ASHE

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Re-Centering the Importance of Service in Academia: A Collective Responsibility

A Report by the 2024 Presidential Commission on Service

About ASHE

ASHE is a scholarly society with 2,000 members dedicated to higher education as a field of study. It is committed to diversity in its programs and membership, and has enjoyed extraordinary success in involving graduate students in Association activities. The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) promotes collaboration among its members and others engaged in the study of higher education through research, conferences, and publications, including its highly regarded journal, The Review of Higher Education. ASHE values rigorous scholarly approaches to the study of higher education and practical applications of systemic inquiry. Through its peer-reviewed publications, annual conference sessions, presidential invited sessions, and other intellectual and professional fora, the Association for the Study of Higher Education promotes scholarly discourse and debate about important issues and ideas, questions, problems, and possibilities in the study of higher education. Learn more at www.ashe.ws.

About the ASHE 2024 Presidential Commission on Service

Building upon the ASHE 2024 Theme, "I Am A Scholar," ASHE's strategic goals of living our values, building organizational capacity, and engaging and supporting all higher education scholars, the group was charged with drafting a report that responds to the following questions: How is service an act of scholarship? How do we sustain a largely service/volunteer-led organization with complicated conceptualizations of service? In addition, the group also hosted a Presidential Session at the ASHE 2024 conference to engage membership with this topic.

The Presidential Commission included:

- Margaret W. Sallee, University at Buffalo (co-chair)
- LaShawn Faith Washington, The University of Texas–Austin (co-chair)
- Timothy R. Cain, University of Georgia
- Katherine Cho, Loyola University Chicago
- Tamara Bertrand Jones, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
- David Nguyen, Ohio University
- Hannah Reyes, The Ohio State University
- M. Yvonne Taylor, Northwest Education Access

Executive Summary

Faculty service—whether to departments, institutions, disciplines, or communities—is an essential yet undervalued pillar of academic life. While research and teaching often receive recognition in tenure and promotion, service labor is inconsistently rewarded and unevenly distributed. This report from the ASHE Presidential Commission on Service calls attention to the urgent need to reconceptualize service as critical to the success and sustainability of higher education.

Our review highlights persistent inequities in who performs service. Women and faculty of color disproportionately shoulder identity-based and "care" service, often without recognition or advancement opportunities. Graduate Students and VITAL faculty (visitors, instructors, adjuncts, lecturers, and other non-tenure-line faculty) face inconsistent opportunities and protections around service, with their contributions often overlooked. These inequities contribute to stress, stalled careers, and diminished retention while simultaneously eroding collegiality and institutional ethos.

Service extends across multiple spheres:

- Departments and Programs: mentoring, admissions, curriculum, and committee work.
- Colleges, Schools, and Universities: governance, strategic planning, and leadership roles.
- Fields and Disciplines: service to professional associations and editorial boards.
- Local Communities: public scholarship, civic engagement, and partnerships.

To support meaningful and equitable service, we recommend actions including:

- clarifying expectations
- formally recognizing service contributions
- creating differentiated service plans
- recognizing community engagement in tenure and promotion
- diversifying editorial boards and leadership roles.

Service sustains the academy. If undervalued, institutions risk overburdening marginalized faculty and diminishing collective governance. We call on ASHE members and higher education leaders to re-center service as a shared responsibility vital to advancing equity, supporting students, and protecting the future of higher education.

Table of Contents

Suggested APA Citation: Sallee, M.W., Washington, L. F., Cain, T. R., Cho, K., Bertrand Jones, T., Nguyen, D., Reyes, H. Taylor, M.Y. (2025). *Re-centering the Importance of Service in Academia: A Collective Responsibility.* Association for the Study of Higher Education. www.ashe.ws/reports

Introduction

Faculty members and other academic employees are typically required to split their time between research, teaching, and service. Indeed, many faculty, both tenure-line and not, work at institutions where they are expected to allot a specific percentage of time to each of these roles, thus signaling their value at the particular institution and to the field broadly speaking. Different types of institutions are more likely to reward particular responsibilities; research universities, for example, typically privilege research production while liberal arts colleges expect their faculty to prioritize their roles as teachers. Whither service? Despite service being an important component of faculty work, rarely is it truly valued—and instead some populations may feel that they engage in more service than their counterparts while others opt out entirely.

Some faculty choose to spend their time engaged in one particular type of service; some might be significantly invested in engaging with their campus communities, others might perform service by engaging with their surrounding communities, while still others may prefer to concentrate their efforts in service to the profession, by serving as editorial board members for journals or being active in their professional associations. Of course, as Gouldner (1958) wrote almost 75 years ago, there are different levels of prestige assigned with each type of engagement. He referred to those who engage more with their local campuses as "locals" and those who engaged more with their professional associations as "cosmopolitans". As he argued, cosmopolitans often hold less allegiance to their individual campus and align themselves more with their colleagues across institutions while locals tend to invest their time in their communities. We argue here that both types of service are important—but that no one should concentrate their efforts solely in one area.

As we lay forth in this document, we know that some populations are more likely to engage in service than others (Griffin et al., 2011; O'Meara et al., 2017). For instance, O'Meara and colleagues (2017) found that associate professors were spending more time engaged in service and women faculty received more requests to perform both professional and campus service. Particularly since the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a decline in academics accepting service requests, and an increase in those from marginalized communities being overtaxed and stretched thinner because of their heavy service obligations. Scholars who identify as women and/or racially marginalized experience intersectional expectations to perform service, and perform more of the informal care service that is not rewarded (Harley, 2008). In other words, due to their positionalities and intersectionalities (e.g., intersections of race, gender, or class) (Crenshaw, 1988), some scholars experience additional service requests and obligations

to perform service. These intersectional service expectations place an additional burden on historically marginalized students and pre-tenure faculty members and can put them into precarious situations where they feel less inclined to opt-out of conducting service because they are more vulnerable than their higher-ranking tenured peers. Faculty of color often engage in more identity-based service, either as mentors for students of color or are sought out to ensure diverse committee representation (Wood et al., 2016). Baez (2000) suggested that faculty of color sometimes engage in race-related service in order to reduce the isolation that comes with being marginalized in the academy.

The majority of faculty—those without the protections of tenure or the ability to earn it—are crucial to these considerations as their experiences and satisfaction can be shaped by opportunities for and expectations of service work. VITAