheng Yi

(1033-1107 AD) that widows should not remarry even out of economic necessity because starvation would be preferred “to a loss of chastity” (p. 88). Some appropriated the texts for their own purposes when they interpreted them as providing narrow dictates intended to control and judge the conduct of others. And such dictates had an impact because the texts had become cultural products.

While genuine engagement and inquiry with the content of the texts might have been the goal of the earliest civil service examinations for test-takers and test-designers, as the examination system evolved, mastery of the texts for many became perceived as a conduit toward achieving officialdom. This development likely narrowed the scope of textual interpretations in part because for those who studied to take the civil service examinations, engagement with the texts had less to do with rigorous or flexible and imaginative interpretations of textual content and more to do with attempts to figure out what one needed to know in order to pass the test. In this way, the normative interpretations of the texts, because they became conflated in part with the exam process, came to be more rigidly interpreted.

### **Texts as Cultural Products**

The texts became cultural products through the examination process. A cultural product can mean more than it does as part of a particular context by becoming a powerful representation of a desire (Johnson, 1986/7). In the case of the classical philosophical texts, their mastery could be connected with that of a societal perception of success, influencing the meaning and interpretations of the texts. Richard Johnson (1986/7) describes culture (drawing on Marx, but giving it his own spin) within the paradigm of Cultural Studies as



emergent from relations between consciousness and subjectivity. As a field, according to Johnson, Cultural Studies is interested in exploring the historical forms of a dimension of relationships influenced by social formations and their function. He describes consciousness as having the capacity to imagine, generate intentions, and dream; but rather than see it as a largely cognitive process, he suggests it has a complex relation to subjectivity, which operates and insinuates the absences of consciousness. In other words, people can feel moved with emotion or have desire without consciously knowing why. Subjectivity's focus is not centered on that of a person but more so on collective identities and beliefs. Subjectivities are produced; they are not premises or essences.

Consideration of how cultural products are produced, circulated, and consumed can provide insights about the conditions from which they emerged. In order to examine culture, Johnson suggests it is not enough to study forms that are subjectively inhabited and can be abstracted to an extreme degree, such as language, ideologies, discourses, and myths; but it is important to consider the historical nature of such forms—the pressures and conditions that informed how they moved and changed. To understand cultural transformations, one must consider the conditions of consumption or reading. These include attention to differences in regard to resources and power as well as the social milieu and social relationships from which cultural products emerged.

While Johnson's interest of cultural products revolves around consideration of those that emerge from capitalist interests—created for economic gain—I think his approach to frame cultural products provides insight to how civil service examinations shaped normative notions of the classical Chinese philosophical texts and their meanings. He suggests that for something to become a cultural product, it needs to become public in the sense that it acquires a more general social significance. Its meanings and interpretations become

generalized as he says, “across the social surface” of a network of communities or a society. In the case of the philosophical texts, as the process of the examination became increasingly used, so did public awareness of the texts because they constituted the material for the exams. Not only did the texts themselves become public—those who may not have read them knew about them—interpretations of the texts also became varied. The exam process served as a forum for publication of the texts.

Secondly, Johnson suggests that publication involves abstraction in the sense that a product can be viewed in isolation from the social conditions that formed it. As the philosophical texts became more visible through their connection with the exams, the two became increasingly synonymous. As a result, some aspects of the texts would likely be emphasized more than others, depending on what exam designers and leaders considered most relevant at a particular moment. This shift toward connecting the texts with the exams not only resulted in the generation of more abstract and rigid normative interpretations of the texts and reduced the flexibility of their interpretations, it also likely deemphasized their connections with the contexts from which they emerged.

Lastly, Johnson suggests that a cultural product becomes subject to public evaluation in different ways, for example, as a national symbol or representation of a desire. It can be made to speak more broadly and collectively when it becomes a site for struggle over meaning. In the case of the texts and their normative interpretations, their inclusion in the examination process meant that perceived mastery of the texts came to represent a pathway toward success. To study the texts for the purpose of taking the civil service exam was an expression of a desire to bring honor and economic benefit to one’s family. A normative notion of success became connected with mastery of the texts and participation in the civil service examination process. This increased the status of the texts and of those

who interpreted them. The texts and interpretations of their meanings became culturally significant, even sacred.

To situate the texts as cultural products is to encourage educators not to dismiss the potential relevance of classical Chinese philosophical texts to contemporary educational constructs. While it is important to acknowledge their multiple normative interpretations, it is also important to recontextualize them and see their connection to the civil service examination process, as well as consider how such a connection might have influenced textual interpretations. Given this context, engagement with a process of reading the texts might help one feel a part of an ongoing process of interpretation rather than pressured to accept normative and dominant interpretations.

### **Reading as Participation in a Flexible and Changing Tradition**

To read the classical Chinese philosophical texts is to participate in an ongoing Confucian tradition that views meaning as constructed rather than fixed. While I have sought to encourage educators not to be deterred from engaging with classical Chinese philosophical texts due to normative interpretations of the texts, I also want to point out that interpretations that emerge through engagement with the texts need not be rigid. From this perspective, consideration of how the civil service exam process shaped the meanings of the texts also suggests that interpretations change depending on how the texts are read and for what purposes. In fact, the activity of reading a text that was written over two thousand years ago is anything but a straightforward process. When I read a translation of the *Zhongyong*, I do so from my specific location in time and place, a factor that influences my reading. More broadly, interpretations and readings will always be partial and

constructed. But rather than see this as a limitation, engagement in reading these texts could be seen as part of an ongoing conversation about the texts that situate them as emerging from what some scholars consider a flexible Confucian tradition.

My reading of the text of the *Zhongyong* is partial in part because I am reading it in translation and translations themselves are specific interpretations. I use a translation by comparative classical Chinese philosophy scholars Roger Ames and David Hall (2001), who frame their approach to translation by drawing readers' attention to how differences in the worldviews/gestalt of Chinese and English languages complicate the translation process. They point out that some English-speaking translators inadvertently impose their cultural views and assumptions, including post-Enlightenment ideals, Christian beliefs, and substance-oriented worldviews, onto the Chinese language. Such misleading translations have shaped the Chinese/English dictionaries that inform English-speakers' views of Chinese culture and have influenced some translations of classical philosophical texts such as the *Zhongyong*, *Daodejing*, and *Analects*. For example, Ames and Hall point out that when the Chinese character *tian* is translated as heaven, the connotations from Christianity relating to a notion of a separation between a divine being and people, including the notion that "Heaven" is a place where "God" resides, become mistakenly read as part of premodern Chinese culture, which did not have such conceptions. In their translation of the *Zhongyong*, Ames and Hall try to acknowledge the complexity of translation in regard to worldviews and language when they choose, for example, to leave *tian* untranslated within the text or refer to it instead as "propensities of things" (p. 26). They also translate *tian* more broadly as "the environing social, cultural, and natural context that is brought into focus and articulated by sagacious human beings" (p. 27). Ames and Hall suggest that the activity of

translation is not simply a direct rendering of meaning from one language to another but implies a complex relationship between text, language, and cultural meanings.

A reading experience that is always partial cannot happen in isolated contexts. And, the Confucian tradition, scholars argue, is a processual one that accommodates multiple and varied readings where meaning is continually constructed through specific engagement with the texts in varied spatial and temporal locations. While the *Four Books* are characterized as Confucian, Roger Ames (personal communication, November 12, 2016) comments that John Francis Davis, 2nd governor of Hong Kong invented the term "Confucianism" in his 1836 publication, *The Chinese*. In Chinese, the English word "Confucian" is a translation of the term "*ruxue*," which Ames says references not so much a specific person but rather a social class of literati that existed 40 generations before Confucius and 80 generations after him. "Confucianism" is not a term that describes the life and teachings of a figure. Nylan (2001) calls the term "an abstraction and a generalization—apparently useful but always obfuscating— a product of ongoing intellectual engagement as much as a subject of it" (p. 3). It is a term that was coined in an effort to find a counterpart to the phenomenon of Christianity in European history. Nylan points out that the classic philosophical texts could be considered related to Confucius the person in regard to two aspects. The first is that Confucius (551-479 BC) and his followers may have used some of the texts for the purpose of drawing inspiration for moral guidance, and secondly, that some traditions claim that Confucius compiled and edited some parts of the classical texts. Prior to 136 BC, the followers of *ruxue* used practices that included "ritualized chanting, dancing, and dressing," (Nylan, 2001, p. 9) which may have contributed to their identification as a group; the literati supported a number of key concepts such as the ability for people to cultivate themselves in order to improve relations with others "through shu (profound

empathy) leading to ren (human kindness)” (Nylan, p. 9). It is these literati, Ames points out, that established the *ruxue* tradition to address contemporary issues. By continually inheriting and elaborating the tradition, the literati developed an approach and philosophy to living that requires ongoing engagement. “Confucianism” from this perspective should be envisioned as a dynamic tradition that, through continual engagement, interpretation, and change, can productively engage with other philosophical traditions.

The view that Confucianism is a flexible and dynamic tradition suggests that it can be a useful resource to consider contemporary constructs. For example, Li-Hsiang Lisa Rosenlee (2006) suggests that the notion of relational personal cultivation that emerges from the Confucian tradition can develop a theoretical framework of Confucian feminism. While the two traditions might seem, from normative interpretations, to be at odds, she suggests through her reading of the Confucian texts that this is not the case. She points out that some English speakers assume that the Confucian tradition is often thought to oppress women. Racialized images of Asian women as submissive and part of a fetishized discourse in mainstream English-speaking cultures may resonate with this perception (Lauretis, 1999; Yamamoto, 2000). While such images likely say more about the racialized landscape of the United States than Chinese culture, they can not only have an inadvertent effect of deterring inquiry into reading classical Chinese philosophical texts, but may also limit exploration regarding how the Confucian tradition can be interpreted to situate the role of women.

Rosenlee (2006) writes that many English-speaking feminist scholars characterized Confucianism before and during the nineties “as a patriarchal ideology that should be discarded as irrelevant to the modern and supposedly superior, Western way of life” (p. 16). For example, feminists Julia Kristeva and anthropologist Margery Wolf wrote independently

that Confucianism reflected and perpetuated patriarchal ideology in China. While recent developments in feminist theory from poststructuralist and ecofeminist perspectives may call attention to the danger of projecting the views and issues of one culture onto another, Rosenlee's work shows just how much in-depth study and knowledge of another culture may be important for making any claims about gender relations within a culture. Even intensive research methods such as ethnography may yield limited insights. She reminds that care needs to be taken when evaluating aspects of different traditions because of the possibility that there are unquestioned assumptions at work in one's reading.

Rosenlee warns that a reductionist view can underestimate, or even miss altogether, the dynamism of the Confucian tradition. She suggests that, theoretically, the Confucian ethical theory of *ren* 仁 foregrounds relationships in ways that echo feminists' interests. The term suggests that the activity of personal cultivation emerges through seeking harmony within one's relationships; one becomes a person through one's interactions with others. She reasons that a theoretical feminist space is possible within Confucianism in the same way that feminists, in order to address their concerns, have challenged and as she describes it, "reappropriated" traditions such as Aristotle's virtue ethics or liberalism, among others. She warns that a simplification of the Confucian tradition bypasses a need to understand Confucian ethics as well as the cultural gender system and makes it easy to situate Confucianism as inferior to substance-oriented philosophies. Furthermore, it precludes a deeper understanding and exploration of the oppression of Chinese women.

Rosenlee believes that the Confucian tradition is equipped to address feminist concerns. She develops a hybrid feminist theory that is both Confucian and feminist. She argues that a "Confucian relational, virtue-based personhood is a viable goal for women's liberation" (p. 160). In her vision, this hybrid construct:

presupposes a relational self situated in a web of relations that are not just external...Instead, the self is conceived to be coextensive with the web of relations, which are constitutive of one's substantial self...Without locating oneself in social relations, one is without a substantial existence, and hence one is not fully personed in the world. This starting point is Confucian through and through, since it is entirely consistent with the Confucian achieved personhood of *ren*, which a person becomes a "person" only through embodying specific social virtues that can only be actualized in specific social relations and roles, starting with familial relations and roles (p. 154).

A relational self is an achievement because a notion of a person emerges through relationships and interactions with others. The specific roles that people embody constitute who we are as people. This notion of person is critical to her vision of Confucian feminism. As such, a virtuous accomplished self is developed through personal cultivation and impacts the relations with others that are part of an "extended field of the relational self" (p. 155).

Rosenlee argues that the Confucian tradition is a dynamic living one that continues to expand and adapt as it has throughout centuries. She situates feminist frameworks as a new challenge for Confucianism rather than as existing so far apart as to be incommensurable. She asserts, "As the epistemological portrait of the roots of women's oppression is enriched by the study of Confucianism, so is the range of the possibility for women's liberation in feminist ethics and in the theoretical imagination" (p. 160). A Confucian tradition can engage with other traditions in productive and imaginative ways.

Through the discussion of how political powers made use of the exam process and the texts that formed the basis of the exams, I hope to encourage educators unfamiliar with the texts not to rely on broader normative interpretations to frame them. While normative



interpretations that emerged from continual use of the texts through the examination process were in some ways reductive, part of realizing the texts are cultural products suggests their meanings can at some level be constructed in multiple and varied ways. While the civil service exam did influence normative interpretations about the texts, it should not be used as a convenient excuse to preclude direct engagement with the texts. Research that seeks to make Confucian texts more accessible to a broader range of educators contributes to the encouragement of imaginative and ongoing engagement with the texts, and will provide new ways to situate and value various aspects of contemporary educational systems. For example, Rosenlee constructs resonances between the texts and the feminist tradition, and generates a compelling vision for a Confucian feminist theoretical framework. To read the texts with consideration of the partiality of one's own contextual view is to participate in and contribute to a dynamic Confucian tradition that changes because it is developed through continued engagement with the texts. Next, I attempt to construct a conception of relationality from Ames and Hall's (2001) translation of the *Zhongyong*.

## CHAPTER 4

### RELATIONALITY: INTERDEPENDENCE, PROCESS, AND THE EXTENSIVITY OF PERSONAL CULTIVATION

When, in Chapter 20 of the *Zhongyong*, the Duke Ai of Lu asks about proper governance, the response attributed to Confucius is that leaders need to develop their characters through the cultivation of “authoritative conduct,” which “means conducting oneself like a human being, wherein devotion to one’s kin is most important” (Ames & Hall, 2001, p. 101). Rather than tackle obstacles and solve complex problems that would provide one experience to be a leader, the text describes the grinding work of a process of personal cultivation that is much more mundane—that it is through continual attention to daily living and acting with propriety, especially with family members, that one can develop the qualities to be a wise person and leader. To describe personal cultivation in this way is to reflect a broader processual orientation that envisions the world as ongoing, subjective, and changing, and people as developing through relationships. In particular, the *Zhongyong* explores the aspects and processes of becoming an exemplary person and provides specific examples of people Confucius was thought to have identified as such. But to strive to be exemplary is not relevant solely for leaders; the text suggests every person has the capacity to become exemplary if a person has a committed interest to “go the way of study and inquiry” and learns to conduct oneself properly through relationships and everyday activities (from *Zhongyong* chapter 27, Ames & Hall, p. 109). Because this view of personal cultivation emerges from a processual worldview, the qualities of exemplary persons are not simply embodied as essences and independent states, but rather can only emerge through the context of relating to others.

I elaborate on a process-oriented framework of relationality largely by drawing on a philosophical interpretation and translation of the *Zhongyong*, a classical Chinese philosophical text (Ames & Hall, 2001). As mentioned earlier, the *Zhongyong*, attributed to the grandson of Confucius, Kong Ji (483-402 BCE), exists in its current form after Song era scholar Zhu Xi (1130-1200 CE) edited it and added interlinear commentary. Relationality foregrounds relationships as primary. People do not exist as individuals, but are necessarily interdependent. Relationality engages a view of the world as processual and changing. The framework suggests that each moment provides an opportunity to undertake a process of personal cultivation, which can only become manifest through relationships with others. As a result, the quality of relationships matters because it directly shapes our day-to-day lives and constructs our identities. Relation-ing is an activity that can have an extensive impact not only on those one directly interacts with but more broadly includes the contexts and communities in which people are a part. Relationality, then, is not a fixed state, it is an ongoing activity.

The juxtaposition of a process-oriented framework like relationality to a neoliberal product-oriented one challenges us to reconsider aspects of universities that are difficult to measure, such as support for teaching and the reflective work of pedagogists. A relational framework suggests that the development of relationships and the quality of engagement have primary value in educational endeavors. Rather than assume the implication that measurable evidence is necessary to determine value, a relational framework accommodates the notion that educational endeavors continually emerge from complex interactions that may refuse delineation. It implies that while the complexity of interactions may be difficult to quantify or characterize, educators cannot overlook their importance or take them for granted. Such a framework does not minimize the importance of “products,”

but does remind educators that they emerge from specific processes in ways that are ongoing.

The processual worldview upon which a concept of relationality relies operates in stark contrast to a product or substance-oriented one. Relationality engages a notion of reality that emphasizes change, subjectivity, and interaction, where truth and knowing are always partial and embodied. The emphasis of a relational process-oriented paradigm differs from a substance-oriented one that envisions reality in terms of objectivity, fixedness, and separateness (Ames & Hall, 2001; Kasulis, 2002). For example, neoliberalism operates from a substance-oriented worldview that reflects an ideology and rationality that expresses a relationship between country and citizens as primarily economic and product-oriented (Biesta, 2010; Brown, 2015). This economically-framed relationship, which operationalizes a notion of managerial and financial accountability through documentation, has given rise to an institutional predilection to seek evidence to determine quality. In educational institutions specifically, perceived indicators of goals and measurable outcomes become valued above other aspects of educational endeavors because they can be used to judge perceived quality. In regard to educational research, notions of perceived measurable outcomes then orient discussions about directions and goal setting because they signify what is desirable (Biesta, 2010).

Because a concept of relationality is process-oriented, it situates people and knowing as always partial. This partiality suggests the infinity of possibilities that emerge from the participation in groups such as faculty learning communities and classroom contexts. There is no such thing, from this perspective, as objectivity and singular truths. Knowledges have specific temporal and spatial dimensions. Relationality, then, is a useful lens to consider research about faculty learning communities and pedagogy because it

offers a way to theorize the importance of those difficult to measure aspects that emerge from interaction without a need to prove their value through measurement.

To make a distinction between the two orientations is not suggest there is a boundary between them that can be fixed or to suggest that they do not have nuanced temporal and spatial dimensions. I also do not posit that a process-oriented gestalt does not have aspects that are more substance-oriented, or vice versa. Nor do I suggest that there are only two gestalts. Rather, I think they could be considered systems of meaning that continually change, both endeavoring toward a deeper understanding of human experience and impacting how people situate meaning and value in different contexts.

While a neoliberal framework can be useful for educators and policymakers to consider aspects of educational phenomena, research, and institutional directions, such a dominant paradigm can eclipse the vast complexity of these endeavors by trying to fix value. For example, how can we really measure learning, especially when it is an ongoing process whose intricacies we do not completely understand ourselves? In consideration of support for teaching, how can one theorize the value of those aspects that emerge outside the scope of the sought-after outcomes, such as the development of the craft of teaching and of collegiality? A relational framework embraces the complexity of relationships and the implications this presents.

### **People as Events**

While the material devastation of New Orleans's Ninth Ward by Hurricane Katrina was widely reported, a radio interview with Jean Gibson, a former resident, expresses the

profound loss of identity that also came with the destruction of her home (Glass, 2015).

Here she describes her thoughts on the return to her former neighborhood:

And I said, Lord, have mercy, look at my city. And it hit me, yeah. It did hit me. But when I came across this canal, I knew there was no humanly way possible that this Ninth Ward could ever come back. The people that you knew, I don't see nobody that I know. People who know you, you know them, know your mama, know your daddy, know your brothers, know where you live, know y'all had a black dog one time—I'm talking about those people. I'm talking about people you did your first communion with, and the people that would tell your mama you did something wrong. You will never see them again. So who am I? I don't know. (Glass, 2015)

When Gibson says that there was no way that the Ninth Ward could ever come back, she wasn't referring to the physical devastation of the place. Buildings can be rebuilt and roads repaved, but the bigger loss was of those relationships she had with the people who had lived there, and surprisingly, of identity and sense of self: "So who am I? I don't know." A person is, she seems to imply, constituted by relationships and those affects that emerge from relating such as sensations and memories. People cannot exist as individuals but are necessarily interdependent, even if we are not always aware of it. Our communities, our relationships, constitute our personal identities—they make us who we are.

This notion that people are interdependent is a central aspect of relationality. But what does it mean that people are not individuals or separate from each other but interdependent? For one, it situates people as specific rather than abstract (Ames, 2011). For example, while Jean Gibson, mentioned above, is a person, it is important to see her as a specific person. Jean is a child to her parents, a sibling to her brothers, a friend to her neighbors, among other relationships. While the words neighbors and brothers can indicate

a type of relationship, a relational perspective implies that people are necessarily envisioned as particular—Jean’s mother is not only a mother but more importantly *Jean’s mother*. If we see a person as specific, then we can see identity as constructed by specific networks of roles and relationships that are enmeshed. For example, Jean’s mother is a person constituted by her own network. She is a mother to Jean, and also to Jean’s brothers, but at the same time a daughter to her parents, a friend to her friends, an aunt to Jean’s cousin, and onwards. People are interdependent because we are born into relationships and live them through interaction. Hannah Tavares points out that in addition to people’s roles, “affective dimensions” emerge from people in relation that contributes to experience and identity formation. In other words, not only were Jean’s relations, and emergent sensations, with other people influenced by the storm but so was her relation to and sensations of the particular place of the Ninth Ward (personal communication, March 24, 2017). Jane Bennett (2010) writes, “Organic and inorganic bodies, natural and cultural objects...*all* are affective” (p. xii). Drawing on Spinoza’s notion of affect, Bennett suggests that people, places, and what might be considered material “things” have a vital force that includes the capacity to act upon and be responsive. A person is interdependent not only with other people but also specific places and dimensions of those places.

When we think about people as particular and specific, then we can see people, as Ames (2011) suggests, from a perspective of correlative cosmology, as narratives and events, rather than as beings or individuals. According to Ames, correlative cosmology, which grounds traditional Chinese medicine’s notion of the body as dynamic form and function, situates life and so called “things” as aspects of the same reality that are inseparable. For a notion of a relational person, this means that a person’s network of relationships cannot be static. In other words, not only is Jean a daughter to her mother, but

this construct implies at the same time *how* she is a daughter to her mother. There could be no relationship without relation-ing somehow. So to say relationships constitute us is also to say that our interactions, our actions, and how we relate, do so too. They, relationships and the activities of living and relating through doing, imbue each other. The relationship and the relating are necessarily entangled in that they are mutually implicative and affective.

Persons, then, from a relational perspective are so-called “narratives” and “events” because 1) we cannot exist as separate from others because we are always specifically networked and 2) who we are cannot be fixed because we live, and so, act and do. People, then, are happenings and occurrences rather than beings.

Aspects of work by pragmatists George Herbert Mead (1934) and John Dewey (1957) can assist with the construction of a conception of person that suggests people and conduct are inseparable and so reinforce the notion of people as events and as confluences of actions. Mead (1934) provides a way to understand a notion of self not as “individual” but as necessarily relational when he suggests a “self” develops through time and experience because it is generated through a process of social experience and activity. It is a cognitive framework that frames a notion of mind as socially constituted because it ascribes meaning to gestures and responses that emerge from interactions with others. In other words, we are born into social mediums. As we develop, the attitudes and institutions of our communities influence us. If this is the case, then the field of a person’s mind extends “as far as the social activity or apparatus of social relationships which constitutes it extends; and hence that field cannot be bounded by the skin of the individual organism to which it belongs” (p. 223). In brief, people can only exist relationally.

Dewey (1957) suggests that people are constituted by others and our environment through our numerous and various habits. These habits are not simply rote actions that we



half-unthinkingly take. Rather, they are persistent social functions that include peoples' interactions with our environments and each other. They are constituted by what we continually do, but also by our approaches to how we think. Habits are a form of what he calls "active means" that influence how we act because they are always with us whether we are conscious of them or not. For example, Dewey points out that just because we may not be walking in a particular moment does not mean that our ability to walk and the sensation of walking do not influence the way we understand distance or how we experience walking when we dream. Acts emerge before thought and habits before abilities: "Our ideas truly depend upon experience, but so do our sensations. And the experience upon which they both depend is the operation of habits—originally of instincts" (p. 32). Ideas can only emerge from habits or "demands for certain kinds of activity" (p. 26). Habits, then, are mediums that serve as filters that shape our perceptions and thoughts.

People are not discrete from others because, from birth, we are exposed to others' habits through our families, which influence and shape our identities and notions of selves. Just as the activity of walking necessarily is an interaction between person and environment, for the ability to walk entails not only movement of our legs but also involves the ground we walk on, so it is, for example, for our ideas of morality and our actual conduct. We are born into families and existing systems of organization that give actions meaning. Who we think we are is influenced and shaped by our social environments situating people as necessarily interdependent and constituted by others.

Both Mead and Dewey reject the notion that people can be isolated individuals or souls but suggest that activity and conduct are primary to determinations about who we are and what we think and believe. In other words, we construct our identities performatively. If we consider that meaning continually emerges through engagement in a process of gesture

and response, and due to the ongoing influence of our habits, then our actions contribute to the construction of who we think we are in every moment. A conception of performativity emphasizes the idea that we continually construct notions of who we are through our actions rather than from a notion of essentialist qualities.

When we situate people as specific rather than abstract, then we can see people as constituted by networks of relationships. Relationships, then, from a relational orientation, are not simply had, they are constructed through interaction and must be taken into consideration of how we understand people. So, rather than “beings,” people are events and narratives that enmesh. This suggests that how people act, including attitudes and approaches, and what we do in every moment, constructs our identities. This view of people reflects a broader processual worldview.

### **The Performativity of Relationship from a Processual Worldview**

When people are seen as constituted by relationships and interdependent, it suggests that the world cannot be a static place but one that continually transforms. While the *Zhongyong* is preoccupied with discussing the qualities and education of exemplary persons, the processual worldview it emerges from necessarily foregrounds a view of world as continually generated from interaction. Ames and Hall (2001) describe people in a processual world as infinite foci in a field. This orientation “presumes a world constituted by an interactive field of processes and events in which there are no final elements, only shifting ‘foci’ in the phenomenal field, each of which focuses the entire field from its finite perspective” (p. 7). In other words, our networks of relationships are generated through

interaction to insinuate a broader contextual field that people, as foci, may find impossible to grasp, but, at the same time, form an intimate part.

While it may be impossible to conceive of the extensiveness of an infinite field that changes, we can at the same time influence the field of our networks through our actions. This means that we become who we are based on how we interact and how people respond to us in every moment. For example, the text of chapter 31 in the *Zhongyong* describes the image of an ideal leader in relational terms: “They [wise leaders] appear and all defer to them; they speak and all have confidence in what they say; they act and all find pleasure in what they do” (p. 112). The notions of a wise leader are described in relation to how people perceive and treat a leader. A leader is a leader because others situate a person as such. Leaders do not hold or claim deference as a personal state, but rather it is through their behavior that others may choose to give deference.

The qualities of wise leaders cannot exist as essences, but are connected and relative, not only to how others might perceive a particular leader, but more specifically, to the qualities needed to perform the work of governance, which could itself be considered a form of interaction:

Only those of utmost sagacity in the world: have the perspicacity and quickness of mind needed to oversee the empire; have the tolerance and flexibility needed to win them the forbearance of others; have the energy and fortitude needed to maintain their grasp; have the poise and impeccability needed to command respect; have the culture and discernment needed to be discriminating. (p. 112)

The qualities mentioned—perspicacity and quickness of mind, tolerance, flexibility, energy, fortitude, poise, impeccability, culture, and discernment—are directly related to the performance of some particular role and function that involves others. For example, one

would need insight and flexibility in order to undertake the numerous responsibilities of governance. The development of tolerance, flexibility, poise, and impeccability are needed not for authoritarian purposes, but in order to persuade and show that one is worthy of respect from others; such qualities are necessary “to win the forbearance of others.” This reflects a worldview where meaning emerges through continual interaction.

If people are constituted by each other through our interactions, then the effort expended to maintain and cultivate relationships influences what we do and how we perceive our identities. In other words, who you are is informed by what you do in the present to maintain and cultivate relationships to those living. Relationship, then, is something that necessarily emerges through action and interaction at every moment. In a processual world that continues to change, the activity of relating happens in real time, in every moment, and so the attention one brings to how one lives each moment matters.

But how is the notion of exemplary government leaders relevant to those who may not have direct access to those roles? While the text of the *Zhongyong* does often discuss leaders, it does so in part through exploration of what it means to be an exemplary person, one who behaves in ethical, responsible, and authentic ways with others. For example, from chapter 13: “Putting oneself in the place of others and doing one’s best on their behalf does not stray far from the proper way” (p. 94). But what makes the content of the text relevant to everyone is that family, Ames and Hall point out, is the governing metaphor (p. 38). Family is seen as the critical and model institution that can allow one to develop as an ethical person. It is what Ames and Hall call a “radial locus” for human growth that suggests that one becomes a person through cultivating interactions with family members foremost. A leader could not lead well without having ethical and strong relationships with family in part

because it is through those relationships, how one acts within them, that one becomes a person.

But doesn't the focus on leadership suggest there is a social hierarchy between people? Li-Hsiang Lisa Rosenlee (2006) in her book that explores feminism from a Confucian orientation suggests that a Confucian tradition does engage a social hierarchy, but she takes pains to clarify that the nature of relationships should be reciprocal. For example, parents and children would not be situated as equals because children would be expected to observe a basic sense of deference to social superiors. But this does not mean that parents have absolute authority, "There is no such thing as right without obligation" in Confucian ethics (p. 157). She also points out that social positioning is not fixed, and that social inequality changes throughout people's lives, for example, children grow up, become leaders, parents: "One is neither definitely socially inferior nor superior, and each relation is premised on complementarity and reciprocity instead of domination and submission" (p. 158). While social inequality may seem fixed between an emperor and the people, when reciprocity and interdependence are considered, a position of leader could only exist because of the people. This also means that if a leader could not be a leader if it were not for the support of the people.

Furthermore, in order to construct a hybrid Confucian feminism, she posits that because the Confucian framework is not gender-based, an appropriate analogy of marital relations would be friendship, which she points out is one of the relations a Confucian tradition identifies as primary. By removing what she calls a "gender-based division of labor," in which women are seen as performing roles in the home while men are seen as public figures, women would have access to public roles and be able to achieve the cultural ideals of exemplary persons—those who are "ritually proper at home but also are fully

cultured, leading the masses by their virtuous example” (p. 159). Rosenlee suggest that early distinctions between gender roles in Chinese culture may have emerged in response to nomadic “barbarian invasions” in the Spring and Autumn period (c. 722-481 BCE) by the more agriculturally situated Han and were not considered essentialized. She writes that boundary markings were drawn not only geographically (and functionally from an agricultural lifestyle standpoint) but politically and culturally. For example, differentiating between genders marked Han notions of civility because “barbarians” were considered to not make gender distinctions. It is the drawing of ritual and symbolic boundaries in relation to ideas of security, frontier, and preserving order, Rosenlee suggests, that gender distinctions emerged between social roles that were “unequal yet reciprocal” and that became manifest in concepts of “*bie* (differentiation)” and “*li* (ritual)” (p. 73). Gender distinctions did not, from this perspective, rely on assumptions of innate qualities.

A processual and substance-orientation differ in their implications for notions of hierarchy more broadly. For example, in chapters 17-20, the *Zhongyong* mentions that Confucius identified people such as Shun; Kings Wen, Tai, Ji, and Wu; and Duke Zhou as models not only of their time but to those who followed because they constructed relationships with their ancestors through ritual. In chapter 19, Confucius identifies King Wu and the Duke of Zhou as filial exemplars who honored “the purposes of one’s predecessors” and strove to maintain their ways (Ames & Hall, 2001, p. 98). Sor-hoon Tan (2003) cautions that Chinese notions of hierarchy of ancestors, and ancestor worship in a religious sense, is quite distinct from that of a Judeo-Christian medieval religion from which the English word “hierarchy” is associated. She warns that it carries with it a religious Judeo-Christian connotation. A “hierarch is a priest that rules over rites and implies a ranking where the ‘Creator’ is envisioned as separate from the ‘created hierarchy’” (p. 99). Such an order

could presumably not change unless the Creator changes it. On the other hand, remembering and honoring ancestors through the performance of rituals and reference to them in a hierarchical way from a Confucian tradition is not thought of as an external activity to worship the divine, but rather “is a continuation, not just a projection, of actual social stratification among them when alive” (p. 99). Hence, the hierarchy and ranking can change when, as she says, the “world changes.” Tan also points out that the view of the cosmos is not one of a fixed transcendence, but is rather, “self-generating and self-sustaining”: “Without the same associations of transcendence, inflexibility of social stratification and persistence of inequalities are contingent rather than theologically or metaphysically necessary” (p. 100). In other words, the differences between people in regard to rank, order, or perceptions of power cannot be fixed but are changing and relative.

A processual worldview implies that peoples’ roles and relationships cannot be fixed but must be considered from the perspective of change, action, context, and complexity. While a substance-orientation may situate people as having particular roles, a relational orientation reminds that those roles cannot be static because they are continually performed. As such, the roles themselves will change through people’s interactions and so will the people who live them.

### **The Quality of Relationship Matters**

Relationality implies that if people are considered “events” rather than “beings,” then the quality of our relationships matters because it influences our day-to-day lives and vice versa. Because the activity of relating happens in the present, how we choose to live every moment impinges on the quality of our relationships: “The proper way of exemplary persons

has at its start the simple lives of ordinary men and women, and at its furthest limits sheds light upon the entire world” (Ames & Hall, 2001, p. 93). The activity of relating, then, takes on temporal and spatial qualities because it happens in real time. Because we live in a specific moment in time and space, we theoretically have some choice about how we want to live each moment. This is not to suggest that people can be completely conscious about our feelings, desires, and actions, but it does imply that we can to some extent reflectively attend to how we act and respond to others. Because the world continually changes, our attention to each moment may somewhat influence how we live the next moment, which impacts the quality of our lives.

To situate quality simply in terms of good or bad misses the point because such a frame implies fixed and static states marked by objectivity. To consider quality in terms that convey direction, movement, and contextual subjectivity that require a continual striving to seek balance is more relevant. The robustness of our lives is connected to how we choose to live each moment, and because people are necessarily relational, it involves attempts to achieve harmonious interactions: “Exemplary persons are able to focus the affairs of the day because, being exemplary, they themselves constantly abide in equilibrium” (Ames & Hall, 2001, p. 90). How people interact with others shapes one’s life. In fact, chapter 20 states, “Ruler and minister, father and son, husband and wife, older and younger brother, friend and mentor—these are the five ways forward in the world. Wisdom, authoritative conduct, and courage—these are the three methods of excelling in character. How one advances along the way is one and the same” (p. 102). Relationships drive the human world, and in order to improve them, one must take reflective action to interact with others with a sense of integrity and earnestness.



From a relational perspective, in which our actions directly influence the quality of our relationships and our lives, attitudes and cognitive processes that inform our actions, such as mindfulness, reflection, will, and choices, only have meaning when contextualized relationally. These processes can be critical approaches that people can use to improve our relationships with others—they can help us develop and grow as people. To strive to create balance and harmony from a relational view does not mean people should try to come to agreement with each other. It means rather that people (those who want to be exemplary) should interact with others with propriety, integrity, and earnestness. For people who want to be exemplary, this means striving to live ethically through harmonious interaction with others. Harmony, though, is not meant to imply similarity, but rather emerges through engaging tension and difference. There are textual examples of harmony that relate it to food or music (Ames, 2011, p. 275). Different elements come together to create something that tastes or sounds good. For example, harmony in music does not emerge from all instruments playing the same note at the same time; it requires difference. What does a note on its own mean; what is its impact? Consider what changes when it is played as part of a symphony, as part of a configuration of, and in relation to, other notes? Harmony develops through change, difference, and interaction. It is not a static thing or state nor is it spatially fixed.

For people, to become exemplary means to seek harmony in our relationships through attention to our interactions in every moment. These interactions inform the texture and robustness of our lives. Because we are constituted by our relationships, to seek harmony means that we strive to strengthen and improve our relationships.

## The Work of Personal Cultivation Through Relationships

Relationality includes the notion that to live properly then is an achievement that requires personal cultivation through relationship with others. To live in an exemplary way requires active engagement with others and reflects a heightened attentiveness to the meaning and consequences of one's actions in each moment. For Confucius, living well requires personal cultivation, which necessitates attention and work. Throughout the *Zhongyong*, there are lamentations about how difficult it is to be exemplary. For example, distinctions are made between exemplary persons and petty persons, and the text references numerous comments attributed to Confucius about those who quit trying to be exemplary (see chapters 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14). Notably, Confucius even admits that he cannot achieve his own expectations regarding living properly when he points out that he is not able to be the son to his father in the ways that he would expect of his own son, or to treat a friend in the way Confucius himself would wish to be treated by others. That said, he suggests it is important to make a continual effort. In Chapter 13, he is to have said, "Where in everyday moral conduct and in everyday attention to proper speech I am lacking in some respect, I must make every effort to attend to this" (p. 94).

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to become exemplary in every moment, the actual methods of living well are not out of reach for those willing to undertake the work of personal cultivation: from chapter 12, "The proper way of exemplary persons is both broad and hidden. The dullest of ordinary men and women can know something of it, and yet even the sages in trying to penetrate to its furthest limits do not know it at all" (p. 93). People have the intuitive potential to learn and the resources to live in harmonious ways, but this requires constant effort to realize: "What *tian* commands is called natural tendencies;

drawing out these natural tendencies is called the proper way; improving upon this way is called education” (p. 89).

I interpret this notion of education to be a process of personal cultivation, which requires one to be continually mindful and attentive of how one interacts with others. This means that one must pay attention and learn from how others behave and to adapt one’s own actions accordingly not simply through mimicry of others’ behaviors but to strive to act in genuine and thoughtful ways. In chapter 13, the text references the *Book of Songs* and states, “In hewing an axe handle—the model is not far away” (p. 94). The passage continues, “But in grasping one axe handle to hew another, if one never looks directly at the axe handle in one’s hand, the handles still seem far apart” (p. 94). Without turning to look and study the axe handle in use, or thoughtfully consider how one lives and interacts with others, one may not notice the ramifications of one’s actions. The notion of living properly in relation to others, living harmoniously and well, while it is not out of reach for people, is not easy to do because it requires people to do the work of looking, reflecting, and attending to how one interacts with others. From chapter 4: “Everyone eats and drinks, but those with real discrimination are rare indeed” (p. 90). While living through relating could be considered mundane, living properly requires personal cultivation through relationships. The work of personal cultivation requires ongoing attention and a motivated attitude of openness toward learning. I quote a section of Chapter 20 here at length because it provides an indication of the relentless will required of one to personally cultivate and the difficulty of such a process:

Study the way broadly, ask about it in detail, reflect on it carefully, analyze it clearly, and advance on it with earnest. When there is something that one has yet to study or that, having studied it, has yet to master, do not stop; where there is something that one has yet to ask about or that, having asked about it, has yet to understand, do not

stop; where there is something that one has yet to reflect upon or that, having reflected on it, has yet to grasp, do not stop; where there is something one has yet to analyze or that, having analyzed it, is still not clear about, do not stop; where there is the proper way that one has not yet advanced on or that, having advanced on it, has yet to do so with earnestness, do not stop. (p. 104)

A process of personal cultivation is accessible and relevant to all in part because it can be pursued as part of our everyday lives and through our interactions, but it requires an inordinate amount of effort. What makes becoming exemplary difficult is not so much the ability to envision what engaged interactions and proper conduct might look like, it is the actual work it takes to persistently achieve it in every moment. And this is important because it can have an extensive impact.

### **The Extensive Impact of Relational Personal Cultivation**

A process of personal cultivation undertaken from a processual, relational worldview is important because it can shape the contexts in which we live. *Zhongyong* Chapter 20 states, “those who realize how to cultivate their persons realize how to bring order to others; those who realize how to order others properly realize how to bring order to the world, the state, and the family” (Ames & Hall, 2001, p. 102). To cultivate oneself through one’s relationships to others not only impacts a person but also those with whom a person interacts. This view differs from that of a substance-oriented notion of personal cultivation that assumes people are separate from others and that a process of learning should be taken largely for the benefit of a self. Relationality accommodates the complexity and extensive impacts of interaction.

A process of personal cultivation can influence not only how we interact with others but also those we might connect with. *Zhongyong* Chapter 20 suggests that leaders who seek to find people to assist them with proper governance should undertake processes of personal cultivation because in doing so they will attract the right people to work with them: “One gets the right persons with one’s own character, cultivates one’s own character with the proper way, and cultivates the proper way with authoritative conduct” (p. 101). A process of personal cultivation, then, happens through interaction with others and in particular with those who are closest: “Thus, exemplary persons cannot but cultivate their persons. In cultivating their persons, they cannot but serve their kin. In serving their kin, they cannot but realize human conduct. And in realizing human conduct, they cannot but realize *tian*” (p. 101). These passages suggest that if a person undertakes the work of personal cultivation through one’s relationships by living each moment with attention to one’s conduct and interactions with others, the person emerges as a harmonious force to shape one’s contexts: “If one cultivates one’s person, the way will be established therefrom” (p. 102).

A framework of relationality that engages a processual worldview foregrounds the importance of relationships. Such a framework situates people as necessarily interdependent because we live in relationship with others. Because living is an ongoing process, each moment provides an opportunity to undertake a process of personal cultivation, which can only become manifest through relationships with others. This process insinuates the importance of the attention we give to the cultivation of relationships that influence our day-to-day lives and construct our identities. Interactions are activities that can have an extensive impact not only on those one directly interacts with but more broadly includes the contexts and communities in which people are a part. Relationality suggests

that each moment offers an opportunity for learning that contributes to the cultivation of people through interactions with others in ways that can have a far-reaching impact.

A relational framework embraces the complexity of human interactions, rather than overlooking it. Through engagement with a processual worldview, its focus is not on fixing or delineating things, but rather emphasizes function and affect. A relational framework suggests that relationships are important and that their cultivation can have an extensive influence on an institution and within a community. This extensivity hinges on a notion of a person as interdependent and as an occurrence rather than a being. When people are situated as specific and networked in relationships to others in ways that construct our identities, then how we interact can have a resonant impact. When a relational frame is used to consider higher educational endeavors and institutions, those aspects that take the cultivation of collegiality and theorize the complexity of the classroom as primary, such as faculty learning communities and the work of scholars who reflectively study pedagogy, take on inordinate value. They are valuable because they contribute to the development of the quality of a university context more broadly. In the next two chapters, I discuss how a relational framework can be used to consider aspects of educational phenomena. In chapter 5, I consider how a relational framework situates the value of the development of collegiality in faculty learning communities. In chapter 6, I read educator Elizabeth Ellsworth's work, which explores the complexity of communication in the classroom, from a relational framework. More broadly, I suggest that a relational framework can be a resource to consider the value of those aspects that support the development of teaching in ways that influence university contexts. It can also function in complementary, challenging, and productive ways in juxtaposition with other theoretical frameworks.

## CHAPTER 5

### DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGIALITY IN FACULTY LEARNING COMMUNITIES

A faculty member in the College of Education I spoke with about faculty learning communities said that participation in one strengthened her collegial relationships. Although the book club, where she and other faculty and staff convened and conversed not only about the designated books but also about whatever else emerged, lasted only a bit more than a year, she marveled at how it impacted their relationships. For example, before participation in the group, she knew a particular colleague by face because they had crossed paths numerous times over the years on the grounds of the College. Now when she and this colleague would see each other, instead of a polite nod or half-wave, they would stop and talk even if it was right there in the parking lot. And, she said, it would be a real conversation. Participation in a learning community enriched a collegial relationship that might have otherwise remained nascent.

While research about university-affiliated faculty learning communities tends to situate the groups as effective processes to realize particular identifiable goals, I will discuss how it often overlooks the potential that the development of collegiality can contribute to the quality and richness of a university community more broadly. In brief, the research misses the fact that the development of collegiality that emerges from faculty learning communities can be situated as a valuable outcome too. While some voluntary groups may be ephemeral and elude a researcher's gaze because they emerge or disappear, registered only by those who create and participate in them, they can nonetheless strengthen collegial relationships through shared learning experiences that contribute to the development of faculty networks and increase the potential for collaborations, among other unpredictable

results. From a relational perspective, which situates people as necessarily interdependent, learning communities are both a means and an outcome. More broadly, one way to situate learning communities is that they are who we become; they become part of our personal identities and construct our institutions.

Researchers describe faculty learning communities as collegial, often interdisciplinary, groups of faculty and staff who want to improve teaching through discussion, reflection, and goal-setting in order to address a broad range of student needs and learning styles in higher education (Ward & Selvester, 2012). Researchers suggest that faculty learning communities create the conditions to develop strong collegial relationships in order to encourage faculty to collaboratively learn about teaching innovations. Participants and facilitators of these groups, which can be topic or cohort focused, strive to create contexts conducive to risk-taking where participants feel comfortable to reflect openly with others about their experiences (Glowacki-Dudka & Brown, 2008; Limbrick & Knight, 2005; Ward & Selvester, 2012; Yayli, 2012). Yet while researchers acknowledge the role of the development of collegiality in learning communities, they often frame it not as a valuable outcome itself but rather as part of a process to achieve particular goals.

The problem with an outcome-oriented perspective about such groups is that the exploration of the value and extensiveness of faculty learning communities and the development of collegial relationships that emerge from them are not fully examined in the scholarship. The articles researchers tend to publish often assume a product-orientation about such groups that describes the success of these communities in terms of the extent faculty are perceived to understand and use teaching innovations in their classes. If concerns about the mastery of teaching innovations orient the research questions and findings about faculty learning communities, then they garner a narrow reader focus. Some



might argue that situating faculty learning communities as a means-to-an-end of the realization of research purposes does not detract from their implied value. While I agree that the interdependence of goals and their processes can to some extent be assumed, I also caution that a limited focus on learning teaching innovations overshadows the value of the time, attention, and energy required to cultivate collegiality. It also overlooks the messiness—as is wont to appear when people from different backgrounds, interests, and experiences converse and work together—of the process too.

Furthermore, a product-oriented view of learning communities can overlook the value of those groups that emerge that have varied purposes and may not garner so much researcher focus. While I do not suggest the value of university-affiliated learning communities' contributions to support teaching be minimized, such a focused product-oriented perspective can miss the contributions varied types of learning communities offer. These include informal groups such as faculty and staff book clubs, groups to support new faculty publishing efforts, among others, that enrich the university community more broadly.

Faculty learning communities must be reevaluated in a way that suggests their complex contributions, actual and potential, to the ethos of universities. I examine three articles about university-affiliated faculty learning communities and consider how a product-oriented perspective deemphasizes the possibility of multiple valuable outcomes, including the development of collegiality itself and the possibility of its extensive impacts. I suggest that a relational framework that prioritizes the development of quality of interactions among people situates learning communities as forums for personal cultivation that encourage dynamic communication. Relationality constructs a notion of a robust community that requires responsive and reflective interaction that emerges from differences among people.

From this perspective, it is the difficulties, messiness, and different experiences that need not be overlooked but are necessary in order for people to grow through interaction.

The genuine conversations that take place, for example, between former book club members should not be considered beside the point; rather, they could very much be considered *the* point. If people are considered interdependent, then learning communities are forums for personal growth that enrich collegial relationships that may encourage future collaborations and interactions. Reading learning communities relationally also insinuates the value of informal groups that foreground the development of collegiality. It suggests that what might seem peripheral may have high value in unpredictable ways. More broadly, learning communities invigorate relationships and the university communities that we are a part of.

### **A Concept of “Communities of Practice”**

Researchers often use a concept of communities of practice as a theoretical frame for learning communities to emphasize the importance of critical reflection on teaching experiences with peers (see Glowacki-Dudka & Brown, 2008; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). They argue that active faculty participation in such groups increases professional knowledge and enhances student learning. Social anthropologist Jean Lave and social theorist Etienne Wenger (1991) characterize communities of practice, such as workplaces or specific professions, as spaces where relations are formed through collective learning as part of specific contexts that generate meaningful patterns of activity. For example, employees in workplaces develop practices of interaction and activities that seek to realize the goals of a company. To identify groups in regard to their practices emphasizes a view of

learning as social but also product-oriented. While this view of learning resonates with the discourse of research articles on faculty learning communities, I suggest that a product-oriented theoretical framework is a limited way to situate learning communities.

### *Learning from the Contexts of Everyday Practice*

A concept of communities of practice developed from a theory of situated learning suggests that it is contexts that shape how and what one learns (Lave, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave (1988) points out that studies of cognition by psychologists and cognitive anthropologists undertaken in laboratory settings do not necessarily reflect how learning occurs outside the lab, troubling the assumption that direct learning transfer happens between classrooms and other contexts. Prior theories of learning reflect a notion of education that assumes cognitive skills can be better learned if removed from everyday contexts. A theory of situated learning disrupts this view by calling attention to the role of culture and context in shaping learning. It identifies the perceived gap between learning in a laboratory setting and in everyday work activities and routines.

People can sometimes learn more from engaging the practices of a particular community and everyday activities than from attempts to deliberately teach and learn in the classroom (Lave, 1988). Learning occurs in complex and relational ways that involve contexts: “agent, activity, and the world mutually constitute each other” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 33). In particular, Lave and Wenger developed a notion of situated learning from considering specific workplaces and professions, as for example, midwifery and tailoring, which have established practices that have specific purposes and outcomes. Specifically, one enters a community of practice of tailoring in order to become a tailor. The practices of

the community then are geared toward a focused goal, to produce a tailor with the capacity to create quality clothing.

### *Practices Imply Goals*

Lave and Wenger's focus on practices as a way to characterize particular groups, then, also implies the importance of the identification and realization of goals. The construction of specific outcomes influences perceptions of the value of particular practices. If specific goals orient practice, then those activities deemed to contribute to the achievement of those goals may be seen as efficient, useful, and also valued. For example, a tailor-in-training might engage in conversation and interaction with other tailors in order to learn to produce accurate measurements and cuts of different kinds of fabric. Such practices would be considered valuable because they help tailors create clothing that fits their clients.

The emphasis on the orientation of practices from an outcomes-oriented perspective makes a concept of communities of practice a limited theoretical framework to consider the phenomena of faculty learning communities. While the concept suggests learning is ongoing, it also implies practices emerge from an interest to achieve perceived material goals, such as the generation of particular outcomes. Wenger (1998) articulates the importance of the relationship between practice and outcome when he writes, "No matter what their official job description may be, they create a practice to do what needs to be done" (p. 6). Such a practices-outcomes orientation does not quite adequately frame the complexity of the development of collegiality needed to encourage faculty to learn about teaching innovations in part because outcomes may be difficult to characterize or perceive.

While it might be considered a useful practice to convey a new teaching approach, how can one judge its influences? No matter how well someone understands a particular teaching approach, there is no guarantee that its use will have the same impact on every class and student. Faculty members approach teaching differently and how they use specific teaching innovations will also vary.

I would like to point out that some groups may loosely refer to themselves as communities of practice and that I do not suggest that all the activities of such groups are goal-oriented or that all participants undertake activities in the communities to realize particular outcomes. To clarify, my focus at this point is on scholarship about university-affiliated faculty learning communities and how learning communities are theoretically framed for the purposes of publication, and not a specific commentary or critique on how participants engage in or feel about such groups. More broadly, I suggest that care should be taken in regard to how the concept of communities of practice is deployed.

### *Practices and Identities*

The fact that some faculty learning communities have flexible practices is somewhat problematic for the use of a concept of communities of practice as a framework, which suggests that learning the practices of a community is critical to the construction of participants' identities. For example, participants of communities of practice are identified as "newcomers" and "masters (newer ones and older ones)" (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Notably, people are identified primarily in relation to their status and experiences within a group, and specifically how familiar they are with a group's practices. So, this implies that the learning that occurs from participation within communities of practice is largely connected to learning

the practices of a particular community, which become referents: “learning occurs through centripetal participation in the learning curriculum of the ambient community” (p. 100).

“Centripetal participation” means that newcomers, like tailor apprentices, develop an embodied way to understand and view tailoring that shapes their identities. An apprentice becomes a tailor by learning the practices of the profession. In other words, who we are or how we think about ourselves is constructed by the practices we learn within particular communities. While workplace communities of practice, like tailoring, may be established and refined through years, the practices of semester- or year-long faculty learning communities may not be as developed. In fact, because the practices of some communities seek to encourage quality engagement amongst voluntary participants, they are flexible and responsive to participants’ interests and preferences. As a result, the practices of faculty learning communities may rapidly evolve, thereby making it difficult to construct identities based on them.

Another issue that emerges from the consideration of a concept of communities of practice as a frame for faculty learning communities is that Wenger suggests that the reconciliation of membership in multiple communities in regard to identity construction is a private enterprise. From his perspective, identities need to be cognitively constructed: “maintenance of an identity across boundaries requires work and, moreover, that the work of integrating our various forms of participation is not just a secondary process...it is at the core of what it means to be a person” (Wenger, 1998, p. 160). He considers such work a “private achievement” that implies one can reconcile numerous identities cognitively and consciously, and that people must do this independently from others.

This view of identity formation as abstract and private situates people as ultimately autonomous and independent from others. It implies that people can enter or leave

communities as “individuals.” In other words, people can join a community by learning its practices and leave by not engaging its practices; a person enters and leaves a community as the same person. It is the practices of a community, then, that characterize a community. One concerning implication is that this frame minimizes the experiences of a group’s participants. In other words, this is not to say that this conception seeks to erase differences between people, but to identify a group based on its practices can have the impact of overlooking those differences, raising questions about issues related to group equity and inclusiveness.<sup>13</sup>

If specific practices are developed in order to achieve particular outcomes, then the value of unexpected outcomes may be missed. The concept of communities of practice, which directs participant attention toward realizing particular goals—while apt for characterizations of product-oriented workplaces—has less relevance for faculty learning communities. It reflects a narrow notion of value that can overlook what may be possible. For example, aspects of faculty learning communities such as the development of collegiality and its potential to generate future collaborations are overshadowed by the focus on whether or not faculty have learned about particular teaching innovations. What gets missed is that the practices of the development of collegiality through the strengthening of relationships might actually foster more than the intended outcomes in ways that are unimagined.

---

<sup>13</sup> Lynn Fendler (2006) writes a critical review from a historical perspective to explore how the discourse of community especially in educational contexts and research can have an exclusionary impact. While educational literature understands the term “community” to mean “shared values, unified purpose, and/or common beliefs” (p. 303), she argues that use of the concept of community without careful consideration of its assumptions may exclude diversity and perpetuate norms of those who are privileged (p. 304). Fendler points out that it is important to be aware of the implications a notion of community has for its participants especially in contexts where people, for example, are perceived to have different levels of institutional authority.

## **The Development of Collegiality as Process/Support for Teaching**

Research articles about university-affiliated faculty learning communities tend to reflect a product-oriented perspective. For example, authors determine the success of such communities based on whether they perceive the purposes set out at the start of the research to have been realized; for university-affiliated faculty learning communities, the authors' research questions tend to focus on the teaching innovations that the groups explore. This focus delimits a notion of the outcomes that emerge deemed as valuable. Part of the reason this is the case is that they position learning communities as an effective method to pursue the realization of particular goals. They consider the development of collegiality as an expectation rather than an achievement or outcome that is valuable in its own right.

The three articles I discuss, selected because they are largely representative of research about university-affiliated faculty learning communities, construct learning communities with the particular purpose of sharing new teaching approaches with faculty. Andrew Furco and Barbara Moley, authors of the article, "Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study," published in the *Journal of Higher Education* in 2012, report their findings of a three-year grant-funded study about the development of faculty learning communities on eight campuses across the United States. The communities were created to promote the understanding and institutionalization of service-learning initiatives, an approach to teaching that integrates community service with academic work. The authors suggest that faculty often resist teaching innovations because they may not understand an innovation's goals or its practices, or feel that it competes with their personal teaching approaches and even



academic freedom. They suggest that the creation of learning community seminars that spanned a time frame of eight to ten weeks on the campuses addressed these issues because it provided a structure and conditions for participants to learn about service-learning in ways that contributed to the participants' professional growth. Participants began to gradually see how such an innovation could become a part of their classroom curriculums.

Daniela Friedman, Tena Crews, Juan Caicedo, John Besley, Justin Weinberg, and Miriam Freeman in their 2010 article, "An exploration into inquiry-based learning by a multidisciplinary group of higher education faculty," published in the journal *Higher Education*, wrote about their experiences as part of a grant-funded faculty learning community of six created to explore inquiry-based learning—an approach to develop students' critical thinking skills. The purpose of the community was to explore ways that university faculty could integrate inquiry and research methods into their teaching. The authors hoped that through the discovery of how inquiry-based methods support student learning, they would revise their classroom curriculums. They also hoped that this experience would prepare them to teach in a course about inquiry fundamentals, if they so wished. Over the period of a summer, faculty participants were expected to meet together six times, design a course that engaged students in inquiry, learn about practices that supported inquiry, and make a campus-wide presentation about inquiry-based teaching. The majority of the paper discusses how each interdisciplinary member of the group implemented the approach in their classroom contexts. In particular, they elaborated on their new curriculums with an inquiry framework based on a five-stage cycle, which includes the directives to ask, investigate, create, discuss, and reflect. This framework was used to help students engage in a notion of critical thinking drawn from Bloom's Taxonomy, a

classification of levels of learning that includes stages such as create, evaluate, analyze, apply, understand, and remember. The authors argue faculty members have an important role to foster student inquiry especially in the initial learning stages. They also conclude that inquiry must be taught in connection with subject matter and not as an isolated process.

In their article, “Faculty learning communities: improving teaching in higher education,” published in the journal *Educational Studies* in 2012, Hsuying Ward and Paula Selvester describe a learning community at a medium-sized university supported by a two-year grant that introduces faculty to universal design for learning—an approach to teaching that uses technology to make course content accessible for students in multiple ways. They suggest that many faculty members find the use of new technology in their classrooms to be a challenge. The purpose of the development of a faculty learning community was to introduce faculty to universal design for learning practices, to assist them to use instructional technology within the learning framework, and to support faculty to develop related projects that could be published in order to support the compilation of tenure and promotion portfolios. Faculty members met twice a month for an hour and a half and, in the second year, broke into two groups of between five and seven participants in order to accommodate varied schedules. The authors suggest that the support of an institution’s administration can be of importance to make universal design for learning accessible more broadly because it helps faculty members see a relationship between learning about teaching and their career advancement. They also found that participation in a faculty learning community before and throughout a semester could help faculty members construct content and make adjustments to the use of universal design learning approaches in their curriculums.

While the three articles discuss the importance of the use of faculty learning communities to convey particular teaching innovations, the research questions the authors pose and how they evaluate success of the communities indicate the aspects of their studies they perceive as most important. In the case of the selected articles, the research questions and evaluation of their studies' successes center on the exploration of the extent to which faculty learned about the specified teaching innovations. For example, Furco and Moley (2012) assess faculty members' attitudes toward the use of service-learning through the distribution of surveys with questions specifically related to the topic. They asked 1) How did participants' views of the value of service-learning change due to their participation in the learning community? 2) Were the learning communities effective in the development of their competence regarding service-learning? 3) How did their views of institutional support for service-learning change? 4) How did they view service-learning in regard to their own professional development? These questions situate the teaching innovation as the main subject. Service-learning is mentioned in each question and this focus insinuates its perceived value as the sought-after outcome.

Friedman et al. (2010) focus the majority of their paper on discussions about how each interdisciplinary member of the group implemented the inquiry-based approach to their particular classroom contexts. For example, one of the faculty members who taught undergraduate philosophy described a semester-long, role-playing activity called, "In Their Shoes," that invited students to take on the perspectives of a particular philosopher that they would study. Students received a reading list with works by a philosopher they had to research and looked for other source material in order to develop a presentation in which they would take on the persona of the philosopher. In the presentation, they would address thematic course questions and also respond to questions their classmates posed about the

philosopher. The students would then write a critical paper about the ideas of their philosopher and were expected to discuss how one of the other philosophers studied by their classmates would respond to particular positions differently. Overall, Friedman et al. describe the success of their faculty learning community through the description of the projects that emerged from participants of the group as they related to the use of inquiry-based teaching approaches.

Ward and Selvester (2012) measured the success of their faculty learning community through the distribution of a survey to participants with questions focused on how they adopted the universal design learning principles in their teaching practice. In particular, they measured success based on participation (record of attendance), feedback (how participation impacted their teaching practice), and professional growth (the use of universal design for learning in a course and publications that resulted from participation in the group). They assessed the success of their group based on their findings that 1) All participants adopted at least one technological innovation to improve accessibility. 2) They all had a chance to evaluate their courses through the use of universal design for learning principles. 3) They all made at least one presentation or produced a publication related to the application of the principles. 4) The learning community offered social and professional mentorship opportunities. While the fourth category directly relates to the importance of the participation in the learning community, the first three focus on the subject of the faculty learning community (to learn about universal design for learning), implying its weight as a research focus.

Because the research questions are generally preoccupied with the extent to which faculty learned about particular teaching approaches, the implied outcomes perceived by researchers as most valuable in regard to these faculty learning communities would be

faculty mastery of the new teaching approaches. Such a product-oriented perspective of faculty learning communities limits an interest to construct and value multiple actual and potential outcomes.

### *Faculty Learning Communities as Method to Foster Communication*

The articles frame faculty learning communities, and in particular the development of collegiality, as an effective method to encourage faculty to learn about specific teaching innovations and not a critical outcome in and of itself. For example, Furco and Moley (2012) describe their faculty learning communities as topic-based cohorts that facilitators set up to be voluntary, interdisciplinary, structured, goal-oriented, safe, and supportive, in order to encourage participants to learn about service-learning. In the discussion section of the article, the authors make the goal orientation of the development of collegiality explicit when they write, “In a number of ways, the learning communities created the conditions for faculty participants to develop their competency with service-learning, gain a better understanding of the extent to which the institution supported the practice, and explore the value of the pedagogy for student growth and their own professional development” (p. 146). Similarly, Ward and Selvester (2012) express an unquestioned acceptance of the notion that faculty learning communities generate contexts to promote universal design for learning. In the discussion section of their article, the authors preface a call for institutional commitment to support faculty learning communities with the sentence, “We knew that the group had become a safe place to problem-solve, provide support for achievable changes, produce real projects to improve teaching, and for publication, receive ongoing feedback, and learn a framework accessible instruction using UDL principles” (p. 119). The articles situate faculty

familiarity and use of teaching innovations as the products gained from participation in the faculty learning communities, and describe such groups as the method to realize their purposes.

The authors characterize the development of collegiality as a process and central aspect of faculty learning communities. Facilitators sought to develop collegiality through the validation of participants' perspectives about student learning and at the same time challenged them to learn new ideas; they encouraged participants to "discuss issues and questions about teaching openly and in confidence" (Furco & Moley, 2012, p. 133). The facilitators tried to develop collegiality through the encouragement of dynamic communication, which is a process that happens more easily when participants feel they are part of so called "safe" and "supportive" environments. While Friedman et al. (2010) do not write explicitly about the generation of such an environment, they provide a specific example of how the group initially worked together to collectively define inquiry-based learning in order to create what could be described as a supportive environment. One of the first activities the group of six undertook was a process the authors call "brainwriting." Each person anonymously wrote down a definition of inquiry-based learning on a piece of paper, and the papers were passed around to others who would write comments, edit, and ask questions about each definition. The group then discussed the process and collectively constructed a working definition of an inquiry-based teaching approach. This activity shows how participants sought to create a context where people felt comfortable to share their perspectives.

The authors of the articles point out that the development of collegiality to support learning can be generated in different ways. For example, Ward and Selvester (2012) describe the introduction of meeting norms to encourage "efficient group work to allow the

processes of critique, self-reflection and self-disclosure to take place” that would “facilitate a positive environment in which to take risks” (p. 115). The norms the authors identify include: 1) openness to improvement; 2) trust and respect; 3) a foundation in the knowledge and skills of teaching; 4) willingness to offer and accept supportive and constructive feedback; 5) shared commitment to teaching and learning. Facilitators sought to develop learning contexts in which participants felt respected and comfortable to converse with others so that they could more easily adopt an attitude of learning.

The authors of the articles situate the development of collegiality as part of a process to help faculty participants learn about particular teaching innovations. They seem to suggest that the development of collegiality, to some extent, can be taken for granted. What a product-oriented view of these groups leaves out is acknowledgment of the value of the hard work of the development of collegiality and also the messiness of process—the differences of opinion, the discomfort of learning, and the disjunctures. A relational perspective, on the other hand, accommodates the complexity of process and suggests that people grow from dynamic interactions. The development of collegiality is not a straightforward process but one that requires reflective inquiry and hard work. What product-oriented perspectives of faculty learning communities leave out is the notion that the development of collegiality is an important outcome in and of itself.

### **Re-envisioning Community: A Relational Framing of Dynamic Interaction**

If a relational theoretical framework is used to read the articles about faculty learning communities, then what emerges as valuable shifts when considered from a product-orientation to a processual one. It situates people as interdependent and prioritizes the

cultivation of the quality of interactions between people. Engagement with a relational perspective implies that researchers might value and attend to the development of collegiality as a complex process and outcome too. It recognizes that the development of collegiality requires attention, time, and effort on the part of participants. Such a perspective frames a notion of community as constituted by dynamic interaction. Rather than similarity between people, differences are considered necessary to foster harmonious interactions. Because interactions are considered central to growth from a relational perspective, faculty learning communities could be considered forums for personal cultivation that have the potential to generate an extensive impact beyond particular communities.

#### *Making Time: Encouraging Participant Commitment and Reciprocity*

While the authors of the articles do not situate the development of collegiality as an important outcome, they inadvertently suggest that it does not happen magically or automatically while implying that genuine interactions and the cultivation of reciprocity requires time to develop. For example, while a group may agree to adopt norms for interactions, the continual realization of the norms would require attention and effort. Similarly, while a group may engage in a messy brainstorming process that requests participants share their ideas, the success of such an activity relies on participants' willingness to make an effort to respond to such requests. The cultivation of collegiality requires the adoption of inquiry and open dispositions toward interaction with others. While the authors may overlook the broader implications of the work of the development of collegiality, a relational framework would see this as important and valuable. In other words, the time and effort needed to develop collegiality cannot be taken for granted or assumed. A



relational perspective suggests that collegiality is an ongoing process and outcome that all participants must strive to achieve.

The authors of the articles discuss how the facilitators of the faculty learning communities encouraged a sense of commitment between participants by creating an expectation that interaction required time. The participants needed time together in order to try to develop respectful contexts where they felt they could speak openly about their experiences and ideas. The faculty learning communities included plans for multiple meetings with the expectation that participants would attend as many as their schedules would allow. Ward and Selvester (2012) mention that their faculty learning community met twice a month for an hour and a half. Furco and Moley (2012) set up the expectation that groups would meet for an eight to ten week seminar. Friedman et al. (2010) mentioned their group ended up meeting seven times, mostly in person and twice online. The meetings provided participants with a space to interact with others implying that the development of respect and openness takes time and a level of commitment to cultivate.

The development of reciprocity also contributed to the emergence of collegiality. Ward and Selvester (2012) write, "Building trust and ensuring bonding are critical for a successful FLC. The elements of 'openness', 'trust and respect', 'willingness to help' and 'accepting criticism', when put into practice, require a lot of care on the part of the facilitators" (p. 116). The trust and bonding the authors refer to center on the expectation that participants would mutually share and discuss their ideas. For example, they mention that participants would start their meetings with what they call "critical friends protocol," which invites one faculty member to share her syllabus with others, discuss its objectives, and reflect on its effectiveness. Others would then offer constructive feedback or ask questions with a universal design learning framework in mind. In Friedman et al. (2010), a

sense of reciprocity developed from “elaborate discussions” (p. 767) in which faculty members exchanged ideas about how they would incorporate inquiry-based learning into their specific class plans. In Furco and Moley (2012), group members invited leaders of community organizations to join the meetings and to contribute to discussions about service-learning. This facilitated the strengthening of relationships between learning community members and the civic leaders.

The articles suggest that facilitators and participants developed collegiality through the generation of dynamic conversation characterized by commitment and reciprocity. The structures of the groups emphasized repeat gatherings that sought to create contexts that fostered active discussion about ideas, syllabi, and curriculum. Such a perspective on faculty learning communities provides an indication that a relational notion of the value and hard work of the development of collegiality can be relevant and useful.

### *Thriving Learning Communities Constituted by Dynamic Interaction*

A community, from a relational perspective, necessitates dynamic communication that emerges from differences rather than similarity or agreement between people in order to thrive (Tan, 2003). Such a perspective refuses the possibility that complex interactions can be completely comprehended or quantified. Sor-hoon Tan (2003), like Lynn Fendler (2006), points out that a common criticism of the concept of community is the idea that it assumes similarity between participants. While a sense of belonging might be thought to generate an exclusionary reality that pits groups against each other thereby limiting diversity, Tan argues that a notion that people are interdependent, which suggests that relationships are made possible by communicative signs that emerge from ongoing

interaction, constructs a notion of community that “accommodates diversity without surrendering integrity” (p. 65). In other words, it is differences between people that enrich a community because they foster inquiry and communication.

How might differences between people encourage quality, harmonious, dynamic interaction? To return to thinking about harmony in regard to music, it is to play different notes rather than the same notes that generates harmony. Harmony does not exist as a stable state—it must be continually constructed by playing multiple notes. A relational perspective would situate a notion of community, then, as dynamic interaction that requires difference but also responsiveness between people. Such a processual view of community accommodates the messiness of interaction that includes the trials and attempts to achieve a harmony that is always, like any sought after aim, deferred. Faculty learning communities, then, thrive when participants have varied backgrounds, motivations, experiences, and assumptions because it is these differences that enrich interaction through responsive inquiry.

One way to frame responsive inquiry is as Tan calls it, “cooperative inquiry.” While some flexibility or shared meaning within language is necessary for interaction and communication to occur, a notion of “quality interactions” suggests that a vibrant, thriving community relies on “cooperative inquiry” (Tan, 2003, p. 92). People express this attitude of inquiry through the ability to ask questions openly and to listen to feedback in ways that support communal and personal growth. Such a characterization of cooperative inquiry resonates with the type of supportive contexts that faculty learning communities’ participants and facilitators in the aforementioned articles sought to generate. Collaborative learning, then, is valuable because people learn through active communication with those who have experiences and thoughts that are different from their own. If we return to

consideration of the notion of harmony, then, it becomes something that may come close to emerging when participants fully engage in cooperative inquiry. When people learn through interaction, when they undertake relational personal cultivation, then this openness toward learning influences how they interact and communicate. It influences the relationships they have with those they interact with. Because people are varied in so many ways, then multiple outcomes could be considered valuable. In fact, notions of value may differ for different participants.

### *Relational Personal Cultivation*

A relational orientation suggests that faculty learning communities, which foster dynamic interaction, influence universities more broadly because they are forums in which personal cultivation occurs. Dynamic communication strengthens collegial relationships to the extent that they may generate the possibility for future collaborations. The authors of the articles describe the importance of the cultivation of communication between participants in ways that develop respect. Active communication may create the safety facilitators and participants seek to some extent, and the collegiality the authors describe. Given a relational orientation, a process of personal cultivation that occurs in forums such as faculty learning communities is undertaken through interaction with others in ways that not only benefit a “self,” but, by extension, communities (Ames, 2011, p. 124). Roger Ames (2011) asserts that if relationships are viewed as intrinsic rather than extrinsic to persons, the notion of what he calls “human becoming” involves the consideration of a person as a part of a configuration of relationships. A person grows through dynamic interactions with others. A relational notion of person underscores the idea that, if people who are part of a particular

community undertake processes of personal cultivation that improve the quality of their relationships, the specific communities that constitute them through their interactions flourish in ways that extend to influence their broader social fields. In brief, if persons are constituted by relationships, including those of an institutional community where one works, then participation in learning communities, through shared learning experiences, can strengthen the configuration of relationships that already exist. Learning communities become who we are.

### *Extensive Influence of Personal Cultivation*

How might the undertaking of personal cultivation as part of a learning community have a broader impact? One way the development of collegiality in faculty learning communities influences the broader ethos of institutions is through the creation of potential for future collaborations and enriched interactions beyond the contexts of particular faculty learning communities. For example, the articles about university-affiliated faculty learning communities allude to how the development of collegiality extended beyond the groups. For example, Friedman et al. (2010) imply its importance when they describe how some participants—faculty from the fields of journalism, philosophy, and public health—developed a new course outside the context of the faculty learning community. The collegiality that developed through participation in the faculty learning community, the authors imply, contributed to the collaborative development of a new course that otherwise would not have existed.

Ward and Selvester (2012) note the influence of collegiality when they remark almost in an off-hand way that all the participants responded to their post-faculty learning

community surveys, and muse about why this was the case: “We believe this was due to the collegiality that had grown over the time we worked together” (p. 118). While the authors do not dwell on the remarkable notion that *everyone* responded to their survey, they provide a glimpse of the strength of collegiality to encourage activity outside of the specific context of a faculty learning community in ways that can be unpredictable.

The development of collegiality can also build collegial networks. Ward and Selvester (2012) report a list of faculty responses to a survey question about how participation in a faculty learning community impacted participants’ teaching practices. One faculty response, sandwiched in a list of comments about the chance to practice and learn about technology and particular computer programs, was, “I now have a community of peers to troubleshoot with” (p. 118). While this comment is easy to miss and while the practical aspects of increased familiarity about technology are valuable in their own right, the importance of having a community to “troubleshoot with” beyond the context of the faculty learning community cannot be underestimated. It insinuates the potential for future interaction, which provides another indication of how the development of collegiality generates the context for possibility.

The engagement of a framework of relationality to consider research about faculty learning communities suggests that contemporary scholarship already includes quite a bit of discussion about the development of collegiality that could conceivably warrant more value than it receives situated as a method. The development of collegiality could be considered an important outcome in and of itself not only because it is necessary for the realization of the articulated research goals but also because it may influence the contexts of participants’ institutions beyond what may be imagined by a person at any particular moment. The strengthening of collegial relationships, in other words, can have an impact that extends

beyond the scope of particular faculty learning communities and contribute to the development of, for example, collegial networks and new collaborative projects.

### **Multiple Forms of Faculty Learning Communities**

While publications make university-affiliated faculty learning communities more visible, there are many more communities that do not get such researcher attention. To engage a relational framework to read faculty learning communities suggests a necessary shift in focus that challenges educators to reconsider the value of different types of learning communities. If the development of collegiality is an important process and outcome of learning communities, then it is important to consider that varied forms of such communities can reflect this focus. More broadly, faculty learning communities can provide a context for faculty to strengthen their relationships with colleagues through shared learning experiences in order to reflect on varied issues of professional interest. For example, new faculty may seek to join or create groups in order to gain support and advice in regard to the preparation of tenure applications (Cox, 2004). Participants of independent, informal, and hybrid communities may have some university affiliation or none at all. While they may be employed at the same institution, the learning communities they create are varied and flexible in terms of their structures, purposes, and time frames. In order to provide some notion of the range of faculty learning communities that can exist at an institution, I provide some examples from the university of which I am a student. I learned about them in various ways, some through email lists, and others through word-of-mouth. I find that while aspects of some conversations that emerge in such varied groups may seem peripheral from a product-oriented view, they can be situated as valuable to particular people from a relational

one. Relationality humanizes educational institutions by reminding that interactions are complex and unpredictable.

Faculty learning communities often exist beneath a university administration's radar—one may not be able to locate a comprehensive list of such groups at a chancellor's office—in part because they are viewed as support for faculty development, which is thought largely unnecessary by institutions (Ritter, 2011). While tenure and promotion requirements show universities' expectations that instructional faculty should be skilled teachers, there is little acknowledgement by universities of their role to support the development of teaching ability, among other aspects of support that they could offer. As a result, varied types of faculty learning communities often elude institutional notice. Yet, despite the fact that instructional faculty often have packed schedules that reflect institutional expectations to conduct research, teach, and participate in service activities, these voluntary groups continue to emerge and persist.

While learning communities may differ in regard to their time frames, purposes, and structures, they generate contexts for faculty to address particular issues and questions through an interest to learn together and to offer mutual support. Because these voluntary groups continue to emerge and persist in various ways, consideration of the value of faculty learning communities more broadly as a phenomenon within higher educational institutions is important. A shift in engagement of a theoretical framework from a neoliberal to a relational one suggests that faculty learning communities cannot be relegated as peripheral in universities but are of critical importance precisely because they are forums for the development of collegiality that can have an extensive influence on universities' ethos. The collegial relationships enriched in these groups may have an impact in some capacity



beyond group structures and may contribute to the shape of a university in ways that are difficult to track or characterize in a comprehensive and systematic way.

The university-affiliated learning communities tend to be the most visible because of their connection with an institution. They include university-sponsored events and initiatives, such as teaching and learning centers, administration organized initiatives, and grant-supported groups as detailed in the scholarship discussed earlier. But even among these, there are varied levels of affiliation. One commonly identified university-affiliated faculty learning community on the campus where I am a student is the Center for Teaching Excellence. It has two full-time staff members and regularly sends invitations via email to the university community to attend various workshops on teaching-related topics such as the facilitation of discussions and the development of syllabi. The Center receives funding from the vice-chancellor's office, but the amount has varied over the decades due to the office's resources and priorities. The director mentioned the Center began in 1987 with institutional support but the financial support was reduced in a mid-90s budget cut, and has varied since then. The director said the Center has quite a bit of autonomy although it regularly reports to the vice-chancellor's office about how many people attend its various programs.

The workshop model generally includes a panel discussion for an hour and a half that includes up to four guest speakers who make short presentations and then respond to attendee questions. The Center also offers some more sustained programs. For example, one initiative called a "teaching exchange" pairs up faculty members from different departments and invites them to observe each other's classrooms, and then gather at the Center afterward to discuss the experience.

The director suggests that the Center is an important place on campus for faculty to learn more about teaching outside of disciplinary departments. Not only does it offer faculty a modicum of privacy because of its interdisciplinary nature, it provides forums for faculty to learn from each other. Faculty members volunteer to be workshop panelists because they are motivated to share what they've learned after they attend a workshop. Sometimes faculty members are invited to be panelists by the center staff that encounters their classrooms when they conduct voluntary mid-term evaluations at the request of the faculty members.

Another form of university-affiliated faculty learning community includes groups created by those at the departmental level to support the development of the craft of teaching. For example, the Department of English organizes voluntary monthly roundtables for their instructors to attend throughout each semester where they can discuss any classroom issues that emerge or explore ideas about teaching. This support complements the formal preparation of composition instructors who are required to take a class on pedagogical theory and also apprentice with a senior instructor before they teach their first course. The chair views teaching as integral to the discipline and thus actively seeks to develop different ways to support faculty in regard to the development of the craft of teaching through reliance on both formal classes and informal groups as well as mentorship.

Scholars distinguish "independent" faculty learning communities from university-affiliated ones in that they tend to be more informal (Glowacki-Dudka & Brown, 2008). They include gatherings where conversations about teaching and learning occur in ways that are unstructured and not directly affiliated with an institution, such as discussions over coffee or between colleagues who travel to a conference. Independent faculty learning communities

also include informal groups that meet more than once or twice for varied purposes. Word about them often spreads informally. While participants may be part of the same institution, the groups are not considered a formal part of an institutional structure in part because they do not receive direct institutional funding to establish or sustain them. Such groups emerge as innovative and critical spaces because participants generate group structures and practices that align with their interests. They may take the forms of reading, collaborative research, and teaching groups, among others, and not have any formal or designated leaders/facilitators. They emerge because faculty feel compelled to address what they see as particular questions or interests through actively seeking to gather with others who have similar preoccupations.

From an email list-serve, I learned about a book group within the College of Education that some faculty members from different departments initiated. One of the participants told me the group of seven or eight met once a month for two semesters around lunchtime. They read books ahead of their meeting time and came together to casually discuss them, a format fashioned after one of the participant's experiences as part of another book club. One participant created a shared online document where group members could make suggestions about books for the group to read. Participation in the group gave the person I spoke with a chance to connect with people in the College that she knew by face for years but whom she had not interacted with. Even after the reading group ended, the collegial relationships initiated during the reading group continued. She mentioned that she was also part of a dissertation writing-group composed of instructional faculty members who were also doctoral students. They found the expectation to meet regularly a motivation to write. They felt accountable to others in the group and met once a week mostly on weekend mornings to write together.

Some groups emerged as a hybrid of university-affiliated and independent faculty learning communities. These started out as independent groups but after they gained university administrators' attention, became partially institutionalized. I learned about an interdisciplinary faculty seminar from a college-wide email that invited new faculty to apply to participate in the year-long program. Initiated by a law professor who saw a need to support new underrepresented faculty to succeed, the seminar, which is just over five years old, includes up to ten faculty members each year who meet for three hours every other week to share their research.

The interdisciplinary seminar sought to help new faculty with the publication process in a supportive way. Participants would meet with the director in person before making a presentation of their research to the group. They shared copies of their research papers with group members before their presentations. All participants were then asked to provide written feedback on the papers. The group met in the facilitator's home to discuss the articles over dinner. While it started out as an informal program, the professor recently received a course release for the facilitation of the seminar that gives the group a sort of hybrid status where it functions as part of the university but also operates outside of it.

While I have mentioned some communities that I have come across at the institution I attend, there may be many more such groups that appear and disappear, some of which may be known only to those who participate in them. If we consider the development of collegiality as a critical method and outcome of such groups, then we can see that the range of faculty learning communities at a university can be quite physically extensive. Even those groups that do not garner much university-level or researcher attention may be just as important as those that do. They also may be more pervasive and varied than administrators realize. I would also like to point out that while seeking to develop collegiality

is a key aspect of these groups, it is not necessarily a given. But the fact that participation is voluntary contributes to an interest in seeking to develop it. While people may have different motivations and expectations in regard to why they may choose to participate in particular groups, they do so because they may feel they can learn something. To participate with an open attitude toward learning likely impacts the quality of conversations and interactions.

### *No Periphery*

Perhaps because I spoke with representatives of these learning communities or participants from the groups, and have not pursued comprehensive research about them for example by talking to multiple participants, which might offer an intriguing and relevant avenue for future research, what I have left out of these descriptions of faculty learning communities are details about the complexity of the interactions between participants. For example, I have not comprehensively investigated how the voluntary nature of these groups influences participants' attitudes toward interactions as part of learning communities. While I have not delved into the particular contexts of the interactions, I did get some indication of the value of the dynamic conversations that emerged. While a researcher or outsider might consider some conversations to be messy or off-topic, a relational perspective suggests that what might seem tangential could be considered valuable to particular participants. It is these robust and wide-ranging conversations that contribute to the development of collegiality.

The dynamic communication that generates the development of collegiality may also include discussion about issues that might seem from a product-orientation external to the purposes of the groups. For example, the facilitator of the interdisciplinary faculty seminar

stated that while the purpose of their gathering was largely to discuss research papers, he noticed that people also spoke about a variety of issues including teaching, raising children, personal and partner relationships, and the examination of departmental cultures, among others. Participants openly shared their questions and general concerns about the production of scholarly work and their experiences as new faculty without worry that what they said would influence their tenure applications. They also felt comfortable enough to discuss their personal lives to some extent.

Similarly, a participant in the book club I mentioned earlier expressed surprise at how conversations that occurred during the book group gathering went beyond the scope of the book under discussion to include conversations about teacher candidates, coursework, and personal experiences within their college. She liked how the conversation “just flowed,” she said. She described the book group as having lots of flexibility and participation as feeling quite natural. While such conversations might seem peripheral to the purposes of gathering, they could also be situated as another aspect that contributes to the development of collegiality and emerges as a related outcome. Rather than tangential, these conversations may in fact be quite valuable especially to those whom the issues are most relevant.

A product-orientated approach to consider the groups for research purposes might involve the posing of research questions that focus on whether the initial intentions of the groups have been achieved. For example, did those who participated in the faculty seminar end up publishing the papers they presented to the group? How did participation in the seminar influence their development as new faculty members? What a relational framework does is to broaden this focus. A relational framework, instead, engages the question of “what else emerges from interaction and what does it mean and for whom?” Because it

suggests that the process of development of collegial relationships is primary, it does not try to limit or fix a perception of the value of outcomes. Conversations about teaching may be perceived as off-topic in a book group from a researcher's perspective, but because they emerge and might have some direct influence on some to make changes to their syllabi or approach to teaching in different ways, they may be considered quite valuable to some participants. Insights about long-distance relationships that emerge in conversation as part of the interdisciplinary faculty seminar might have an inadvertent yet real impact on some people and their partners' lives. A notion of value, from the perspective of a relational framework, cannot be determined in an objective or completely generalizable way, but rather must necessarily be contextualized and specific.

### **The Extensive Value of Faculty Learning Communities**

The use of a concept of relationality to consider faculty learning communities implies that the cultivation of relationships is a valuable achievement in and of itself. To suggest that the cultivation of collegiality is not only a process to achieve particular goals but also an outcome may seem like a minor distinction, but it has sharp ramifications for what some educators and researchers value. A relational framework assists in a reevaluation of the processes of the development of collegiality described in faculty learning communities' research in ways that suggest the extensive influence, actual and potential, of such groups in higher educational institutional contexts.

A concept of communities of practice is a limited theoretical framework to consider faculty learning communities because it frames practices as directly related to products in a way that narrows a notion of the types of products that are envisioned as valuable.

Research articles about university-affiliated faculty learning communities reflect this product-oriented approach when they situate the development of collegiality as a process rather than an outcome. While they make a strong and important case for the value of such groups to encourage faculty to learn about teaching innovations, what they overlook is that multiple outcomes that emerge from participation in faculty learning communities could be considered valuable.

A relational framework, on the other hand, which suggests that the quality of interactions is of primary importance, situates faculty learning communities as forums that encourage dynamic communication. It acknowledges the time and effort to generate collegiality and re-envision a notion of a thriving community as constituted by responsive and inquiry-focused interactions generated by the differences between people. From a relational view, learning communities are forums for personal cultivation that can have an extensive impact on university communities because they generate the collegiality that may foster future collaborations and continued interactions.

While informal faculty learning communities may not attract much researcher focus, from a relational framework, they are valuable. Departmental forums set up to support their instructors, teaching center offerings, faculty research seminars, and book clubs, among others, that may emerge and disappear without much institutional notice, often strive to foster collegiality. While conversations may be wide-ranging and seem to an outsider to at times veer off-topic or seem peripheral, they can nonetheless be important to particular participants in unpredictable ways. A relational framework suggests that if we are constituted by our interactions, and if it is through interaction that we grow, then learning communities become who we are. Because the communities value the cultivation of relationships, they enrich us as people and the educational institutions that we are a part of.



Who knows what might emerge from those engaging and ongoing conversations initially fostered through participation in a book club or other learning community, which can extend beyond the contexts of those groups? When notions of value are loosened from the grip of a product-oriented perspective, then the value of those aspects of faculty learning communities that may be difficult to measure or seem peripheral to the articulated purposes of a group could be perceived more flexibly and contextually. A concept of relationality reinforces the notion that determinations of value are always partial and so must be temporally and spatially located. What might seem off-topic to some could have impacts on others in ways that researchers or other participants may not be aware. A relational framework challenges educators and researchers to see how extensive faculty learning communities are in institutions and consider the possibility that they may have impacts in ways that are unimagined and unpredictable. A product-orientation that ties a notion of value to specific outcomes can dehumanize participants in an educational system because it regards people and what they do in limited, economic terms. Relationality, on the other hand, humanizes educational systems because it insinuates that relation is of foremost value even if interactions cannot be completely characterized or understood in fixed ways. It situates people as part of a processual world of possibility.

## CHAPTER 6

### A TURN TO PARADOX IN THE CLASSROOM

A relational framework can be a useful resource to consider the relevance of reflective pedagogical research to support the development of teaching at universities. A relational perspective suggests that work by educators such as Elizabeth Ellsworth who examines the complexity of the classroom space and the relationships between its participants is broadly relevant to instructional faculty of numerous disciplines rather than positioned as mainly part of the purview of education and cultural studies departments. Though Ellsworth does not seek to frame her work specifically from a relational perspective, I suggest it envisions personal cultivation as necessarily relational and extensive. More broadly, a relational framework can function in juxtaposition to contemporary theoretical frameworks in complementary and also challenging ways.

Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989/2013) published a seminal critique of practices from the field of critical pedagogy in her essay, “Why doesn’t this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy.” In the essay, Ellsworth wrote about how she noticed that her efforts to encourage students to speak openly in a curriculum and instruction course she called “Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies” backfired. While she tried to construct the classroom space as a safe one to encourage students to speak with power and with equal opportunity, she found that students did not perceive this to be the case. By observing student responses to her teaching, Ellsworth offers an insightful critique of her pedagogical approach.<sup>14</sup> While a neoliberal framework may overlook the value of qualitative

---

<sup>14</sup> Roger Ames suggests that Ellsworth’s critical approach to pedagogy reflects what he calls a “provisional take on practice,” which underscores the need to adjust and refine

work by educators such as Ellsworth, who strive to become more responsive teachers through theorization about the complexities of their classroom experiences, a relational orientation foregrounds it.

If our roles and relationships constitute who we are and inform what we do, then, for faculty members, the classroom is also a potential forum for learning through relational personal cultivation. For those who strive to be exemplary, teaching and learning are not separate endeavors but one in the same (Ames, 2016). A faculty member, then, is always learning and one who strives to be exemplary could be positioned as Ames says, “the most advanced learner in the classroom.” From a relational perspective, faculty members who choose to do the hard work of personal cultivation undertake a process that impacts not only those they interact with but also extends to influence the constructs of the university institution of which they are a part in unpredictable ways.

Ellsworth engages a process of personal cultivation from a relational perspective because she seriously attended to her students’ responses to her pedagogical approaches, an action from which her critiques of the practices of critical pedagogy stemmed. She sought to develop a stronger reciprocal relationship with her students through reflective inquiry about their attempts to communicate. In the essay, Ellsworth (1989/2013) discusses how some authors assume that rational deliberation can be used to confront and redress racism to some extent, among other injustices, through empowering students to identify and name oppressions. But she says that theorists of critical pedagogy (she cites Giroux and McLaren (1986); Liston and Zeichner (1987); Shor and Friere (1987)) have not rigorously

---

theoretical structures in relation to the specifics of practice. In particular, he suggests her critique embodies *zhixing heyi* 知行合一 (“authentication in practice”) and expresses Wang Yangming’s notion of the reciprocity between wisdom and practice—wisdom begins practice and practice manifests wisdom (personal communication, December 28, 2016).

analyzed the implications of the imbalance of power between students and teachers, which tend to assume that teachers can use their authority to empower students. They imply that teachers can, through provision of the tools of rational debate and sharing what they call “subjugated histories,” create an equitable classroom space that seeks to “emancipate” students even when, from her perspective, this is impossible for them to do. The notion that teachers can empower students through encouragement to speak their experiences and thoughts in the classroom situates teachers, she argues, as “voyeuristic” of students because it leaves teachers’ own positions, voices, and privileges uninvestigated. In other words, teachers may overlook the partialness of their own knowing and how their agendas can be oppressive to others.

From her teaching experience, Ellsworth (1989/2013) notices that her efforts to encourage students to speak and develop their voices for the purposes of empowerment ended up instead being oppressive and that she and her students became what she calls “vehicles of repression.” She finds that the use of the language of critical pedagogy such as “empowerment” and “dialogue” proved to be “repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination” (p. 188). Rather than feel emboldened to speak, she found that people in her class did not always voice their thoughts because they felt that if they did, they might be misunderstood, say too much, or feel vulnerable, among other reasons.

Not only did Ellsworth notice how her students reacted, she sought to learn more about why there was a gap between her pedagogical intentions and the student reactions and how this inquiry could refine her pedagogical approaches. In the essay, she suggests that the abstract use of the language of critical methods without historical context and acknowledgement of particular political positions can be problematic. In other words, she implies that the content of what one teaches and how it is taught cannot be separate. The

way something is taught in part constitutes the “what” that is taught. To further complicate things, she points out that the validity of people’s narratives or as she says it, “words spoken for survival” or as “a reality check for survival” (p. 191), cannot be responded to as part of a rationalist debate. While such narratives and their implications can be “made problematic” (p. 194), classroom discussion is complicated by the fact that people’s views are always partial and subjective. As a result, people do have particular interests and agendas that may impinge on others’ perspectives despite the interest of those involved to create a safe space for equitable dialogue.

Rather than overlook the fact that she cannot realize her intentions to create a safe classroom space, Ellsworth acknowledges it and adapts her pedagogical approach. Even though she was in a position to facilitate the class as she wished, she changed her class plan in order to be responsive to her students’ inclinations to speak more freely with each other in naturally formed groups outside of class. Ellsworth posits that larger injustices at play in the culture make communication difficult in the classroom: “Educational researchers attempting to construct meaningful discourses about the politics of classroom practices must begin to theorize the consequences for education on the ways in which knowledge, power, and desire are mutually implicated in each other’s formations and deployments” (p. 204). She suggests that in order to become aware of one’s own assumptions and agendas, effort must be made to become familiar with others, which includes inquiry about what is at stake for them in their lives, their histories, and motivations. In her own class, she finds that this was in part made possible through the natural development of what she calls “affinity groups” that resulted from student interactions outside of class. She noticed that these informally formed groups became the building ground for coalition among various groups inside the classroom. She welcomed these formations in her class and encouraged

students to work on collaborative class projects. In this way, her classroom practices and expectations were responsive to her students' reactions to her pedagogical intentions and approaches. In other words, she sought to develop respect and reciprocity with her students.

Ellsworth's willingness to relentlessly question her intentions and assumptions and then change how she interacted with her students could be described, from my perspective, as a process of personal cultivation that has an extensive impact. While Ellsworth sought to understand her students' assumptions and agendas, she, at the same time, tried to destabilize her own. Through attention to the student responses to her pedagogical approaches, she turned her focus to situating herself as one who was partial and whose agendas could be oppressive to others. If we see people as interdependent and networked as part of a broader field, then the personal cultivation Ellsworth undertook in the classroom could have a broader influence. For one, it impacted the students in her class. For faculty who continually strive to become better teachers through being responsive to students and through inquiry into their own pedagogical assumptions, they also model for their students what a process of personal cultivation looks like. Students learn not simply from what faculty members may deliberately articulate or intend to convey but from how they act and what they do. More broadly, Ellsworth's pedagogical inquiries may have influenced her colleagues. In the essay, she mentions that she shared her syllabus with colleagues she felt were like-minded. Discussions she may have had with them about her class experiences may have influenced them to consider the content of their curriculum and their pedagogical approaches, and their conversations with other faculty members. Also, because Ellsworth wrote about her experience and published the essay, her inquiries continue to influence others in ways it would be difficult to trace. The point here is not to suggest that the impact

needs to be traced, but rather to consider the fact that it may be extensive and unpredictable.

Since the publication of the essay, Ellsworth continued to dwell on the gap she noticed between what she intends to teach and what students hear and how they respond. In a book Ellsworth (1997) published eight years later titled, *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*, she continued to theorize about how and why critical pedagogy may miss its intended mark by drawing on, in part, media studies. In particular, she suggests that because classroom participants, students and teachers, are always partial, the difference between them is not of knowledge (which she calls a “structural dynamic”) or authority, but “a difference of *location* within the pedagogical structure of address that takes place between student and teacher” (p. 62). She argues that it is the relationship, a “structure of address,” that teaches. This idea resonates with a relational framework from numerous aspects. I discuss them next in part because I think it is important to consider not only that a relational framework can call attention to the importance of supporting those aspects of contemporary higher education systems related to teaching, but also to consider how a relational framework may be expressed in such a context.

### **A Relational Approach to Situate Pedagogy**

Ellsworth came to educational studies as an assistant professor in the 1980s after completion of her graduate work in film studies. She endeavored to use a humanities research approach to explore her theorizations about pedagogy in part through intensive reflective inquiry about her own teaching. Ellsworth (1997) writes that she hoped that educational research, a field largely dominated by social science approaches, if undertaken

with a humanities perspective could “change—unfix—our theorizing and practice as educators” (p. 11). Now a professor of Media Studies at The New School, her more recent research and work involves the exploration of public pedagogy and aesthetic experience in part through media arts collaborations. While her own professional trajectory has shifted, she continues to strive to inquire about the complexities of pedagogy through her own teaching practice and research.

I consider how aspects of her 1997 work resonate with a framework of relationality. I dwell on this not simply to show that a relational framework is relevant to highlight the value of existing aspects of contemporary higher educational institutions that foreground the cultivation of relationships, but to also suggest that the framework’s relevance is manifest through interpretation, translation, and reading of contemporary educational phenomena. In other words, to use a relational framework to consider Ellsworth’s construction of pedagogy provides an opportunity to consider a nuanced interpretation of the framework in relation to contemporary contexts.

A framework of relationality resonates with Ellsworth’s 1997 work in numerous aspects. She situates pedagogy from a processual orientation when she argues that pedagogy is always performative because it involves continual attempts to communicate through what she calls “modes of address.” Because modes of address can have unpredictable outcomes—in other words, there is no guarantee that a speaker’s intended meaning will be heard by another in the same way at any particular moment—she suggests that faculty members should embrace the impossibility of teaching. If teaching is not viewed reductively as a transmission of information through direct communication, then what she calls a “return of difference” in regard to communication can be seen as an opportunity to



reflect on one's own assumptions or to generate new modes of address.<sup>15</sup> A "return of difference" from my understanding is that there may be dissonance between a speaker's intention and a hearer's understanding. This difference, rather than a problem, could be situated as an opportunity for inquiry and learning. From this perspective, faculty inquiry about pedagogical approaches and assumptions is an opportunity for relational personal cultivation. For example, she takes as her broader project the challenge to as she calls it, "unlearn" her positions of privilege in a relational way as she seeks to complicate normative notions of pedagogy: "I am trying to unsettle received definitions of pedagogy by multiplying the ways in which I am able to act on and in the university both as the Inappropriate/d Other and as the privileged speaking/making subject trying to unlearn that privilege" (Ellsworth, 1989/2013, p. 210). Rather than make assumptions about what one is supposed to know and do, or one's position to others, a pedagogical emphasis may be more productive if it is focused on being responsive to others, not in abstract or predictable ways, but specifically, contextually, and complexly. Disjuncture can destabilize notions of roles in the classroom and university through the implication that people's positionalities are not fixed or essential but necessarily relational.

### *A Processual Orientation*

Ellsworth (1997) suggests that it can be useful to situate pedagogy as performative and processual, both aspects of relationality. She argues that a "mode of address" informs

---

<sup>15</sup> Roger Ames commented that when we consider what a relationship means or what it means to relate to someone, one useful response in the "parlance of Ellsworth" is that it reflects the interaction between different modes of address—to relate to means to "give an account of" in conversation (personal communication, December 28, 2016).

all pedagogy. This concept, which emerges from film and media studies, suggests that how people convey a story is influenced by whom they imagine their audience to be. Similarly, in a classroom, the assumptions teachers may have about their students impact how they converse with them. Ellsworth asks, “How do teachers make a difference in power, knowledge, and desire, not only by *what* they teach, but by *how* they *address* students?” (p. 8). She argues that what matters in classrooms is not only what is taught, but how it is taught. Although pedagogical modes of address in curriculum and practice can be difficult to trace, they exist in the form and expression of a powerful intention to shape another’s experiences, responses, and even identity. But because those who teach cannot control what students hear, this insinuates that pedagogy is always performative and an event that is ongoing. It is constantly enacted.

Pedagogy is performative in part because it is always social. Ellsworth describes pedagogy as an intensive “social relationship” (p. 6): “It gets right in there—in your brain, your body, your heart, in your sense of self, of the world, of others, and of possibilities and impossibilities in all those realms” (p. 6). It reflects social positions in a tangled, nonlinear, and not always visible way. Our relationships are constructed in part not only by what we say but our expectations of how others will respond. As a result, pedagogy is performative because what happens in the classroom is always what she calls “inaugural.” Teachers cannot control how and what their students hear, so the impact of their teaching practice can be unpredictable.

Our “practices of everyday life” are inaugural, they are not re-presentations of already achieved and decided Truths. Our improvisations are performative, they are culture-in-the-making. All the pre-given norms and prescriptions called up by the question, How will you respond are both enacted *and reworked* in my response.

There is a performative aspect to any response I give, and that prevents my response from being an answer, from being settled. (p. 137)

For Ellsworth, the performativity of pedagogy is implicitly and intrinsically relational and ongoing. It is meaning-making in process.

The activity of “pedagogy-izing,” then, cannot be neutral. I believe she suggests that while it is informed by intentions, expectations, assumptions, and desires, it is always in a state of becoming something that cannot really ever be realized in any sort of fixed or final way. While those who teach may try to shape what they teach for a particular audience, the reality is that it is impossible to completely know their students or themselves. She writes, “I never ‘am’ the ‘who’ that a pedagogical address thinks I am. But then again, I never am the who that I think I am either” (p. 8). She suggests that all participants communicate from partial perspectives. For example, if one says to students in a class that Ellsworth believes pedagogy is performative, the speaker cannot control how someone in the class hears what is said or how others envision the notion of teaching or of performativity. People’s experiences and beliefs may inform what and how they hear in unpredictable ways. Ellsworth points out that “pedagogy is much messier and a more inconclusive affair than the vast majority of our educational theories and practices make it out to be” (p. 8). In fact, she suggests that the relationship between teacher and student is a paradox that is impossible to resolve, in part because the outcomes of our modes of address can be unpredictable. Even when pedagogy is perceived to be successful, it is not necessarily replicable because it “is unpredictable and cannot be copied, sold, or exchanged—it’s ‘worthless’ to the economy of educational accountability” (p. 17). Pedagogy cannot be fixed because it involves interactions between people. Because the impact of modes of addresses can be impossible to control there is always the potential for disjuncture between what is said or

heard perhaps due to differing expectations, perspectives, and experiences of those in a classroom even during what might be considered normative “successful” communication.

Ellsworth situates pedagogy as an event that emerges from interaction rather than “a representation of something else ‘over there’” (p. 16). The activity of attempted communication that emerges from classroom contexts, then, will always be processual because it is relational.

### *Ellsworth’s Case for Analytic Dialogue*

Ellsworth’s (1997) discussion of the difference between communicative and analytic dialogue resonates with a concept of relationality, which suggests that communication thrives on difference rather than similarity. What does normative “successful” communication look like in the classroom? Educators often use what Ellsworth calls “communicative dialogue” as a way to foster learning where what she calls “absolute representation” is a goal. When one person speaks to another, it is assumed that the words used should directly convey a particular idea to another. The listener who is perceived to hear the speaker’s “conscious intention,” is viewed as successful whereas any misunderstanding has a negative inflection. “Analytic dialogue,” she says, differs because it does not assume or expect complete understanding, but instead foregrounds the question, “How will I respond?” (p. 136). To situate dialogue in this way suggests that dissonance in a conversation has the potential to generate richness in communication and relationship.

Ellsworth points out that critical pedagogists often rely on the use of dialogue to teach. Dialogue is given practically a mystical role in educational settings because it is assumed to be capable of everything from “construction of knowledge, to solving problems,

to ensuring democracy, to constituting collaboration..." (p. 49). But it is also a process and practice that has emerged from particular social, historical, and political constructs influenced by networks of power, knowledge, and desire. Without consideration of the modes of address, which are influenced by culture and power that inform dialogue, Ellsworth warns that it is difficult to see limitations of the dialogical process: "What can't be subverted by the dialogical process is communicative dialogue itself. What can't be subverted by dialectical thinking is dialectical thinking itself" (pp. 147-148). In other words, she suggests there is an unquestioned assumption that the dialogical process can be used, for example, toward a liberatory endpoint.

This view of the dialogical process is reinforced by what she calls "communicative dialogue," a process in which the speaker expects to achieve conscious reflective understanding in the listener—"did you get it?"—before the listener can respond to a speaker's views. With communicative dialogue, there is an assumption that views can differ only once there is mutual rational understanding. The structure of the address of communicative dialogue strives to generate a sense of cohesiveness, which ideally allows for people to consciously reflect together by sharing their thoughts. This sharing then encourages participants to broaden or change their perspectives by adding on to each other's perspectives. This results in what she calls a "mirrored" understanding that is "repetitive." The structure of communicative dialogue suggests that any difference can be referenced consciously, and it is this structure, Ellsworth argues, that intends to keep out "the unmeant, the unknowable, the excessive, the irrational, the unspeakable, the unheard, the forgotten, the ignored, the despised" (p. 95). It is a structure and expectation that attempts to fix perspectives and implies that people can fully understand others' perspectives.

But, Ellsworth asks, what if a listener does not understand the conscious intention of a speaker? How can communicative dialogue be transformative if it is restricted by conscious discourse? She points out that the expectation that everyone in a class should participate in a dialogue that expects mutual understanding before the offering of different views is coercive because it requires participation. One who does not understand is excluded and viewed as a disruption of the continuity of a dialogue through the breaking of the “rules of reciprocity, commitment, and participation—the rules of continuity” (p. 108).

Ellsworth provocatively suggests that teaching is impossible especially if one understands it as a matter of transmission of information because faculty cannot know how their students understand or perceive what they say. The fact is that an instructor’s modes of address will misfire. Rather than overlook the implications that students may not understand a teacher’s conscious intention, faculty should instead acknowledge, even embrace this possibility. The recognition of the impossibility of teaching generates possibility because it creates an opportunity for the development of multiple and creative modes of address: “Instead of trying to manage and control a relation that is uncontrollable, we might ask, What might we learn from ways of teaching that are predicated, paradoxically, on the impossibility of teaching?” (p. 9). If faculty see teaching as a “paradoxical relation” (p. 16), it allows teaching to happen because the working through of paradox can be generative in that it turns up constructive and creative responses that can encourage one to question one’s own assumptions and practices. Such a view of teaching also contributes to the richness of interaction and relationships in the classroom because it encourages participants to be increasingly attentive and responsive to dialogue and its complexity.

Ellsworth posits that “analytic dialogue” may be a more useful construct to envision communication in classrooms because it does not assume or expect complete understanding, but instead foregrounds the question, “How will I respond?” (p. 136). Such a relational view of communication provides a way for participants to interact that allows for numerous responses and differences; it opens instead of shuts down or excludes because it takes as an assumption that “we are both empowered and condemned to meaning-making. We cannot *not* communicate. We cannot *not* respond to the events and stories that in-form us. Even not responding is a response—it has its consequences for myself and for others” (p. 136). “How will I respond?” is a question not threatened by disruption or performativity because it “insists on the consequences of difference” (p. 137). Here by difference, I think she means that modes of address can be received in varied and unpredictable ways. To ask “how will I respond?” allows for multiple understandings because it is a question that does not assume a shared agreement of what has been said. It suggests that even if one does not hear something said in the way a speaker intended, one can still engage in numerous and constructive ways because it encourages one to inquire about one or another’s assumptions and responses. Roger Ames suggests that a notion of “conversation” would be a better term than “analytic dialogue” for the type of “give and take” that Ellsworth describes (personal communication, December 28, 2016). People in conversation do not assume specific responses, while the terms “analysis” and “dialogue” assume a kind of endpoint or certainty. A conception of conversation suggests that classroom participants can move away from the expectations of communicative dialogue in order to create a different structure of relations that may foreground those aspects that were overlooked in order to maintain “dialogue’s illusion of understanding...” (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 109). To focus on the question, “How will I respond?” insinuates to some extent the notion

that people are interdependent. It implies that how we think is constructed through interactions and relationships with others.

The focus on the responses to a question is not threatened by discontinuity because, within the context of a conversation, learning happens when assumptions have been questioned and initial thoughts have changed: “it happens when ‘self-reflection’ describes an ellipse, rather than a circle” (p. 147). Learning occurs not when notions of knowledge are transmitted from one person to another but when the questions asked become displaced by responses that may be unexpected and disrupt the initial context/thoughts from which the questions emerged. In other words, to seek answers to questions generates a return or response that shakes up the points of observation that initially informed the questions.

Ellsworth orients the activity of this type of open communication and learning within a classroom as necessarily relational because the focus on the responses to questions implies interactions and interdependence between people. It is from the return of differences in response to questions that people learn. This perspective recognizes the complexity of modes of address in the classroom in ways that situate not only students as learning from classroom interactions in unpredictable ways but faculty members too. While she does not directly say this, there is an implication that personal cultivation emerges from interaction because it is through interaction that people learn.

### *Destabilization of Teacher Student Roles*

A notion that roles are not fixed or essential resonates with a relational concept. Engagement with what Ellsworth calls analytic dialogue in the classroom is not relevant simply to what is discussed but also has implications for the positions of participants in the



classroom. Ellsworth suggests that the roles of teachers and students in a class are not fixed, but rather are positionalities. Positionality is a term that suggests that the meaning of aspects of identity, such as gender and race among others, are relationally constructed (Alcoff, 1988). In regard to roles in the classroom, the positions of teacher and student, rather than essential, are interdependent: one would not have meaning without the other. People's positionalities—contexts and particulars—influence how and what we know. If teachers and students always have partial and different knowledges, then they must continually strive to problematize and question their roles within the classroom context.

Acknowledgment of partialness on the part of all participants in the classroom challenges what may be perceived to be a teacher/student binary:

Am I a teacher or a student? Who am I 'as' teacher, who are you as student, what do I do as teacher, what do I want from you as student? The terms teacher and student urge me to choose among the many answers currently circulating and competing for these questions. (Ellsworth, 1997, p. 141)

She suggests that a teacher is both teacher and student, and that students are both students and teachers: "this new concept of the 'teacher-student' must never be constituted as a third (additive) term, because we must continue troubling every definition of teacher-student that is arrived at" (Ellsworth, p. 141). Because teaching is performative, the activity of teaching includes the ongoing cultural production of notions of teaching and learning.

Ellsworth suggests that to destabilize the roles of teacher and student does not privilege notions of student or to position student as teacher but functions to continually ask what it means to teach and what it means to be a student: "Rewriting the teacher-student relation this way means refusing to let the question of the teacher-student relation be settled. It means working in and through the oscillating space of difference between teacher

and student as positions within a structure of relations” (p. 140). In her 2005 book, *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*, Ellsworth elaborates on this notion of movement and relation in regard to pedagogy when she suggests that teaching should be more about, as she frames it, “thinking” rather than “complying.” In particular, she points out that learning is an action that involves bodies, emotions, experiences, place, and time, among others (p. 55). So, speaking and listening are not straightforward processes but involve interactions with what she calls peoples’ “mind/body/brain” systems. She suggests that spaces or events designed to be pedagogical can create contexts to support learning and, although they may not be able to directly make it happen, they can enhance the possibilities. In other words, to teach does not imply that one can directly control how or what another learns, but the intention and activity to teach through one’s approach can influence others’ experiences and increase the possibility of learning in ways that are unpredictable. In other words, to teach is not to impose but to participate in what she calls “interrelation.”

Pedagogical spaces, while they cannot dictate learning, can seek to engage a person in ways that challenge one to reconsider or amend what one thinks one knows. For example, intentionally constructed spaces—Ellsworth provides examples of memorials and museums—try to generate experience through engaging people’s bodies and emotions within a particular time and place. The emphasis here is on attempts to communicate, to construct experiences, without the guarantee that one can do so. To situate teaching as an attempt to address others in a way that can return unpredictable responses implies that the meaning of the roles of student and teacher cannot become fixed because the roles only emerge through action and interactions, through interrelation. Notions that they are or can be fixed are illusory. At the same, it also suggests that while one may not control what and

how someone hears, one can potentially have some influence in regard to a person's experiences.

Disjuncture, then, becomes an occasion for productive inquiry. For Ellsworth, to unsettle meaning in regard to student and teacher roles does not imply that people should give up trying to ask about the meaning of the roles or dismiss the idea of roles all together. Rather, the act of unsettlement that emerges from inquiry serves to be a constant reminder that one should continually inquire about what one thinks one knows. This inquiry will then inform how we interact.

Ellsworth, through the situating of pedagogy as performative, a focus on dialogue as analytic instead of communicative, and the continual destabilization of roles in the classroom, implies that teaching is an occasion for the work of relational personal cultivation, and more broadly, reflects a relational framework. Notions of teacher and student roles suggest a structural relationship that needs to be continually destabilized in part because all knowledges are partial. She positions the classroom as a space in which all participants can learn from each other through interactions because responses to questions may return something unpredictable. Disjunctures between expected responses and actual responses can help participants locate their own assumptions and encourage further inquiry more broadly. To engage difference is to enrich interactions and relationships.

I would like to acknowledge that my discussion of how Ellsworth's work can be read from a relational perspective is limited in that I cannot generalize and say to what extent educators accept her theorizations more broadly. But what I do want to suggest is that her work provides an example of the varied endeavors that prioritize the cultivation of relationships and, from my perspective, provides an example of relational personal cultivation in contemporary educational systems. To read her work with a relational

framework suggests its extensive value to multiple disciplines and to university communities more broadly.

In reading Ellsworth's discussion of pedagogy, the immediacy and relevance of a relational perspective drawn from a Confucian tradition for contemporary educational constructs is clear. Her work provides a language and context that can contribute to an ongoing conversation about what a relational framework means and how it can function in contemporary settings. Her insights about the value of responsive interaction, positionality, analytic dialogue, and particularity, reflect a way to envision and express a processual orientation in regard to classroom contexts and pedagogical approaches. In fact, such an inquiry provides an opportunity to ask about what other aspects of current educational systems situate relationships as primary and engage a processual view of the world. It also provides a chance to ask how a relational framework can be juxtaposed with those contemporary frameworks that currently circulate, and what differences its use might return.

### **The Juxtaposition of Theoretical Frameworks**

While I have discussed how a concept of relationality can be used to frame Ellsworth's theorizations about pedagogy, I want to point out that her work is also situated as feminist, although she does not directly describe her work in this way, and that the frameworks need not be exclusionary. Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2000) describes Ellsworth as a poststructuralist feminist and educator who "is well aware of how language works to both constrain and open up the everyday lived experiences of those working in education" (p. 484). Ellsworth's description of the performativity of pedagogy and the notion of multiple knowledges resonates with feminist concerns and perspectives, and to read her

work with these perspectives situates her ideas as part of a feminist discourse. Rather than suggest that one framework is more adequate than another, I posit that the two can exist as complements that reinforce the importance of Ellsworth's work more broadly especially in an educational system whose administrative practices and strategic directions are dominated by a neoliberal orientation. The juxtaposition of the two frameworks, feminist and relational, can be useful in that it may engage questions about their assumptions and their expressions, which can in turn further inquiry more broadly. While there are numerous resonances between the two frameworks and how they might situate Ellsworth's theorizations about pedagogy, there is a key difference—the extent to which they perceive people to be interdependent.

Engagement with a framework of relationality can complement and also productively challenge other theoretical frameworks that circulate in contemporary higher educational contexts. One useful way to envision how a concept of relationality can function more broadly is to consider it as part of a processual world and to revisit the concept of focus and field constructed by Roger Ames and David Hall (2001). If the world is perceived as an infinite field of interactive processes and events with foci that continually shift and whose own limited perspectives “focus” the field, then, while a framework can dominate an educational institution's function as a focus, it cannot completely exclude the possibility and influence of other frameworks because it is always part of a broader field. For example, the dominating use of a neoliberal framework in an educational system cannot preclude the possibility of the construction of other frameworks that circulate or can emerge at any time. In fact, when a dominant framework is deliberately juxtaposed with others, it may even change as a result of inquiry about its assumptions and nuances. From this perspective, the juxtaposition of a concept of relationality to other frameworks can provoke tensions that are

productive and unpredictable. The activity of inquiry about the tensions of the juxtaposition of foci, like the creation of pathways between neurons in a neural network, can construct more robust connections that influence how the foci function. These provocations, rather than dismissed or reasoned away, can be seen as a chance to illuminate assumptions and to inquire about how specific frameworks might function in particular contexts.

I want to acknowledge that my approach to juxtapose the two frameworks is limited. Hannah Tavares points out one aspect that is missing is discussion about power relations (personal communication, February 9, 2017). I agree and hope that my not delving into a discussion about how the deployment of particular frameworks reflects differing power constructs does not suggest that this is not an important aspect of situating the meaning of these frameworks. That said, I admit that I am approaching the juxtaposition of these frameworks in a more theoretical rather than prescriptive or material sense. The activity of juxtaposition, from my understanding, is that it is a process that centers on the act of reading, which seeks to enrich the contextual field of those concepts being juxtaposed. In particular, to read two texts or concepts next to each other, can destabilize my understanding of them on their own. Mismatch is expected to emerge, and rather than try to resolve this, the point from my perspective is to ask what assumptions juxtaposition makes visible given that it is an activity that seeks to construct meaning from resonances and disjuncture. In other words, it is an artificial and to some extent an arbitrary construct in that I deliberately situate two concepts in conversation in order to enrich their relation. While the discourses of feminism and the Confucianism from which a concept of relationality has been constructed are historically complex, nuanced, and changing, I do not presume that my discussions of them here are comprehensive or even adequate especially when compared to those researchers and educators who specialize in these discourses. I do not suggest

that by choosing these two there are not others deserving of attention. I also do not suggest that by focusing on these two that my discussion of them is any way representative or definitive. In fact, my intention here is to undertake this acknowledged limited activity with an inquiring and experimental perspective in mind, one that seeks to ask and construct what might be possible and made visible by their juxtaposition.

Feminist scholars suggest that feminism, which is a movement that has broadly been described to respond to and resist patriarchal ideology and practices, does not exist as one unitary tradition (Reinharz & Davidman, 1992; Stone, 2013). It continues to have paradigmatic shifts. For example, Black women critiqued early feminists conceptions of sisterhood as exclusive because they foregrounded Caucasian women's experiences through attempts to identify and address patriarchy (Dill, 1983/2013). In particular, Bonnie Dill (1983/2013) explains not only did this universalist orientation overlook issues of race and class, it assumed what she calls a bourgeois goal of personal self-fulfillment that countered Black women's beliefs that group identity intimately shapes personal identity: "Research on kinship patterns among urban Blacks identifies the nurturant and supportive feelings existing among female kin as a key element in family stability and survival" (p. 61).

As a result of numerous critiques of early feminist movements, there has been a shift toward acknowledgement of the differences—experiences, positionalities, perspectives, and others—among people. This shift is reflected by a move away from notions of essentialism toward explorations of the contexts of people's lives and their conceptions of identity in order to empower underrepresented groups, promote social justice, and address oppression. In the epilogue of a book on feminism in education, Lynda Stone (2013) articulates a recent perspective about feminism:

Diversity through particularist feminisms is rightly valued. However particularism in feminism has also resulted in individual authors who need not and often do not identify with a feminist ideology or group. And today, this seems appropriate. The question then remains about feminist activism. The present answer is a localist orientation. This means that theorists take up and refer to specific exemplars in their writings. This means that groups of concerned citizens, feminists and non-feminists, women and men, join together to promote social justice projects that may focus on women and girls or are extensive and inclusive. Everyone can benefit. (p. 471)

A poststructuralist framework reflects this notion of particularist and inclusion-focused feminisms. Poststructuralists examine statements of truth and knowledge from the perspective that power relations have influenced them (St. Pierre, 2000). They believe power and knowledge have a correlative relationship. In other words, truth does not exist as some sort of external object but rather is constructed by power relations within cultural practice: "What can be said? Who can say it?" (p. 496). These questions lead to considerations of the history of particular discursive statements, and the conditions and power relations from which they emerged. In order to trace these statements, poststructuralist feminists often use Foucault's methods of archeology and genealogy to identify patterns of discourse that serve to marginalize women and other groups.

Ellsworth's (1997) discussions of the performativity of pedagogy and how modes of address influence interactions, resonate with a poststructuralist perspective, which operates with assumptions that a word and a thing are not directly correlated. Words do not have essential meanings, but rather, their meaning is derived from their difference or absence from other signs in language: "Meaning is generated through difference rather than through identity" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 481). Meaning is impossible to fix because it is always delayed



and questions of interest focus on how something functions, “How is it produced and what are its effects? (p. 485). The use of language itself is performative:

We word the world. The “way it is” is not “natural.” We have constructed the world as it is through language and cultural practice, and we can also deconstruct and reconstruct it. There are many structures that simply do not exist prior to naming and are not essential or absolute but are created and maintained every day by people. (p. 483).

Ellsworth’s articulation of the differences between communicative and analytic dialogue implies that the communication of conscious intent, like a poststructuralist notion of meaning, is always postponed because a speaker cannot know or control what a listener hears. It is the space of difference that generates further inquiry and learning.

### *Resonances and Differences*

Both relational and feminist frameworks can situate Ellsworth’s work in compelling and similar ways. They are similar in their prioritization of processual orientations and share the notion that all perspectives are partial. For feminists, the continual destabilization of knowledge frameworks situates one in a position of doubt. St. Pierre (2000) says, “the feminist poststructural critique of epistemology is one of ongoing questioning, a skepticism about the relation of women to power, truth, and knowledge – a permanent political critique that has no end” (p. 500). She points out that she does not suggest that all knowledge is as she calls it, unknowable, but rather, it is important to keep in mind that knowledge is partial. This awareness means one must always consider the assumptions of one’s own constructs and beliefs. Skepticism about how meanings and truths are produced especially as derived

from conceptions of rationality and power relations is an important part of the destabilization process. This means that people cannot be afraid to ask questions about their own positionality and assumptions. It also means that it is important to ask questions not simply about definition but of function and response. It insinuates that personal cultivation is hard work.

But the two frameworks differ in a key aspect. While both foreground the importance of relationships and consider people to be interdependent, they differ in regard to extent. A feminist framework seems to be inflected with a notion of a substance-oriented perspective that suggests people are “individuals.” For example, Ellsworth (1997) describes pedagogy as “a performance that is suspended (as in interrupted, never completed) in the space between self and other...between time before learning and after... between prevailing categories and discursive systems of thought” (p. 17). The notion that pedagogy is a suspended performance between two people seems to assume that two people can be separate from each other. She suggests a performance is something people can be a part of or not and that they can leave it as whole persons because they are independent from each other. It insinuates that relationships exist outside of each person, rather than expressing the relational notion that people are necessarily constituted by relationships and so could not exist as independent or separate from others. While her discussion of modes of address and explorations of how pedagogy, specifically communication, can be unpredictable and performative, she does not ask what such ideas imply about how a notion of person or self is situated.

Similarly, while feminist educator Lynda Stone (1988/2013) in her essay, “Toward a transformational theory of teaching” suggests that a relational epistemology is feminist and transformational, she does not consider what this might mean for how a notion of person is

constructed and the extensive impact a process of personal cultivation could have. She suggests that a concept of relationality is a useful epistemological alternative to what she describes as Platonic and Rousseauian educational theories that tend to reflect dualistic beliefs and ways of knowing. It suggests that relation is what she calls “basic,” and potentially transformative because it is located “in the realm of possibility rather than actuality” (p. 132). While she implies that a notion of gendered upbringings is relational in that it situates gender identity not as essentialist but informed by normative beliefs and expectations of what it means to be a man or woman, she does not push through on this idea to consider what the implications a notion of gendered upbringings means to a broader notion of self and other. In other words, she does not go as far as to suggest that people are necessarily constituted by others to the extent that people cannot and do not exist as individuals. But a concept of relationality addresses this.

As I have discussed previously, the notion of a relational person drawn from classical Chinese philosophy suggests that people cannot be situated as separate from others:

In Confucianism, the self is never seen as an isolated, autonomous individual whose essential qualities and intellectual capacities are bestowed from without and possessed solely within. Instead, a person is always a person situated in a social context; a person qua person is a self-in-relation. For a person without social relations is also a person without humanity. (Rosenlee, 2006, p. 39)

People are born into and live in relation. Rosenlee suggests that gender, from this perspective, has more to do with social roles than perceived traits of femininity and masculinity. A notion of woman as a gendered being emerges through the occupation and performance of different family and kinship roles. It is through action, through the roles that

people enact, that there are perceived differences between genders rather than a question of capability, capacity, or essential differences. Rosenlee points out that the written character for “person” in the Chinese language is gender neutral, and that specific references to gender entail the use of entirely different characters.

This is a slightly different take than Stone’s discussion of a notion of gendered upbringing. Stone (1988/2013) says, “men and women develop distinct forms of self” (p. 132) because of how we are socialized and raised by our parents. She writes, “In this process, men must undergo a process of separating and distancing from a sexually different parent, their mother. Women, in contrast, remain in connected relation to her” (p. 132). While she suggests that the notion of differences in expectations and behaviors between genders is socially constructed in part by how parents raise their children, she identifies and focuses on a “sexual difference” between people as meaningful. In other words, this view of men and women as biologically sexually different implies that there is a slight essentialist notion of difference at work here, one that can be used to distinguish people from each other in a more extensive way. I am not suggesting that she deny that men and women are not sexually different or even more broadly that there are differences between people, but the focus on this particular distinction imbues it with an implied significance. It suggests that an identification of sexual difference, as reflected by the use of the terms “man” and “woman,” shows an embedded assumption that people are distinct selves that can be separate from others. While feminist traditions may have shifted toward the broader acknowledgement of differences between people and away from essentialist notions of identity construction, this shift may not have necessarily resulted in sustained inquiry about the implications for how a person is situated in regard to others. Engagement of a relational

framework and its conception that people cannot be considered “individuals” or separate from others, could be a useful way to further inquire more robustly on this topic.

One possibility of why this may not be a focus, from the perspectives of the works I have mentioned, is that feminism is sometimes situated, as St. Pierre (2000) describes it, a “reverse discourse” that “circulates alongside patriarchal discourses and gains legitimacy as it works within and against their assumptions” (p. 499). This particular conception of feminism assumes that feminist discourse emerges in response to or in resistance to a more dominant patriarchal substance-oriented discourse. For example, this notion is expressed in St. Pierre’s (2000) suggestion that feminists analyze patriarchy. She says feminists should ask:

How does patriarchy function in the world? Where is it to be found? How does it get produced and regulated? What are its linguistic, social, and material effects on women? How does it continue to exist? What are its differences from itself? Once these questions can be asked of the specific, local, everyday situations that oppress women, and once the working of patriarchy is made intelligible at the level of micropractice, women can begin to make different statements about their lives. Once they can locate and name the discourses and practices of patriarchy, they can begin to refuse them. (p. 486)

Feminists, from this perspective, are compelled to be preoccupied with exploration of the impacts of patriarchal discourse. One impact of such a focus is that the field of a reverse discourse may be delimited to an extent by the dominant discourse to which it seeks to explore and counter. While resistance and response to a dominant discourse may result in the development of new discourses, a dominant discourse and those that emerge as

“reverse” may share or overlook some of the same assumptions, such as the notion that people are “individuals.” A relational framework can help make visible such an assumption.

While both a poststructural feminist and relational framework may adequately situate various aspects of Ellsworth’s work and provide language and ways to extend and understand it, there are considerable implications that emerge from differences in how they situate a notion of persons in regard to an educational context. In particular, they may differ in regard to how they situate the extensivity and impact of processes such as personal cultivation. A concept of relationality, as discussed in chapter 4, situates people as persons rather than individuals, as events and narratives rather than beings. In particular, it considers a person as constituted by a network of specific roles and relationships, for example of family, friends, and colleagues, rather than descriptive attributes. People are ongoing happenings rather than fixed beings. From a relational perspective, personal cultivation can only happen relationally because it is what one does that constitutes who one is. In other words, personal cultivation in the classroom does not simply become relegated to only that context but influences the people who undertake such processes more broadly. It may become manifest in how people interact in relationships with others outside of the classroom, which may extend to influence how those others interact with others one may not even know. This does not mean that one cannot be cognitively reflective, but that reflexivity is related to what one does and how others respond.

A substance-oriented notion that people are independent and separate from each other, on the other hand, suggests that development and growth are largely isolated activities. Personal cultivation in the classroom, from this perspective, could be seen as something that benefits the person who undertakes the process first and foremost. It could be seen as a self-serving undertaking rather than one that has a more extensive impact.

Interaction, from a substance-oriented perspective, is seen as a choice rather than as something that constitutes us.

Lynda Stone (1988/2013) says that a notion of the relational as epistemological and educational ideal must be unpacked by educators. She writes, “I emphasize the difficulty of this task given the scarcity of descriptive examples—given the founding hegemony” (p. 132). She ends her essay by imploring readers to examine the implications of a relational epistemology. A framework of relationality drawn from classical Chinese philosophy can assist with this. But more broadly, the juxtaposition of these two frameworks can be useful in that their differences can be a source of further inquiry in varied ways. For example, the *Zhongyong* was penned over two thousand years ago when the phenomena of extensive social institutions like contemporary educational systems did not exist. Inquiry about how a relational framework might be used to consider Ellsworth’s work provides an opportunity to consider the nuances of expressions of a relational framework. Consideration of Ellsworth’s work from a feminist framework, which has numerous resonances to a relational one, provides a chance to ask questions about the concept of relationality and its expression in contemporary higher educational contexts in ways that might not have occurred to me otherwise. To juxtapose these frameworks is to imply that each can enrich the other and that their juxtaposition produces meaning that is greater and more extensive than each considered on its own. Also, the resonances that emerge from the juxtaposition of these frameworks could be used to consider the limits and assumptions of a neoliberal framework.

A framework of relationality emphasizes the importance of the cultivation of reciprocal and responsive relationships in educational institutions in part by calling attention to the reflective pedagogical work of educators such as Ellsworth. It suggests that Ellsworth’s approach to inquiry about pedagogy provides, in my view, an example of

relational personal cultivation whose influence extends beyond the classroom. Her work is broadly relevant for faculty because her theorizations about the impossibility of direct communication have compelling implications for how faculty of any discipline might approach teaching and the development of curriculum. To dwell on the complexity of relating in the classroom is not to suggest that other frameworks have no place in educational endeavors, but rather to provoke that the juxtaposition of multiple frameworks can make visible their assumptions, provide opportunities to inquire about how they may be deployed, and also enrich their discourses in mutual ways.



## CHAPTER 7

### THE UNIVERSITY AS LEARNING COMMUNITY

University declarations such as strategic direction documents, mission statements, and tenure/promotion guidelines reflect normative institutional values. Document construction often involves the gathering of committees constituted by various faculty and administrators to discuss institutional goals and function. The content of such documents emerges to serve as a guide for institutions more broadly—how they function, what to value, and their aims. Contemporary higher educational institutions often use market-oriented language to describe their goals and activities. For example, strategic direction documents characterize institutions in terms such as “high performance-mission driven system” and “academic enterprise” that emphasize the importance of measurable outcomes and accountability, among others, in order to determine institutional effectiveness.

The documents can express a product-orientation in different ways. For example, while a strategic directions document may emphasize the use of market-oriented language in its delineation of goals and action strategies, tenure/promotion guidelines may not use the same kind of language to describe their expectations of faculty members. Yet, they still reflect a product-orientation when they insinuate the importance of faculty members’ publications over more difficult to quantify activities like teaching. If teaching is viewed as a complex activity that is relational and contextual, then it may not be easily described in measurable or outcome-oriented ways. As a result, its value may be more easily deemphasized by an institution, but also by faculty members themselves who seek to balance multiple institutional expectations. Because the documents express what an institution normatively values, they can influence participants’ activities and choices.

More broadly, a product-orientation influences how people are normatively situated from an institutional perspective. For example, while transcripts and CVs, which give snapshot descriptions of people that distinguish them from each other, make it easier for people to move from institution to institution, it is important to ask not only what they purport to show but also to consider what they leave out. While a strategic goal may seem initially clear in its claim to “create more high quality jobs,” when considering the multiple ways to realize this claim, the goal becomes increasingly abstract, what kind of high quality jobs? Who is supposed to create these jobs? Is this goal a priority in relation to the other goals, such as calls for academic rigor? Methods that seek to describe people and institutional directions in outcome-oriented ways may overlook the fact that educational endeavors involve complex interactions and that people in relation constitute institutions. While administrators may take for granted that people generate institutions through interactions, engagement of a relational framework can call attention to the importance of those institutional aspects that prioritize the cultivation of collegiality and insinuate their extensive influence.

A concept of relationality does not assume that measurable evidence is necessary to determine value because it engages a notion of the world as process-oriented and continually changing. From this perspective, people are situated as specific, interdependent, and necessarily constituted by others; how people interact is of paramount importance. It is our actions that directly influence the quality of our relationships and our lives. A process of personal cultivation can have an extensive impact because it emerges through attention and energy directed at improving the quality of interactions with others. From this perspective, educational endeavors and function cannot be seen as outside or separate from people’s interactions.

This notion of relationality emerges from consideration of the *Zhongyong* and the work of comparative philosophers. While normative interpretations of the text and other classical philosophical texts emerged in part from their use as content for the Chinese civil service examination process for much of the last two millennia, scholars point out that engagement with the texts can be situated as part of an evolving and flexible tradition. The texts can be resources to consider contemporary contexts and ideas. In the case of higher educational institutions, a concept of relationality constructed from a classical Chinese philosophical text can be used to consider the value of those existing aspects of institutional function that support the development of the craft of teaching through the cultivation of collegiality.

Relationality situates the development of collegiality in faculty learning communities as more than just a method to achieve the introduction of teaching innovations, but as an important achievement in and of itself. While research about university affiliated faculty learning communities discusses the importance of collegiality, it tends to deemphasize the time, effort, and complexity involved in attempts to cultivate the relationships necessary to encourage people to reflect openly about their teaching experiences and to collaboratively learn about teaching approaches. Because the research tends to be product-oriented, the value of multiple forms of learning communities, which may have varied purposes, also tends to be overlooked at an institutional level. To engage a concept of relationality is to call attention not only to the value of the cultivation of collegiality but also the implications and possibilities of this focus.

Relationality also situates the potential for reflective pedagogical research to be considered a process of personal cultivation. Elizabeth Ellsworth, through theorizations about her students' responses to her pedagogical approaches, suggests that notions of

teaching as a way to simply convey information from teacher to student is problematic because they assume that such direct communication is possible. Instead, she argues that faculty should acknowledge the impossibility of such an approach to teaching because one cannot completely control what someone else hears. Rather than treat disjuncture between speaker and hearer as tinged with failure, being open to the differences that emerge from interaction can provide opportunities for those involved to question their assumptions and to destabilize what they think they know. Learning, from this perspective, is an integral aspect of teaching.

What are the implications of engaging a relational framework for universities? For one, a relational framework frames universities as learning communities more broadly. If we see such institutions as constituted by people, and people by relationships, then we continually construct who we are and our institutions through our actions. The participants of learning communities, while they construct and aim to achieve particular goals, do so through the development of collegiality that is best cultivated through dynamic communication. A relational framework challenges the assumption that learning communities are constituted by individuals who come into relationship. Because people cannot be isolated, then people are already configured as part of relationships, and so participation in a learning community strengthens those relationships through shared learning experiences. To engage varied perspectives enriches relationships, and by extension, the experience of participation in an institution. To situate universities as learning communities is to position them as open to learning through inquiry. From this perspective, university leaders have to be willing to ask and consider what is missed by the pursuit of particular agendas and directions. To adopt such a position of inquiry is also to

acknowledge the partiality of all perspectives, and to be open to the emergence of unimagined possibilities.

Engagement with a concept of relationality also suggests the primary importance of teaching-related aspects of higher educational institutions. Faculty learning communities, for example, seek to develop collegiality in order to address varied faculty interests including teaching. And rigorous reflective work on pedagogy, such as Ellsworth's, can challenge normative pedagogical approaches in the classroom. Because the development of collegiality in faculty learning communities and the complexity of reflective pedagogical research can be difficult to describe in measurable or quantifiable terms, their broader value may be difficult to consider from a limited product-oriented perspective. Institutions may overlook the value of such supports and opportunities because they feel the pressure of social and regulatory expectations to justify what they do and to provide metrics and evidence of their influence.

But, universities cannot afford to overlook these forums and their influences. Not only can they foster the collegiality that can generate robust collaborations, they can also enrich the quality of the university community more broadly. If we see faculty learning communities as creating the conditions for people to engage in dynamic conversation, such groups can be envisioned as forums that broaden faculty networks and promote future interactions and innovations in regard to teaching and research in unimagined ways. Ellsworth's reflective pedagogical research, which involves rigorous inquiry about her teaching approaches and attends to student reactions, generates rich questions and theorizations about what it means to teach and learn that are valuable for faculty in any discipline. A relational framework situates Ellsworth as an example of a faculty member who undertakes a process of personal cultivation that leads to elaborations on the complexity of

communication in classrooms that can influence her students and colleagues in surprising and far-reaching ways. Because learning communities prioritize the cultivation of relationships, for universities, this implies that aspects such as support for teaching should be considered a priority. For if it is relationships that teach, as Ellsworth suggests, it is not enough for universities to simply expect that instructional faculty be expert teachers. They need to also acknowledge the effort and time required to teach as well as its complexity.

What makes these forums particularly robust is that they rely on differences of perspective to generate dynamic interactions that develop rich possibilities. To undertake a process of personal cultivation through relationships requires continual attention to interactions. From a relational perspective that situates people as interdependent, this process can have an extensive influence on the university context because if people are constituted by each other, then our relationships and interactions shape who we are and how we live, including our institutional contexts. The richness of engagement and interaction not only influences people's lives but also the broader communities that people participate in and create. In other words, support for teaching that emerges from dynamic interactions, like faculty learning communities or the work of reflective pedagogists such as Ellsworth, contributes to the quality of the university community in ways that it is difficult to measure or trace. If people are situated as interdependent and specific, then our actions and their richness not only constitute who we are but what our institutions are, as well.

Another implication is that a framework of relationality situates people as continually learning. For universities, this view compels academics to continually and critically ask questions about institutional structures, practices, and expectations, and consider which aspects, especially those related to the prioritization of cultivation of relationships and interactions, are taken for granted or overlooked. Engagement with a relational framework

also asks us to consider how a dominant product-oriented framework gets expressed in educational contexts and what such an orientation leaves out. If relationships constitute us, then the cultivation of relationships must be a primary consideration for educational institutions. But this is a difficult charge, especially as the space of relationships can be impossible to characterize in the ways a substance-oriented neoliberal framework is wont to demand. If we, following Ellsworth's lead, strive to see the impossibility of measuring or fixing relational space, such as that of communication, then we may instead see it as a complex space of possibility that fosters learning through the encouragement of people to ask questions, notice difference, and destabilize our notions of what we know.

A relational orientation insinuates the importance of learning because it engages a processual worldview that suggests that we construct who we are by what we do. We learn through our interactions and relationships, and they continually surprise us and challenge what we think we know or have taken for granted. For example, Ellsworth believed her critical pedagogical approach was effective until she noticed and further inquired about her students' differing responses to her approach. Confucius strove to become a better person but also realized through his relationships and interactions that he could not be the son to his father that he expected his son to be to him. It is through relating that we see difference. If we pay close enough attention, and ask about difference—what does it mean and why—it can foster learning and growth.

Asking questions may encourage more critical interpretations of institutional documents and guidelines with an eye toward the possibility of continuing to revise them. For example, a tenure and promotion committee could include as part of its evaluations of applications, discussion and even recognition that a neoliberal framework may overlook the importance of the development and complexity of quality teaching and that tenure and

promotion guidelines tend to imply the importance of publications. Discussions about the primary importance of teaching and of the time and work required to develop teaching ability, and the difficulty to quantify such activities, could potentially influence how teaching activities described in applications are interpreted, and more broadly, spur the recommendation of changes to tenure and promotion guidelines.

To continually adopt an attitude of reflective inquiry about institutional and academic practices may encourage acknowledgement of the complexity of processes, such as research collaborations, and the importance to cultivate them. Although normative publication expectations include the request for a sequential byline for authors on papers and books, the complex processes and experiences of faculty collaboration can be difficult to delineate or comprehensively characterize. For example, Roger Ames and David Hall have worked together on six book projects over two decades. As part of a response to an earlier draft of the chapter, Ames writes about his relationship with Hall, “I have been so altered in this relationship that I fully believe that anything I write now even 15 years after his death should be listed as co-authored with him. Collaboration requires that you understand everything and take responsibility for everything.” A relational framework reminds that even while attempts are made to distribute credit for research, they may be inadequate reflections of the processes of collaboration. Collaboration is interaction that generates relationship, which produces a productive space, but like experience, cannot be fully captured, fixed, or defined. A relational framework, one that assumes people are constituted by each other, recognizes and accommodates the complexity and nuances of relationships.

Being open to inquiry also encourages experimentation and innovative thinking in practical ways. From a processual worldview, for example, normative publication practices



are not fixed, but persist as they do because people use them. Because they exist through use, this also means that such practices can change. For example, bibliographies of academic books are generally located at the end of a book and include an alphabetized list of references. Thomas Kasulis (2002) notices that such a list, while it provides a reader with helpful information about other works that influenced the creation of a particular book, also leaves out quite a bit of information, such as under what circumstances did an author encounter a particular work, and how did it impact the development of the author's ideas? While he writes the majority of his book about two types of cultural orientations, intimacy and integrity, in a straightforward and analytical manner, in the last chapter, he swerves. Instead of offering readers a list of books in the form of a traditional bibliography, he decides to write what he calls "an intimate bibliography." This chapter differs from what might be considered a typical bibliography in an academic book in that he tells the story of how he encountered the texts that informed the writing of his book. He asks, "what might an intimacy-oriented bibliography look like?" and the result becomes an occasion to reflect upon the function of bibliographies in academic contexts and to experiment with the writing of a bibliography as a narrative. His purpose is not only to provide readers with a list of the books and influences that have shaped his work, but to share with readers how he encountered these influences, and how they figured into the development of his ideas. He does not suggest that bibliography formats need to be wholly revised, but asks what normative formats leave out, insinuating the notion that all academic endeavors, to some extent, can only be partial and that it is important to consider how they may be limited.

While I have suggested some of the broader implications a relational framework might generate, I want to point out that this discussion about possible applications and expressions is not meant to be prescriptive. Because our intellectual and academic

activities cannot be fixed and because we interact at specific moments in time and contexts, people must do the work of interpretation of frameworks for their particular contexts. I suggest that a relational framework could be seen as a resource that inspires imaginative possibilities for all participants of educational systems through continued personal cultivation, with an understanding that what we do and how we interact with others not only constitutes who we are but also constructs the institutions we generate through our participation. It also reminds that those forums that encourage the cultivation of relationships and interactions, such as those that support teaching, can be immensely valuable to educational institutions and deserve to be attended to and supported.

Conceptual shifts have practical implications.<sup>16</sup> To engage differing theoretical frameworks will reflect varied interpretations of specific contexts. The two are inextricable—concepts and their practical expressions are necessarily interrelated. That said, it might be of some use to consider how an educational institution might express openness toward engaging a relational framework. How might administrators choose to foster more discussion and inquiry about the value of collegiality and the complexity of teaching? There are myriad possible answers to these questions; some might include an acknowledgement of the complexity of educational endeavors in the institution’s public documents, encouragement of discussions about teaching at the departmental and institutional level, or recognition of the value of developing collegiality as part of formal and informal faculty learning communities toward enriching university communities.

---

<sup>16</sup> Hannah Tavares problematizes the notion of a separation between theory and practice. She writes, “our work as scholars entails conceptualizing/re-conceptualizing and I do not simply see that work as a technical matter (i.e. a better or more reliable conceptualization) separate from the so-called ‘real’ world; rather, our conceptualizations have very real consequences and practical implications because they can (re)orient how we might approach, act, say, and what we might feel and value” (personal communication, April 24, 2017).

Because public documents construct institutional identities and priorities, to some extent, administrators may wish to engage a relational framework by revising the documents to include recognition of existing tensions and nuances that may emerge from their interpretation. For example, in the strategic directions document discussed in chapter 2, I noticed that while the core values were identified early on in the document, they were not mentioned again or in relation to the four institutional goals described. Administrators could try to elaborate how the core values are related to the goals and even discuss the potential difficulty of envisioning them as interrelated and acknowledge the tensions that might emerge. Because educational endeavors are complex and difficult to quantify, the document could recognize this rather than taking a stance of overt confidence and assumed clarity about the ways to achieve the stated goals.

Administrators could also revise tenure guidelines for instructional faculty to acknowledge the complexity of the various institutional expectations of faculty roles. In a conversation referenced in chapter 2, the university's assistant vice chancellor of academic personnel stated unequivocally that she felt that tenure evaluation committees should weigh research and teaching equally. If this is indeed the case, that she and other high-level administrators believe this to be true, they could make an effort to share their perspective that teaching and research should be equally considered in a more formal way. For example, in the tenure and promotion guidelines discussed in the second chapter, I pointed out that while the institutional expectations of instructional faculty in regard to contributions to teaching, research, and service were identified, the document did not mention how the expectations should be weighted in comparison to one another. Administrators could clearly articulate in the document, and elsewhere, how evaluation committees should consider the

categories in relation to the others and address the complexity of such an endeavor. They could also acknowledge the pressures on faculty to prioritize publishing over teaching.

In the tenure guidelines section on expectations of teaching referenced in the second chapter, administrators could discuss the difficulty of evaluating teaching and providing evidence for it. While evaluating teaching in an evidence-based and standardized way is difficult, if not impossible, they could ask that faculty members discuss, for non-evaluatory purposes, where they may have encountered support for teaching at the institution, for example, by describing participation in informal and university-affiliated faculty learning communities. In fact, they could ask open-ended questions, not intended to evaluate a faculty member at all, but in order to see them as resources that provide administrators with a better understanding of faculty experiences at a particular institution. The tenure process could be envisioned not only as a means to evaluate faculty members in individualized ways but also as a chance for an institution to learn about how they could support faculty members in achieving the various expectations as well as learn about the difficulties in doing so. Relationality assumes interrelation and situates everyone, no matter the role, in a position of learning.

Foregrounding a process orientation might mean that narratives about the construction of public documents accompany the documents themselves. While the narratives may be limited in their ability to comprehensively characterize the process of constructing the content of the documents, they may at least signal to those who read the documents the complexity of their construction. The inclusion of one or even multiple narratives, perhaps provided by the committee members that developed and vetted the documents, would provide some indication of the time, effort, and concerns involved in the development of the content. These narratives would remind readers that the documents

emerged from specific and contextual processes. Similarly, the inclusion of commentaries about the interpretations of the content of the documents might help to acknowledge and legitimize the multiple responses that readers may have about the documents. While it may be impossible to make transparent the processes of the construction of the documents, finding varied ways to situate them in specific contexts would not be a sign of weakness or institutional discord but rather to acknowledge publicly the complexity of educational endeavors and the importance for institutions to adopt a position of inquiry.

Another way for administrators to engage a relational framework would be to increase departmental awareness and discussion of the complexity and the value of teaching. This could happen in varied ways; for example, in one-on-one conversations with faculty members, as part of faculty meetings, and through encouraging the sharing of reflective pedagogical research or materials. Simply talking more about the value and complexity of teaching may assist in influencing how they are perceived as part of faculty roles from departmental and institutional perspectives. For example, if an administrator, in conversation with a faculty member, expresses an interest in talking about teaching, this may in fact draw attention to it. The attitude about teaching that an administrator may express to faculty members may influence how they situate teaching. If administrators are open to sharing their teaching experiences and open to fostering discussions about teaching in supportive ways at a departmental level, this may contribute to the way it is situated institutionally. In addition to bringing attention to the complexity of teaching by speaking about it, administrators may choose to encourage faculty members to share research they've encountered about teaching with each other. Offering to be a resource and sharing resources about teaching would be ways an administrator could encourage discussions about the complexity of teaching. Additionally, administrators could choose to

use part of the time allotted for faculty meetings to discuss teaching or share resources, if this does not already occur, to show departmental interest in support of teaching. They could also encourage more established faculty members to mentor new faculty, if they do not do so already.

Broad articulation and recognition of the value of faculty learning communities to enrich universities could contribute to institutional support and faculty participation in such communities. More often than not, the broader influence of participation in informal faculty learning communities may be taken for granted even by the participants themselves. For example, when speaking with the department chair of the Department of English, toward the end of our conversation when we were talking about learning communities, she mentioned in passing that she was part of a writing group herself. She shared drafts of her articles with a small group of friends and colleagues and received valuable feedback on her work in return. While informal communities such as this one may be situated as personal, recognition of their contributions toward supporting faculty endeavors may help encourage institutions to see their value. While institutionalization of informal learning communities should not, in my view, be a goal for universities, acknowledging their potential impact on faculty members and university communities more broadly by recognizing them and their potential could encourage conversation and awareness about the complexity of the roles of faculty members and support their work.

To situate universities as learning communities is to position them as open to unexpected possibilities. To engage a relational framework with a product-oriented one in the context of educational institutions can make visible the limits of product-oriented aspects of educational endeavors. Such juxtaposition raises questions about the impact, for example, that strategic directions and tenure/promotion guidelines can have on faculty

attitudes and approaches to teaching. More broadly, to adopt an attitude of inquiry is also to be open to the unexpected. Engagement with a relational framework can inspire faculty members and educators to consider not what universities “are” but how they function and influence people in specific contexts. It also suggests that to attend to the cultivation of collegiality can enrich university communities and initiate collaborations from which the unexpected may emerge.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcoff, L. (1988). *New versions of the coherence theory: Gadamer, Davidson, Foucault, and Putnam* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Brown University, Providence, R.I.
- Ames, R. T. (2011). *Confucian role ethics: A vocabulary*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ames, R.T. (2016). On teaching and learning Xueji: An interpretive context. In D. Xu, H. McEwan, & L.X. Yang (Eds.), *Universal principles for teaching & learning: Xue Ji (學記) in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Ames, R. T., & Hall, D. L. (2001). *Focusing the familiar: A translation and philosophical interpretation of the Zhongyong*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A Critical discourse analysis. *Review of Higher Education, 28*(4), 527-549.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bennett, L. A. and Khanna, S. K. (2010). A Review of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines in Higher Education: Optimistic Signs for Applied, Practicing, and Public Interest Anthropology. *American Anthropologist, 112*, 648–650.
- Bevir, M. (1999). Foucault and critique: Deploying agency against autonomy. *Political Theory, 27*(1), 65-84.
- Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.



- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Cox, M.D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. In M.D. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities* (pp. 5-23). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1957). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology*. New York, NY: The Modern Library.
- Dill, B. (1983/2013). Race, class, and gender: Prospects for an all-inclusive sisterhood. In Thayer-Bacon, B. J., Stone, L., & Sprecher, K. M. (eds.) *Education feminism: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 59-74). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ellsworth, E. A. (1989/2013). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In Thayer-Bacon, B. J., Stone, L., & Sprecher, K. M. (eds.) *Education feminism: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 187-214). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ellsworth, E. A. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ellsworth, E. A. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elman, B. A. (2000). *A cultural history of civil examinations in late imperial China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Fendler, L. (2006). Others and the problem of community. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(3), 303-326.
- Fitzsimons, P. (2002). Neoliberalism and education: the autonomous chooser. *Radical Pedagogy*. Retrieved from [http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/radicalpedagogy/Neoliberalism\\_and\\_education\\_\\_the\\_autonomous\\_chooser.html](http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/radicalpedagogy/Neoliberalism_and_education__the_autonomous_chooser.html)
- Foucault, M. (1975/1995). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Friedman, D.B., Crews, T.B., Caicedo, J.M., Besley, J.C., Weinberg, J., & Freeman, M.L. (2010). An exploration into inquiry-based learning by a multidisciplinary group of higher education faculty. *Higher Education: the International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 59(6), 765-783.
- Furco, A., & Moley, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128-153.
- Gardner, D. K. (2007). *The four books: The basic teachings of the later Confucian tradition*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub. Co.
- Gardner, S., & Veliz, D. (2014). Evincing the ratchet: A thematic analysis of the promotion and tenure guidelines at a striving university. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(1), 105-132.

- Germain, M., & Scandura, T. A. (2005). Grade inflation and student individual differences as systematic bias in faculty evaluations. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 32(1), 58-67.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: the case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 213-238.
- Glass, I. (Producer). (2015, August 28). *Lower 9+10* [audio podcast]. Retrieved from <http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/565/transcript>
- Glyer, D., & Weeks, D. L. (1998). *The liberal arts in higher education: Challenging assumptions, exploring possibilities*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Glowacki-Dudka, M., & Brown, M. P. (2008). Professional development through faculty learning communities. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 21, 29-39.
- Green, T.F., Ericson, D.P., & Seidman, R.H. (1997). *Predicting the behavior of the educational system*. Troy, NY: Educator's International Press.
- Hunter, I. (1996). Assembling the school. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 143-166). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, R. (1986/7). What is cultural studies anyway? *Social Text*, 16, 38-80.
- Kasulis, T. (2002). *Intimacy or integrity: Philosophy and cultural difference*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lauretis, T. (1999). Popular culture, public and private fantasies: Femininity and fetishism in David Cronenberg's "M. Butterfly." *Signs*, 24(2), 303-334.
- Lave J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lave J. & Wenger E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Limbrick, L. & Knight, N. (2005). Close Reading of Students' Writing: What Teachers Learn about Writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4, 5-22.
- Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. *Journal of Education*, 169, 117-137.
- Liston, D. D., Hansman, C. A., Kenney, S. L., & Breton, C. C. (1998). Teaching portfolio use in the absence of institutional support. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 9(1), 121-34.
- Marsden, G. M. (1994). *The soul of the American university: From Protestant establishment to established nonbelief*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, G. H., & In Morris, C. W. (1934). *Mind, self & society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meiklejohn, A. (1932). *The experimental college*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Miyazaki, I (1981). *China's examination hell the civil service examinations of imperial China*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric across Institutional Type. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 456-471.
- Nylan, M. (2005). Toward an archaeology of writing: text, ritual, and the culture of public display in the classical period (475 B.C.E. - 220 C.E.). In M. Kern (Ed.), *Text and ritual in early China* (pp. 3-49). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Nylan, M. (2001). *The five "Confucian" classics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ozcan, K. (2013). Student Evaluation of Lecture and Teaching Effectiveness in Higher Education. *Educational Research And Reviews*, 8(8), 378-389.

- Pinnegar, S. (1995). (Re-)Experiencing beginning. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 22(3), 65–83.
- Proefriedt, W. A. (1994). *How teachers learn: Toward a more liberal teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Reinharz, S., & Davidman, L. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ritter, J. K. (2011). On the affective challenges of developing a pedagogy of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education*, 7(3), 219-233.
- Rosenlee, L.-H. L. (2006). *Confucianism and women: A philosophical interpretation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schön, D.A. (1983). *Reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). What is the dialogical method of teaching? *Journal of Education*, 169, 11-31.
- Sirat, M. B. (2010). Strategic Planning Directions of Malaysia's Higher Education: University Autonomy in the Midst of Political Uncertainties. *Higher Education: The International Journal Of Higher Education And Educational Planning*, 59(4), 461-473.
- O'Boyle, L. (1983). Learning for Its Own Sake: The German University as Nineteenth-Century Model. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 25(1), 3-25.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13, 5, 477-515.
- Stone, L. (1988/2013). Toward a transformational theory of teaching. In Thayer-Bacon, B. J., Stone, L., & Sprecher, K. M. (eds.) *Education feminism: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 127-135). Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Stone, L. (2013). Epilogue. In Thayer-Bacon, B. J., Stone, L., & Sprecher, K. M. (eds.) *Education feminism: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 469-471). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Tan, S. (2003). *Confucian democracy: A Deweyan reconstruction*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tavares, H. (2016). *Pedagogies of the image: Photo-archives, cultural histories, and postfoundational inquiry*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Vescio V., Ross D., & Adams A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80-91.
- Yamamoto, T. (2000). In/Visible difference: Asian American women and the politics of spectacle. *Race, Gender & Class*, 7(1), 43-55.
- Ward, H. & Selvester, P. (2012). Faculty Learning Communities: Improving Teaching in Higher Education. *Educational Studies*, 38, 111-121.
- Wenger E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yayli, D. (2012). Professional Language Use by Pre-Service English as a Foreign Language Teachers in a Teaching Certificate Program. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18, 59-73.



## University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions, 2015–2021

As the sole provider of public higher education in Hawai'i, the University of Hawai'i (UH) is committed to improving the social, economic and environmental well-being of current and future generations. These *University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions, 2015–2021* build upon previous work outlined in the *Strategic Outcomes and Performances Measures, 2008–2015* (<http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan>) and will guide the university's priorities for the next three biennia to achieve the outcomes directed by the UH Board of Regents (BOR). Productivity and efficiency measures associated with these outcomes provide clear, measurable goals and the ability to effectively monitor progress over time.

Interwoven in the strategic directions are two key imperatives embraced within the BOR-approved UH mission: a commitment to being a foremost indigenous-serving institution and advancing sustainability. To those ends, the directions embrace the work and input of *Hawai'i Papa O Ke Ao* ([www.hawaii.edu/offices/op/hpokeao.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/op/hpokeao.pdf)), a plan for the university to become a model indigenous-serving institution, the Pūko'a Council, and the UH System Sustainability Task Force and their reports. In addition, the President's Task Force on Title IX and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has provided recommendations on how to achieve compliance with emerging mandatory federal requirements. The university stands firmly committed to advancing these directions in concert with core values of the institution: academic rigor and excellence, integrity and service, aloha and respect.

The four strategic directions outlined below describe the university's priorities for 2015–2021.

### **Hawai'i Graduation Initiative (HGI)**

*Goal: Increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiians, low-income students and those from underserved regions and populations and preparing them for success in the workforce and their communities.*

An educated labor force and engaged citizenry are essential in today's global, knowledge-based economy. Across the nation, states have set ambitious goals to boost college completion rates. Hawai'i's own *55 by '25 Campaign* goal focuses on increasing the percentage of working age adults with two- or four-year degrees to 55 percent by 2025. According to the most recent data available, 43 percent of Hawai'i's working age adults hold a postsecondary degree. At the state's current rate of degree production, that percentage is expected to reach only 47 percent in 2025, resulting in a shortage of 57,000 degree holders. As the state's sole public higher education system, the University of Hawai'i is committed to doing its part to close the state's projected educational attainment gap.

The university plans to address this gap through expanded access to postsecondary education and training throughout the state and strengthened support for student success. Vigorous support for Native Hawaiians, low-income students and underrepresented and underserved populations and regions remains a top priority for the university.

*HGI Action Strategy 1:*

Strengthen the pipeline from K–12 to the university to improve college readiness and increase college attendance.

Tactics

- Engage K–12 students and their parents statewide early and often to promote and encourage them to prepare for college
- Emphasize pipeline and college readiness initiatives for Native Hawaiians, rural communities, low-income and under-represented groups, including through UH programs (e.g., *Na Pua No'ea*) and through partnerships with non-UH entities
- Institutionalize early college and “bridge” programs
- Align high school graduation requirements with college entrance requirements and readiness
- Expand outreach services and support to facilitate the completion of college admissions and financial aid applications
- Enhance professional development for K–12 teachers and counselors in support of student preparation for higher education
- Strengthen private school partnerships, including with Kamehameha Schools

*HGI Action Strategy 2:*

Implement structural improvements that promote persistence to attain a degree and timely completion.

Tactics

- Establish pathways for all degree programs, including transfer pathways from the community colleges
- Strengthen developmental education initiatives that increase preparation, improve placement methods and reduce time spent in developmental education
- Reduce gaps in college completion for Native Hawaiians, low-income and under-represented groups
- Transition from a course-based to a curriculum pathway-based registration system
- Schedule courses to facilitate timely degree completion
- Strengthen and align financial aid resources, policies and practices for increased access and completion
- Improve and stabilize student support services for Native Hawaiians, veterans, returning adults and part-time students.
- Make effective use of summer terms



### *HGI Action Strategy 3:*

Anticipate and align curricula with community and workforce needs.

#### Tactics

- Obtain accurate information about workforce, employment and salaries from the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Economic Modeling Specialist International and other sources
- Follow up with graduates and employers regarding UH students' preparation for the workforce and community
- Engage systematically with community-based groups to inform program offerings and curricula
- Develop new programs that are responsive to community needs, e.g., STEM, data science, sustainability sciences and cybersecurity

### *HGI Action Strategy 4:*

Solidify the foundations for UH West O'ahu, and Hawai'i CC at Palamanui, our "startup" campuses, and establish large-scale student support services for Native Hawaiians, low-income students, and the under-represented populations they serve.

#### Tactics

- Develop complementary academic and strategic plans that promote UH mission differentiation with applied baccalaureate degrees, offerings of regional interest and need, 2+2 and 3+1 programs with community colleges, programs for returning adults, statewide online and distance learning programs, and development of strong University Centers
- Develop financial and operational plans that support the expected rapid increases in enrollment as the communities embraces their new campuses
- Create capital development plans for facilities that support expected enrollment growth and campus academic and strategic plans
- Develop plans for utilization of non-campus land assets to generate revenue and/or reduce university costs through complementary and compatible activities such as development of a university village and alternate energy generation

### *Productivity and Efficiency Measures for Hawai'i Graduation Initiative (HGI)*

- Number of degrees and certificates
- Graduation rates, graduation and transfer rates (IPEDS 100% and 150%, APLU-SAM)
- Enrollment to degree gap for Native Hawaiian students
- Enrollment to degree gap for Pell students
- Average unmet need of resident students
- Average total debt per undergraduate completer
- Tuition and fees as a percent of median household income

## **Hawai'i Innovation Initiative (HI2)**

*Goal: Create more high-quality jobs and diversify Hawai'i's economy by leading the development of a \$1 billion innovation, research, education and training enterprise that addresses the challenges and opportunities faced by Hawai'i and the world.*

The economy of Hawai'i is currently highly dependent on tourism and military spending. The creation of a third economic sector based on research and innovation has been identified as a community priority. As the largest research enterprise in the state, the University of Hawai'i is absolutely essential to achieving this economic diversification. The university, in partnership with the business community, plans to create innovation clusters that link fundamental scientific discovery with applied research and economic development. The university will also provide the training required for technological innovation and economic development to enable Hawai'i's citizens to lead and participate in this sector. With an emphasis on our responsibility to the community, the Hawai'i Innovation Initiative will focus on the following hubs: astronomy, ocean sciences, health sciences and wellness, data intensive sciences and engineering, agriculture and sustainability sciences including energy.

### *HI2 Action Strategy 1:*

Sustain and advance the UH research enterprise.

#### Tactics

- Empower current UH faculty by identifying and removing administrative and policy barriers that impede research efficiencies and effectiveness
- Achieve financial sustainability for research under declining state investment
- Craft internal incentives and rewards for growth

### *HI2 Action Strategy 2:*

Advance innovation and entrepreneurship within UH and the community.

#### Tactics

- Integrate entrepreneurship and innovation throughout the UH educational experience for students across the system with strengthened credit and non-credit education, internships, employment opportunities and extra-curricular/co-curricular activities
- Introduce new approaches to UH commercialization and technology acceleration (OTTED 2.0) such as:
  - More flexible licensing
  - Proof-of-Concept/Accelerator to nurture UH technologies
  - Greater community outreach and institutional in-reach
- Strengthen existing partnerships and form new ones to enhance high quality job creation in Hawai'i:
  - Support the Hawai'i Business Roundtable (HBR) and others in the establishment of a Hawai'i version of "CONNECT"

- Enhance meaningful collaborations with state agencies, incubators and accelerators, national and international agencies and collaborators
- Improve communication within the State and beyond regarding the value of UH research and its critical roles in Hawai'i's economic development, job creation and in addressing the challenges and opportunities facing Hawai'i and the world

*HI2 Action Strategy 3:*

Invest internal resources and seek external resources for strategic infrastructure requirements and hires that leverage our location and strengths as well as address critical gaps.

- Ocean and climate sciences
- Astronomy
- Health and wellness
- Digital/creative media
- Cybersecurity
- Sustainable agriculture
- Energy
- Data intensive science and engineering initiative to support all research sectors

*Productivity and Efficiency Measures for Hawai'i Innovation Initiative (HI2)*

- Number of invention disclosures, patents, licenses and start-up companies and jobs
- Total extramural funds
- Number of STEM degrees

**21<sup>st</sup> Century Facilities (21CF)**

*Goal: Eliminate the university's deferred maintenance backlog and modernize facilities and campus environments to be safe, sustainable and supportive of modern practices in teaching, learning and research.*

The University of Hawai'i must eliminate the substantial deferred maintenance backlog and modernize facilities to meet 21<sup>st</sup> century needs for learning, teaching and research. This systemwide problem exists on all but the newest campus, and is particularly acute at the flagship Mānoa campus. As of June 2014, the university's deferred maintenance backlog for general funded facilities is just over \$400 million for its nearly \$5 billion dollar capital plant.

UH students, faculty and staff need and deserve well-maintained and up-to-date facilities that support modern teaching, learning, innovation and scholarship. Facilities and campus environments must be safe, sustainable and support 21<sup>st</sup> century higher education expectations and practices. The university's facilities must be fully digitally enabled; flexible in use; maintainable at low cost; energy, water and waste efficient; and supportive of deep collaborations with partners across the state, nation and the world.

### *21CF Action Strategy 1:*

Adopt model policies and practices for development and management of UH buildings and campuses.

#### Tactics

- Develop, adopt or adapt new streamlined, accountable, efficient and effective processes and organizational structures for construction, renewal and maintenance of facilities to include all phases from planning and procurement through project management and acceptance
- Develop comprehensive multi-year capital improvement plans for construction, renewal and modernization that minimize disruption to campuses
- Develop a financial plan that responsibly leverages state and university financial capacities to execute capital improvement plans and meet ongoing operating, maintenance and renewal requirements

### *21CF Action Strategy 2:*

Improve the sustainability and resource conservation of the built environment including facilities and grounds by reducing energy consumption, greenhouse gas production, water use and waste production.

#### Tactics

- Implement full energy metering and monitoring of campus buildings
- Improve energy efficiency of UH campuses and facilities
- Increase the percentage of UH energy generated from renewable sources
- Reduce costs of energy consumed on/by UH campuses
- Improve the sustainability of campus grounds
- Track, report and minimize greenhouse gas emissions
- Re-invest savings and costs avoided from energy conservation and efficiency projects into sustainability projects

### *21CF Action Strategy 3:*

Provide safe, healthy and discrimination free environments for teaching, learning and scholarship for students, employees and visitors.

#### Tactics

- Collaborate as a system to understand and comply with Title IX and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) guidance and apply best practices in promoting safety and response to incidents across the state
- Update systemwide and campus policies and guidelines to ensure compliance and promote safety and security
- Ensure availability and accessibility of high-quality confidential resources for victims

- Provide appropriate safety and awareness education for responsible officials and all students and employees
- Ensure that clear and useful information is readily available when needed

*Productivity and Efficiency Measures for 21st Century Facilities (21CF)*

- Deferred maintenance
- Electricity purchased per gross square foot
- Gallons of water purchased per gross square foot
- Number of criminal offenses on campus

**High Performance Mission-Driven System (HPMS)**

*Goal: Through cost-effective, transparent and accountable practices, ensure financial viability and sustainability to ensure UH’s ability to provide a diverse student body throughout Hawai’i with affordable access to a superb higher education experience in support of the institutional mission of the university, which includes commitments to being a foremost indigenous-serving university and advancing sustainability.*

UH is committed to accountability, transparency and managing costs including by leveraging our unique status as a unified statewide system of public higher education. Strategies for achieving higher performance will include: providing a diverse student body with multiple entry points and educational pathways across the state; streamlined administrative and support processes; efficient utilization of facilities; exploration and implementation of new instructional approaches; and enhanced use of metrics for productivity and efficiency.

These objectives are achieved with a deep commitment to the institutional mission of UH as a foremost indigenous serving university that advances sustainability at UH and for Hawai’i.

*HPMS Action Strategy 1:*

Employ best practices in management, administration and operations.

Tactics

- Implement world-class business practices to advance efficiency, transparency and accountability with sound risk management
- Create effective and efficient organizational structures that leverage the advantages of centralization and decentralization to maximize efficiency and responsiveness to internal and external stakeholders
- Maximize efficient use of facilities and classrooms
- Provide professional and leadership development for UH faculty and staff
- Effectively use metrics throughout the system to advance goals and objectives
- Increase transparency in budgeting and expenditures through improved reporting practices

### *HPMS Action Strategy 2:*

Increase opportunity and success for students and overall cost-effectiveness by leveraging academic resources and capabilities across the system.

#### Tactics

- Expand student-centered distance and online learning to create more educational opportunities through use of technology and by leveraging University Centers on all islands
- Develop degrees and certificates, including with distance delivery, as part of integrated pathways for students enrolled across the UH system
- Promote stronger and more comprehensive transfer and articulation policies that are student-centered, transparent and well communicated in order to support student mobility and success throughout the system.
- Promote mission differentiation through the review of academic offerings to identify unnecessary duplication and opportunities for improved collaboration
- Nurture instructional innovations and institutionalize high impact educational practices
- Standardize, centralize and collaborate on shared services to improve operating efficiencies and effectiveness in student support areas such as transcript evaluation, financial aid processing, admissions, monitoring of student progress, early alerts and intervention strategies
- Reduce cost of textbooks

### *HPMS Action Strategy 3:*

UH aspires to be the world's foremost indigenous serving university and embraces its unique responsibilities to the indigenous people of Hawai'i and to Hawai'i's indigenous language and culture. To fulfill this responsibility, the university ensures active support for the participation of Native Hawaiians and supports vigorous programs of study and support for the Hawaiian language, history and culture. In addition to the Native Hawaiian student success agenda within the Hawai'i Graduation Initiative, the following tactics align with the thematic areas set forth in *Hawai'i Papa O Ke Ao*, UH's plan for a model indigenous serving university.

#### Tactics

- Prepare more Native Hawaiians to assume leadership roles within UH and the community
- Develop community and public-private partnerships locally and globally that advance UH's indigenous serving goals and share practices globally
- Advance the utilization and understanding of the Hawaiian language and culture throughout the UH System, including through articulated programs of study as well as through informal learning
- Impart a Hawaiian sense of place on campuses through landscaping, signage and the creation of Pu'u Honua

#### *HPMS Action Strategy 4:*

UH will be a global leader in the integration of sustainability in its teaching, research, operations and service. The university must embrace both indigenous practitioners and global experts to advance Hawai'i's stewardship and use of energy, food, water, land and sea for the well-being of the state and the world.

##### Tactics

- Integrate sustainability across the curriculum using common criteria such as an 'S' designation
- Develop academic programs in sustainability sciences collaboratively throughout the system
- Support research and service around issues of sustainability
- Incorporate sustainability practices, including those derived from indigenous wisdom, throughout the university
- Encourage alternate modes of transportation
- Support Hawai'i's local food economy

#### *HPMS Action Strategy 5:*

Diversify resource base beyond state appropriations and tuition to support public higher education in Hawai'i.

##### Tactics

- Execute a successful fundraising campaign across all campuses to provide additional support for students, faculty, facilities, priorities and programs
- Actively manage UH land assets to generate revenue, reduce costs and support UH's mission activities statewide
- Execute a coherent strategy for international and non-resident recruitment and enrollment, including through partnerships, that advances revenue goals as well as the educational benefits to Hawai'i students of a globally diverse student body
- Improve revenue generation associated with UH innovations and intellectual property through the Hawai'i Innovation Initiative

#### *Productivity and Efficiency Measures for High Performance Mission-Driven System (HPMS)*

- Education and related expenditures per completion
- SSH/instructional faculty FTE
- FTE Students/FTE staff (non-instructional, non-EM) ratios
- FTE Students/FTE Executive/Managerial ratios
- Number of programs with low number of graduates per year
- Classroom utilization
- Number of Native Hawaiian employees and graduate assistants (faculty/staff/administrators)

- Student enrollment in Native Hawaiian courses in language and culture (unduplicated count)
- Number of international undergraduate students enrolled in credit courses
- Number of degrees in Health, Education, and Agriculture



**CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR  
FACULTY TENURE/PROMOTION APPLICATION  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA**

**September 2015**

**SUBMISSION DEADLINE TO DEPARTMENT:**

**FRIDAY, October 2, 2015**

**PLEASE SUBMIT AN ORIGINAL PLUS SEVEN (7) COPIES**

**NOTE:**

**ALL REFERENCES ARE TO THE *2015-2017 UHPA/UH AGREEMENT***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Instructions for Tenure Applicants .....	3
II.	Instructions for Promotion Applicants .....	4-5
III.	Joint Appointments and Split Appointments .....	5
IV.	Criteria for Tenure: General Comments .....	5-6
	A. For Instructional Faculty .....	6-7
	B. For Research Faculty .....	7-8
	C. For Specialist and Librarian Faculty .....	8-9
	D. For Extension Agent Faculty .....	9
V.	Criteria for Promotion: General Comments .....	9-10
	A. For Instructional Faculty..... (including Law and Clinical Medicine)	10-11
	B. For Research Faculty .....	11-12
	C. For Specialist Faculty .....	12-13
	D. For Librarian Faculty .....	13-14
	E. For Extension Agent Faculty .....	14-15
VI.	The Tenure/Promotion Review Process .....	15-16
VII.	Guidelines for Preparing the Application .....	16-22
	Appendix A: Executive Policy - Classification of Faculty (E5.221)	
	Appendix B: Supplemental Guidelines	
	Appendix C: Tenure/Promotion Application Form	

## I. Instructions for Tenure Applicants

The 2015-2017 *Agreement between the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i (Agreement)* requires that all eligible faculty must apply for tenure by their final year of probationary service according to a timetable established and published by the University. Probationary service is defined in Article XII, Section C of the *Agreement*. Failure to apply results automatically in the issuance of a terminal year contract. If you have doubts about which is your final year of probation, check your most recent PNF (Payroll Notification Form). Assistance in obtaining this information will be provided by your Department Chair or comparable unit head.

The information submitted by you in your tenure application, and that appended to your application by its reviewers, are the principal bases on which your case for tenure will be assessed. It is your responsibility to see that all pertinent information has been included in your application. Guidelines for preparing the application are provided in Section VII below.

The Available Options. Article XII of the *Agreement* defines when you should normally apply for tenure. There are several options available to you:

- A. If you are in your final year of probationary service, or in your terminal year of service but have a written agreement that the University will accept your application during the 2015-2016 academic year, you must elect whether or not to apply.
  1. After familiarizing yourself with the criteria contained in Section IV below, and any additional college and/or departmental criteria appropriate to your application, you may proceed by signing the statements in Part II on p. 2.2 of the application form. **If your Department Personnel Committee Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal have been revised, you may elect to have your tenure application reviewed under the procedures in effect for 2012-2013.** Be sure to complete the application by **October 2, 2015** and submit it to your Department Chair or comparable unit head. To assist you, the Department Chair is required to be available for consultation but is neither required nor permitted to prepare the application for you. Procedures for review of your application are outlined in Section VI below. You should also be familiar with Article XII, "Tenure and Service" of the *2015 – 2017 UHPA/UH Agreement*.
  2. You may elect not to apply, in which case you should sign the form for this purpose by **October 2, 2015**. The form is available in your Dean's/Director's office. **IMPORTANT:** If you make this choice, your contract for 2015-2016 will be your last probationary year and you will receive a terminal year contract commencing August 1, 2016 and your appointment with the University will terminate on **July 31, 2017** unless you resign before that date.
- B. You may apply for tenure before your final year of probationary service. If you wish to do so, however, you must submit a signed letter requesting that the University reduce your normal probationary period. This letter must contain a statement that you understand that,

in the event the request is approved, the **2015-2016** academic year will become your final year of probationary service and that a negative decision on your application for tenure will result in a terminal year's contract for **2016-2017**. Your request should be submitted to your Department Chair and will be forwarded for appropriate review and action by your Dean/Director. You may attach a copy of the request to your application form and submit the application according to the procedures outlined in Section VI below. However, the University will take no action on your application for tenure until a decision is made on your request for a reduction in your probationary period.

For Instructional (including Law and Medicine) and Research Faculty (Rank 3):

If your initial appointment was at Rank 3 on or after July 1, 1977, you will be promoted to Associate rank if you are awarded tenure. This means you will be evaluated for promotion to Rank 4 as well as for tenure at Rank 4.

For All Specialist, Librarian, and Agent Faculty and Instructional and Research Faculty (Rank 4):

All Specialist, Librarian, Agent faculty members and Instructional and Research faculty members at Rank 4 may use a single application to apply for: 1) tenure only at the current rank, and 2) tenure and promotion (**please note, the second action requires a separate vote for tenure and a separate vote for promotion by each level of review**). If the recommendation for promotion is negative, but the recommendation for tenure is positive, your tenure-only application will be forwarded to the Board of Regents for positive action.

## II. Instructions for Promotion Applicants

The *Agreement* between the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly and the University of Hawai'i provides that any faculty member may apply for promotion in any year in accordance with the guidelines set forth below.

The information submitted by you in your promotion application, and that appended to your application by its reviewers, are the principal bases on which your case for promotion will be assessed. **If your Department Personnel Committee Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal have been revised, you may elect to have your promotion application reviewed under the procedures in effect for 2012 - 2013.** It is your responsibility to see that relevant supportive information has been included in the application. Guidelines for preparing the application are given in Section VII below.

- A. You may apply for promotion in any year you meet the minimum qualifications for the rank to which you seek promotion. If you do not meet the minimum qualifications, you may still apply, but in this case, you must request a waiver of one or more of the specified minimum qualifications. For the 2015-2016 review cycle, the deadline for all requests for waivers of minimum qualifications is **August 26, 2015**. The authority to approve waivers of minimal education requirements has been retained by the Chancellor; the authority to approve waivers of time in rank has been delegated to the Deans/Directors. By this date all requests recommended by the Department Chair and Dean/Director must be sent to the Mānoa Chancellor's Office, Hawai'i Hall 209.

- B. You may apply for promotion in the same year that you apply for tenure, provided that you meet the requirements outlined above.

### **III. Joint Appointments and Split Appointments**

If you are affiliated with and receive payment for your services from more than one unit, such as two departments or a department and a research institute, you have at least two responsibilities and must, in general, be assessed on your performance in these responsibilities. Page 1.1 of the application defines joint appointments and split appointments (only in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources). If you have either a joint or split appointment, make sure that page 1.1 is completed so that the reviewing bodies have an appreciation of your multiple responsibilities and give proper consideration to them.

If you have a joint appointment, then you must prepare duplicate applications and assure that each of the units or departments has a copy for review. You should give one copy of the application to the Department Chair, or equivalent, of your primary unit. If you have a joint appointment between two departments in the same College or School, then you should consult with the Dean/Director of the College or School involved and get a signed statement designating the primary unit without ambiguity. Correspondingly, if your appointment is between departments or organizations not in the same College, you should consult the Mānoa Chancellor's Office (Dr. Beverly A. McCreary, 956-9429 or [bmccrear@hawaii.edu](mailto:bmccrear@hawaii.edu)).

A second copy of your application should go to the secondary unit head at the same time. Each department or unit will then forward copies of your application through its chain of review and the results will be consolidated by the Dean/Director of the primary unit prior to submission to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

If you have an appointment in which one component is administration, then your application will be based only on your non-administrative activities. Due consideration will be given by reviewing bodies to the reduced time you have or have had for your professional activities, but your administrative duties and skills are not a substitute for these professional activities in your application for tenure/promotion.

### **IV. Criteria for Tenure: General Comments**

Article XII.G.1 of the *Agreement* provides that a faculty member applying for tenure in the final year of the normal probationary period shall have the option of being considered under the criteria contained in the *Criteria and Guidelines* distributed in the year of application or those contained in the *Criteria and Guidelines* distributed two years earlier. The campus criteria contained in these 2015-2016 *Criteria and Guidelines* are similar to those distributed for 2012-2013. There are changes to the dossier based on several faculty senate resolutions designed to simplify the tenure and promotion application. Please see Section VII.C for specific changes. Additionally, there are four other changes to the *Criteria and Guidelines* that took effect 2012-2013, one reflects a change in the *2015-2017 Agreement* (see page 15) and the other three provide clarification. The first provides language clarifying criteria for promotion to associate professor and researcher (pages 10-12); the second recommends articulation of authorship convention within the faculty member's field (pages 7-8 & 10); the third further

delineates the conflict of interest requirements for the external evaluators (page 19-21). You should determine with your Department Chair if departmental and/or college criteria have changed. If such criteria have changed, you would have the option of using the criteria distributed two years ago.

The general reasons for granting tenure are that the University has concluded that you are and will continue to be a productive and valuable member of your department, school/college, and campus, that your pattern of continuing professional growth is positive, and that the University anticipates a long-term need for your professional specialty and services. This is a matter of judgment, and there may be honest differences of opinion based on fair and thorough consideration of the evidence.

Because the granting of tenure involves a long-term commitment of the University's resources, the review process is essentially conservative. Unless there is a clear case for tenure, the practice is not to recommend tenure. The Board of Regents must approve all tenure recommendations.

In assessing the evidence for tenure, reviewers will assign the greatest weight to accomplishments and performance during the period since your initial hire at the University of Hawai'i and your pattern and rate of professional growth. In order to be awarded tenure in a given rank, a faculty member must meet the minimum qualifications, including the requirements for education and experience, in addition to any criteria which may be established by the University for that rank. If you do not meet the minimum qualifications, as specified in Executive Policy – Classification of Faculty, E5.221 (see Appendix A), you may still apply, but in this case, you must request a waiver of one or more of the specified minimum qualifications. For the 2015-2016 review cycle, the deadline for all requests for waivers of minimum qualifications is **August 26, 2015**. By this date all requests recommended by the Department Chair and Dean/Director must be sent to the Mānoa Chancellor's Office (attention: Dr. Beverly A. McCreary, Hawai'i Hall 209).

#### A. Tenure Criteria for Instructional Faculty (including Law and Clinical Medicine)

1. The University must have a present and long-term need for a faculty member with the particular combination of qualifications, expertise, and abilities possessed by the applicant for tenure.
2. The faculty member must have demonstrated a high level of competence as a teacher during the probationary period. In the rank of Assistant Professor, there should be evidence of increasing professional accomplishment as a teacher. For the Associate and full Professor ranks, there should be evidence of a mature level of performance and the versatility to contribute to all levels of the department's instructional program. In all cases, the evidence should include summaries of student evaluations, how your classes contribute to programmatic and institutional learning outcomes, or other objective assessments of a significant sample of the courses taught during the probationary period.

3. The faculty member must have demonstrated a level of scholarly achievement appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers active in the same discipline. The comparison peer group consists not only of departmental colleagues but also of the whole of the appropriate community of scholars active at major research universities. For the Assistant Professor seeking tenure as an Associate Professor, the applicant should be well on the way to becoming an established scholar in his or her discipline. The Associate Professor seeking tenure should be an established scholar whose scholarly contributions and recognition during the probationary period reflect this stature. The full Professor must be among the leaders in the scholarly discipline. In general, publication in a form that involves review by independent referees is of first importance in establishing scholarly achievement. Other means by which scholarly and creative contributions to the discipline are reviewed, utilized and evaluated by peers outside the University are also important. A more detailed listing of the criteria that will be used at each rank may be found in the promotion criteria (Part V) and the Executive Policy – Classification of Faculty, E5.221 (Appendix A).

Collaborative research and joint and shared publications may be the norm in some fields or disciplines. In such cases, departments should include a discussion of authorship conventions - including the significance of authorship order - in their policies and procedures used for tenure and promotion. If not, applicants in such fields or disciplines should provide Department Personnel Committees and Department Chairs with documentation that such is the norm to aid the review process. The significance of such work within the discipline or field should be described to assist the review. Both 1) the proportion of time among given tasks and functions in research and/or writing, and 2) the total proportion of time and effort in the research or publication should be described to aid the review process. Co-author or researcher concurrence or an independent report on such contributions is needed to aid in review.

4. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, and have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community.

#### B. Tenure Criteria for Research Faculty

1. The University must have a present and long-term need for a faculty member with the particular combination of qualifications, expertise, and abilities possessed by the applicant for tenure.
2. The faculty member must have demonstrated a level of research achievement and productivity appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers active in the same field. The comparison peer group consists not only of local colleagues but also of the whole of the appropriate research community active at major research centers. For the Assistant Researcher seeking tenure as an Associate Researcher, the faculty member should be well on the way to becoming an established

researcher in his or her field. The Associate Researcher seeking tenure should be an established researcher whose productivity during the probationary period reflects this stature. The full Researcher must be among the leaders in the research field. In general, publication of research results in a form that involves review by independent referees is of first importance in establishing research competence and productivity. A more detailed listing of the criteria that will be used at each rank may be found in the promotion criteria (Part V) and the Executive Policy – Classification of Faculty, E5.221 (Appendix A).

Collaborative research and joint and shared publications may be the norm in some fields or disciplines. In such cases, departments should include a discussion of authorship conventions - including the significance of authorship order - in their policies and procedures used for tenure and promotion. If not, applicants in such fields or disciplines should provide Department Personnel Committees and Department Chairs with documentation that such is the norm to aid the review process. The significance of such work within the discipline or field should be described to assist the review. Both 1) the proportion of time among given tasks and functions in research and/or writing, and 2) the total proportion of time and effort in the research or publication should be described to aid the review process. Co-author or researcher concurrence or an independent report on such contributions is needed to aid in review.

3. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, and have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community.

#### C. Tenure Criteria for Specialist and Librarian Faculty

1. The University must have a present and long-term need for a faculty member with the particular combination of qualifications, expertise, and abilities possessed by the applicant for tenure.
2. The faculty member must have demonstrated a level of professional achievement and productivity in the field of specialization appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers active in the same field. The comparison peer group consists not only of local colleagues but also of the whole of the appropriate professional community active at major institutions of higher education. At the ranks of Junior and Assistant Specialist and Librarian II and III, the applicant should demonstrate clear evidence of professional growth in the specialty. The Associate Specialist and Librarian IV seeking tenure should be an established contributor to the standards, techniques, and methodology of the profession. The full Specialist and Librarian V must show evidence of interaction with the broader professional community beyond the University of Hawai'i and have made significant contributions to the standards, techniques, and methodology of the profession. For the senior ranks, there should be evidence of a high level of professional maturity and the capacity to assume responsibilities calling for the extensive exercise of independent judgment. A



more detailed listing of the criteria that will be used at each rank may be found in the promotion criteria (Part V) and the statement of minimum qualifications (Appendix A).

3. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community, and have demonstrated the ability to work effectively with faculty, staff, and administrators as necessary.

#### D. Tenure Criteria for Extension Agent Faculty

1. The University must have a present and long-term need for a faculty member with the particular combination of qualifications, expertise, and abilities possessed by the applicant for tenure.
2. The faculty member must have demonstrated a level of professional achievement and productivity in extension service appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers active in extension. The comparison peer group consists not only of local colleagues but also of the whole of the community of extension professionals active in major extension service programs nationwide. At the ranks of Junior and Assistant Extension Agent, the applicant should demonstrate clear evidence of professional growth. The Associate Extension Agent seeking tenure should provide evidence of interaction with the nationwide extension profession and of contributions to extension as a profession. The full Extension Agent should provide evidence of significant interaction with the nationwide extension profession and of substantial contributions to extension as a profession. A more detailed listing of the criteria that will be used at each rank may be found in the promotion criteria (Part V) and the Executive Policy – Classification of Faculty, E5.221 (Appendix A).
3. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, and have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community. The faculty member should have rendered other services to the community as appropriate and have shown an ability to work effectively in an integrated extension program.

#### V. **Criteria for Promotion: General Comments**

In order to be considered for promotion, an applicant must meet the minimum qualifications established by the Board of Regents for the rank to which promotion is sought. The applicant must also meet additional criteria which may be established by the department/unit, school/college and campus. The mere satisfaction of minimum qualifications does not guarantee promotion, nor is promotion granted to recognize “satisfactory” service on the part of a faculty member. Instead, promotion represents important transitions in the faculty member’s professional growth, development, and status. In general, competent or even superior performance in one area of activity or responsibility is not sufficient to justify promotion. It is

expected that an applicant will demonstrate the level of academic achievement and reputation that is commensurate with the rank sought as found at major research universities in the United States. The exact stage of a faculty member's career at which promotion is merited is a matter of judgment, and there may be honest differences of opinion based on fair and thorough consideration of the evidence.

Collaborative research and joint and shared publications may be the norm in some fields or disciplines. In such cases, departments should include a discussion of authorship conventions - including the significance of authorship order - in their policies and procedures used for tenure and promotion. If not, applicants in such fields or disciplines should provide Department Personnel Committees and Department Chairs with documentation that such is the norm to aid the review process. The significance of such work within the discipline or field should be described to assist the review. Both 1) the proportion of time among given tasks and functions in research and/or writing, and 2) the total proportion of time and effort in the research or publication should be described to aid the review process. Co-author or researcher concurrence or an independent report on such contributions is needed to aid in review.

The granting of promotion has implications for the University's standards and its standing in the academic community. Therefore, the review process is essentially conservative. Unless there is a clear case for promotion, the practice is not to recommend promotion to the Board of Regents. In the case of promotion to Rank 3, the final decision has been delegated to the President by the Board of Regents.

In assessing the evidence for promotion, reviewers will assign the greatest weight to accomplishments and performance during the period since the last promotion, or since initial hire at the University of Hawai'i if you have not been previously promoted during your service here.

#### A. Promotion Criteria for Instructional Faculty (including Law and Clinical Medicine)

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate in the relevant field or other appropriate terminal degree is required. The faculty member must provide evidence of competence and increasing professional maturity as a teacher. This evidence should include summaries of student evaluations, how your classes contribute to programmatic and institutional learning outcomes, or other objective assessments of a significant sample of the courses taught while in the rank of Instructor. There must be evidence of scholarly research and contribution to scholarship or other related creative activity which shows scholarly ability, accomplishment and promise.
2. Promotion to Associate Professor. The faculty member must provide evidence of a mature level of performance as a teacher and the versatility to contribute to all levels of the department's instructional program. This evidence should include summaries of student evaluations, how your classes contribute to programmatic and institutional learning outcomes, or other objective assessments of a significant sample of the courses taught while in the rank of Assistant Professor. The Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor should be well on the way to becoming an established

scholar in his or her discipline. The comparison peer group consists not only of departmental colleagues, but the whole of the community of scholars active at major research universities. In general, publications and other creative activities of a type that permit review by independent referees are of first importance in establishing scholarly achievement. Other means by which scholarly and creative contribution to the discipline are reviewed, utilized and evaluated by peers outside the University are also important. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees and should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community.

3. Promotion to Professor. The faculty member must provide evidence of a mature level of performance and achievement as a teacher and the versatility to contribute to all levels of the department's instructional program. This evidence should include summaries of student evaluations, how your classes contribute to programmatic and institutional learning outcomes, or other objective assessments of a significant sample of the courses taught while in the rank of Associate Professor. The significance and distinction of the scholarly achievement should clearly place the faculty member at the forefront of the discipline or field. In general, publication in the major journals and presses in the field is of first importance in establishing this level of scholarly achievement. Funded research grants and other means by which scholarly and creative contribution to the discipline are reviewed, utilized and evaluated by peers outside the University are also important. The faculty member should be a leader in the academic affairs of the University, should have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community, and should have shown significant accomplishment in the profession and the appropriate discipline.

#### B. Promotion Criteria for Research Faculty

1. Promotion to Assistant Researcher. An earned doctorate in the relevant field or other appropriate terminal degree is required. The faculty member must provide evidence of competence and increasing professional maturity in the performance of professional and scientific work in the field of research indicated by the title of the class. There must be evidence of ability and promise in independent professional and scientific research documented by independent research activities, publications and contributions to scholarship.
2. Promotion to Associate Researcher. The faculty member seeking promotion to Associate Researcher should be well on the way to becoming an established scholar in his or her discipline in comparison with peers active in the same area of research. The comparison peer group consists not only of departmental colleagues, but the whole of the community of scholars active at major research centers. Publication in a form that involves review by independent referees is of first importance in establishing research achievement. Other means by which scholarly and creative research contributions to the discipline are reviewed, utilized and evaluated by peers outside the University are also important. The faculty member must provide evidence of independent ability to

plan and organize funded research activities, including effective interactions with students and assistants as appropriate. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, and have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community.

3. Promotion to Researcher. The faculty member must demonstrate a level of research achievement and productivity which establishes stature among the leaders in the relevant research field or sub-field. This leadership position is not only with respect to departmental colleagues, but the international community of scholars active at major research centers. Publications and funded research grants that involve review by independent referees are of first importance in establishing research achievement. Other means by which research contributions to the discipline are reviewed, utilized and evaluated by peers outside the University are also important. The faculty member should have participated in the academic affairs of the University, such as through service on appropriate faculty committees, and have shown a willingness to use professional competence in the service of the profession and the general community.

#### C. Promotion Criteria for Specialist Faculty

1. Promotion to Assistant Specialist. The faculty member must provide evidence of competence, productivity and increasing professional achievement and maturity in the performance of assigned duties. Training represented by a Master's degree and 30 credits of graduate study beyond the Master's from a college or university of recognized standing with major work in a field closely related to the position involved is required. There should be evidence of ability to perform duties calling for independent professional judgment in the field of specialization, evidence of productivity and an indication of the capacity to supervise clerical help and at least three years previous experience at the next lower rank or equivalent.
2. Promotion to Associate Specialist. The faculty member must provide evidence of increasing professional maturity in the professional specialization and in the performance of duties in the rank of Assistant Specialist, including evidence of the ability to exercise independent professional judgment competently in the field of specialization. Training represented by a doctorate from a college or university of recognized standing with major course work and dissertation in a relevant field is required. At least four years of experience in the appropriate specialty in the next lower rank or equivalent are required. The faculty member must demonstrate the ability to plan and organize assigned activities and to supervise the work of assistants, if appropriate. The faculty member must demonstrate a level of professional achievement which reflects his or her stature as a contributor to the standards, techniques and methodology of the profession in comparison with peers active in the same field. The comparison peer group consists not only of local colleagues but the whole of the professional community active at major institutions of higher education. In general, contributions of such a nature as to permit critical review and facilitate use by other professionals are of first importance in establishing professional achievement. There

must be evidence of interaction with the broader professional community beyond the University of Hawai‘i.

3. Promotion to Specialist. The faculty member must provide evidence of increasing productivity and professional maturity in the performance of duties in the rank of Associate Specialist, including evidence of the competent exercise of independent professional judgment in the field of specialization. Training represented by a doctorate from a college or university of recognized standing with major course work and dissertation in a relevant field is required. At least four years of experience in the appropriate specialty in the next lower rank or equivalent are required. The faculty member must provide evidence of successful planning and organization of assigned activities, including the supervision of assistants, if appropriate. The faculty member must demonstrate a level of professional achievement which establishes his or her stature as a substantial contributor to the standards, techniques and methodology of the profession. This stature is not only with respect to local colleagues, but the whole of the professional community active at major institutions of higher education. In general, contributions of such a nature as to permit critical review and facilitate use by other professionals are of first importance in establishing professional achievement. There must also be evidence of significant interaction and leadership with the broader professional community beyond the University.

#### D. Promotion Criteria for Librarian Faculty

1. Promotion to Librarian III. The Librarian must provide evidence of competence, productivity and increasing professional achievement and maturity in the performance of assigned duties. Training represented by a Master’s degree in Library or Information Science and in addition to the Master’s degree, 24 post-baccalaureate credits of academic study, and at least three years of appropriate experience is required. There should be evidence of ability to perform duties calling for independent judgment as well as evidence of initiative, analytical and problem-solving ability and familiarity with departmental functions, library-wide goals and University programs. The Librarian should demonstrate awareness of current professional literature and development.
2. Promotion to Librarian IV. The Librarian must provide evidence of increasing professional maturity in the professional specialization and in the performance of duties in the rank of Librarian III, including evidence of the ability to exercise independent professional judgment. Training represented by two Master’s degrees is required: one in Library or Information Science, and one in a specialized subject area. Seven years of appropriate experience or four years in the rank of Librarian III are also required. The Librarian should show ability to anticipate and recommend changes in accordance with the changing needs of the Library and University as a whole and should also exhibit independence and creativity in the provision of service and/or program development or evaluation. The Librarian should demonstrate participation in academic or professional activities within the University and beyond. If managerial or supervisory responsibilities are an aspect of the Librarian’s assigned position or function, there should be demonstration of maturing competence in this area.

3. Promotion to Librarian V. The Librarian must provide evidence of increasing productivity and professional maturity in the performance of duties in the rank of Librarian IV including evidence of the competent exercise of independent professional judgment. Training represented by two Master's degrees is required: one in Library or Information Science and one in a specialized subject area. The Librarian also must have 12 years of appropriate experience or four years in the rank of Librarian IV. The Librarian must demonstrate academic and professional leadership, functioning in responsible positions in academic and professional affairs. The comparison group consists not only of local colleagues, but the whole of the professional community active at major institutions of higher education. Leadership can be at the state or national level and may be demonstrated by contributions to the field through activities such as publication, committee work, presentation of papers, etc. In general, contributions should be of such a nature as to permit critical assessment and to facilitate use by the population the Library serves. If supervisory or managerial responsibilities are an aspect of the Librarian's assigned position or function, there should be demonstration of mature competence and effectiveness in this area.

#### E. Promotion Criteria for Extension Agent Faculty

1. Promotion to Assistant Extension Agent. A Master's degree from a college or university of recognized standing, with major work in agriculture, home economics, marine science, resource management or a related field, as appropriate, or, in addition to the Bachelor's degree, 30 credits of post-baccalaureate academic work in a field appropriate to the individual's job is normally required. Three years of successful experience in Cooperative Extension work, Sea Grant Extension work, or equivalent in closely related fields are required. The faculty member must provide evidence of competence, productivity and increasing professional maturity in the performance of assigned extension activities. In addition, there should be evidence of ability to perform duties calling for independent professional judgment, and of the capacity to assume responsibility for the development of an extension program. The faculty member must have shown an ability to work effectively with other agents in an integrated extension system.
2. Promotion to Associate Extension Agent. A Master's degree from a college or university of recognized standing in agriculture, home economics, marine science, resource management or a related field, whichever is appropriate; in addition to the Master's, 15 credit hours of post-baccalaureate academic work in an appropriate field; at least four years experience as an Extension faculty member or its equivalent in related fields in the next lower rank is required. The faculty member must provide evidence of increasing productivity and professional maturity in the performance of extension activities in the rank of Assistant Extension Agent. There must be evidence of a high level of leadership ability, including the capacity to develop leadership in others. The faculty member must demonstrate the successful administration of a well-organized extension program and the capacity to work effectively with agents in other jurisdictions and with related public agencies. There must be evidence of interaction

with the profession and of contributions to the appropriate subject matter discipline or to extension as a profession.

3. Promotion to Extension Agent. A Master's degree from a college or university of recognized standing with major work in agriculture, home economics, marine science, resource management or a related field, whichever is appropriate; in addition to the Master's degree, 30 credit hours of post-baccalaureate academic work beyond the Master's degree in an appropriate field; and at least four years of experience as an Extension faculty member or similar and equivalent work in the next lower rank are required. The faculty member must provide evidence of continued professional growth as an Associate Extension Agent. There must be evidence of exceptional leadership ability and success in a position with significant program or administrative responsibilities covering major subject areas or large geographic areas. The faculty member must provide evidence of ability to perceive and implement broad educational programs relevant to community needs, and the capacity to work harmoniously with agents in other jurisdictions and with other governmental agencies in an integrated extension program. There must be evidence of significant interaction and leadership with the nationwide extension profession, and of substantial contributions to the appropriate subject matter discipline or to extension as a profession.

## VI. The Tenure/Promotion Review Process

The procedures for review of your application for tenure/promotion are given in detail in Article XII, and Article XIV of the *2015-2017 UHPA/UH Agreement*. In summary, you should complete your application in accordance with the guidelines in Section VII as described below and submit it by **October 2, 2015**.

- A. The application for tenure/promotion must be submitted to the Department Chair. He/she and the Department Personnel Committee will make written assessments of your strengths and weaknesses, append recommendations if they so desire, and transmit the dossier to the Dean/Director.
- B. The Dean/Director will make his or her independent assessment and recommendation and transmit the dossier to a Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) which has been appointed to review your case.
- C. The TPRC "shall review the dossier and make a recommendation, then return it to the Dean/Director for consideration and transmission to the Chancellor."<sup>1</sup>
- D. Faculty Members will be notified of the TPRC's recommendation after it has been received by the Mānoa Chancellor's Office.

---

<sup>1</sup> From *2015-2017 Agreement between the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i*, Article XII.G.2.F.

- E. If, after the TPRC review, the dossier contains only positive recommendations, the dossier will be transmitted to the Mānoa Chancellor for review. If the Chancellor's assessment is positive, a recommendation for tenure/promotion will be made to the President and to the Board of Regents.
- F. If, after the TPRC review, the dossier contains a negative recommendation, you will be permitted to examine the dossier and to submit written comments and additional materials. If the negative recommendation occurred at the TPRC, the dossier will be returned to the same TPRC for a second review. The dossier will then be forwarded to the Mānoa Chancellor who will make an independent assessment of the application, reviewing all materials, including any additional materials that may have been submitted in accordance with the procedure described. If the negative review did not occur at the TPRC, then the additional materials will be forwarded directly to the Mānoa Chancellor. The Mānoa Chancellor will then decide to either recommend tenure/promotion or deny tenure/promotion. If the latter, you will be so notified and permitted to examine the dossier and meet with the Mānoa Chancellor, if you desire.
- G. If you are denied tenure, the options available to you are explained in Article XII.H of the *2015-2017 UHPA/UH Agreement*.
- H. If you are denied promotion, under certain circumstances, as specified in Article XIV.D of the *2015-2017 UHPA/UH Agreement*, you may request a further review.

## VII. Guidelines for Preparing the Application

The tenure/promotion application is the means by which you convince those involved in the review process of your achievements and ability. Therefore, you should document your accomplishments with as much objective evidence as possible. The sections below indicate some of the kinds of evidence that are of particular value to the reviewers. If you include letters of support from colleagues, students, or others as part of your application, it is wise to select those that evaluate specific contributions or achievements rather than those which simply express support for your case. The reviewers of your application are charged with making an independent assessment of your record, and specific information and evaluation by peers is more useful for this purpose than general statements or opinions. Inclusion of testimonials that do not provide specific substantive support may detract from the effectiveness of your presentation.

You are required to complete Parts I, II, III and IV of the application form. If you have questions about Parts I, II or III, your Department Chair will be able to assist you. Some guidelines for completing Part IV are as follows:

- A. Pagination. Be sure that every page of material you submit has a page number, starting with 4.2 and proceeding sequentially. **Please type or use labels to put your legal on the upper right hand corner of each page you submit (Last, First M.I.)**. To guard against the loss of any material, enter the number of the last page submitted in the appropriate space on page 4.1 of the application.



- B. Language. The Constitution of the State of Hawai‘i identifies two official languages in the State, English and Hawaiian (Ōlelo Hawai‘i). Please indicate the language in which you are submitting your dossier on page 2.1.
- C. Statement of endeavors. (Recommended length: 1-9 pages, 12 point) You are required to give a well-documented and clear report of your teaching, research and service activities and achievements since the last promotion or since initial hire, whichever is appropriate. This report should be more than a list of activities. Where appropriate, an analysis of the quality and value of your research, a statement of your instructional philosophy and a statement about the impact of your professional service will be expected. You can provide a statement about the unique aspects and special significance of your accomplishments and future plans in teaching, research and/or service. Discussions of departmental/University service and community service are in Sections D.4 and D.6 below. Please read these in order to fully understand the weight given to these activities in comparison with research and teaching.
- D. Supporting materials. Appropriate supporting materials depend on your faculty classification. Faculty in the Instructional classification must submit documented evidence of teaching accomplishments, as suggested in Section D.1, “Teaching,” outlined below.

For both Instructional and Research faculty, a bibliography or other objective record of scholarly work is essential. Section D.2, “Bibliography,” below gives the format you should use in compiling your bibliography. Faculty in fields such as the fine arts may substitute a list of shows, performances, etc., in lieu of a bibliography. Professional reviews of your work by peers not associated with University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UH Mānoa) are important and should be included if available.

1. Teaching. If you are in the Instructional classification, you must have documented evidence of your teaching ability and of your contributions to the curriculum.
  - a) Teaching ability is usually documented by means of teaching evaluations. These should reflect a representative sample of all of the courses you have taught in recent years. You should include coverage of all the recent courses you have taught which used the standard evaluation procedures adopted by your department, college or school. Special recognition by awards or citations for excellence in teaching should be recorded. Evidence of progress over the years in the scope, depth and effectiveness of your teaching may be helpful to reviewers in evaluating your maturity as an instructor.
  - b) Contributions to the curriculum may be documented by materials from courses you have helped to create or modify; materials from classes you have taught as writing intensive, as part of the honors program, or to serve special needs; and evidence of innovations in teaching or teacher training, including the development of textbooks and innovation in the publication of educational materials (e.g., electronic publication, CD ROMs, etc).

2. Bibliography. Your bibliography provides an invaluable objective record of your scholarly activity. The format which should be used is as follows:
- a) Separate your published works, conference presentations and manuscripts into appropriate groupings. The following categories may be adapted to your discipline. Additional categories may be created as necessary.
    - Books of original scholarship—author/co-author
    - Chapters in books
    - Edited volumes
    - Textbooks
    - Articles in international or national refereed journals
    - Articles in other periodicals
    - Unpublished work, accepted for publication (with documentation: submitted, conditionally accepted, in press, etc.)
    - Internal reports and other unpublished work
    - Invited conference presentations
    - Refereed conference contributions
    - Departmental seminars
    - Published abstracts
    - Other scholarly products (such as major software, video or film)
    - Grants (indicate funded, approved but not funded, submitted but not approved, etc.)
  - b) Within each category, list your works in order of publication or completion, with the most recent works first. Make a clear division between work published or completed since your last promotion (or initial hire if you have not previously been promoted at the University of Hawai‘i) and earlier work.
  - c) For each item, give complete citation. An entry for a published article, for example, should include all the authors as listed in order by the journal, complete title, volume, year and pagination.
  - d) Make a clear distinction between works for which you were an author and those for which you were an editor.
  - e) For all jointly authored and edited works, you must indicate your estimate of the extent of your contributions.
  - f) Faculty in disciplines such as the fine arts, music, drama, etc., should provide a complete listing of exhibitions, performances or other appropriate presentations of their creative work. A clear division should be made between presentations since your last promotion (or initial hire if you have not previously been promoted here) and earlier ones. Complete information as to the nature of each presentation, place, dates, etc., should be provided.

3. Peer evaluations of contributions. You should include all relevant external reviews of your published work or creative productions. These include published reviews, grant reviewers' comments, letters to the editor, readers' comments of manuscripts submitted for publication and unsolicited letters from peers in response to publication of your work.
  4. University service. Your statement concerning service on departmental committees or special projects should be included in the narrative. Academic service activities may include (but are not limited to): participation in faculty governance by membership in standing and ad hoc organizations, committees and task forces at the college/school and/or university levels, activities contributing to the improvement of teacher education, etc.
  5. Professional service. You should include activities related to service to your discipline and professional organizations. Professional service activities may include (but are not limited to): serving as an officer in a professional organization, editing a professional publication, organizing conferences/workshops, creating discipline-related instructional models and resource materials for use in K-12 education, etc.
  6. Community service. Public service that is related to your profession is considered a positive factor in reviewing faculty for promotion. Still, for Instructional and Research faculty, the lack of professional public service accomplishments (unlike University service) is not detrimental to advancement—a recognition that the opportunity for such work in some fields is quite limited. Public service is not a substitute for research and teaching achievements. It is complementary to these other types of activities for Instructional and Research faculty. Public service (as other faculty achievements) should be documented, including an assessment of quality and impact. In sum, public service is a generally marginal but sometimes significant factor in the advancement of UH Mānoa faculty. While not weighted equally with research and teaching, meritorious public service activities—if linked closely to the other two areas—can have a favorable impact on tenure and promotion decisions.
- E. Solicitation of external evaluations by Department Chair, Chair of Department Personnel Committee, or Dean/Director. Departments should seek external evaluations of each applicant's work. An evaluator should be at, or above the rank aspired to by the applicant. External evaluators should be professionally capable to assess the applicant's work objectively and comment on its significance in the discipline.

Normally, the applicant is asked to provide in writing three to five names and addresses of respected scholars in related fields who are not at the University of Hawai'i, Mānoa. Applicants should not contact possible external evaluators. It is the obligation of the Department to secure external evaluations. It is recommended that the Department Chair, in consultation with the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee, should secure letters from 2-3 of these people and a comparable number of letters from known scholars proposed by the Department who can evaluate the applicant's work.

Approximately the same cover letter soliciting the evaluation should be sent to each evaluator. The Department Chair should keep a copy of each letter. A curriculum vita will be included with the letter and if possible copies of reprints of the applicant's major publications, if practical. The purpose of the request is to obtain an opinion about the scholarly contributions which the applicant has made and not to determine whether or not the applicant would receive tenure/promotion at another institution.

The confidentiality of such evaluations is of great concern. The following paragraphs should be included in the letter to external evaluators:

Your review of Professor\_\_\_\_\_ is for the sole purpose of helping the faculty and administration of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa to evaluate this faculty member for promotion and/or tenure (use appropriate phase). Your identity as a confidential referee will not be shared with this applicant and we will do our best to maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation.

The faculty and administration of the University of Hawai'i greatly appreciate your willingness and efforts in evaluating and commenting on the work of this faculty member.

When the external evaluations arrive in the departmental office, necessary steps should be taken to ensure that the evaluation is kept confidential. The procedure for handling the evaluation should include the following:

1. Mark the letter "Confidential" as soon as it arrives. Do not show the letter to the applicant at any time.
2. Make seven (7) copies of the letter and assemble eight (8) sets of confidential letters (original + 7 copies). One set of confidential letters should be included with each copy of the dossier.
3. Place the confidential letters in eight (8) manila envelopes marked "CONFIDENTIAL" and with the applicant's name. Include inside each envelope a listing of the reviewers, their institutional and disciplinary affiliations and whether they came from the candidate's or the department's list. Also include a copy of the letter sent to external reviewers.
4. On page 5.2, Department Assessment (Section E, Confidential Letters of Evaluation), indicate the number of confidential letters solicited by the department and the number of confidential letters received by the department. Do not list the authors of the confidential letters in this section.
5. In **Summer 2016**, when the final decisions are announced, a brief letter should be sent to each of the external reviewers informing them of the disposition of the case and

thanking them once again for their efforts on behalf of the department, the college, and the UH Mānoa. In the case of a negative decision, departments must confirm with the Mānoa Chancellor's Office that any appeal has been resolved prior to contacting the reviewers.

F. Compiling dossiers.

- Each appended page should be numbered at the bottom center and have the applicant's full name (Last, First M.I.) at the top right corner; labels may be utilized for names and page numbers.
- The margins for each appended page should be wide enough to ensure that no part of the text is obscured when the dossier is bound.
- Dossiers should be bound in a manila file folder or three-ring binder.
- Fasten at the left side of the page with a prong paper fastener. Set the two-hole punch at 11" for the pages and 12" for the manila folder. **If using manila folders, please make sure that the fastener opens at the back of the folder.**
- Label the original dossier as "Original" and number it "Copy 1". Number the subsequent copies "2" through "8".
- Place a file label with the applicant's full name, college/unit, department, and copy number on the manila file folder tab, or the front of the three-ring binder.
- When using a three-ring binder the dossiers may be printed double-sided.
- Confidential letters in their own manila envelope should be included in the folder (but not attached) by the Department Chair.

Special instructions for Specialists, Librarian, and Extension Agent faculty and Instructional and Research faculty at Rank 4 who may apply in two categories simultaneously. Faculty who are Specialists (S), Librarians (B) or Extension Agents (A) may receive tenure at ranks 2 and 3 without being promoted. Specialist, Librarian, and Agent faculty members who wish to be considered for tenure with promotion to the next rank may use a single application for these two options. **Please note – these actions require a separate vote for tenure and a separate vote for promotion by each level of review.** For example, faculty with S, B, or A classifications may complete the top of page 1.1 of the application form as follows:

X Tenure only at \_\_\_\_\_ (indicate current rank)  
(Rank)

X Tenure and Promotion to \_\_\_\_\_

(Rank)

Thus, if the faculty member is recommended for tenure but is not recommended for promotion, the faculty member will still be awarded tenure at his/her current rank.

In the event that an applicant receives tenure but is denied promotion, he/she is eligible for the remedies for denial of promotion (see Article XIV.D-J). In the event that tenure is also denied, the applicant may elect the remedies in Article XII.H.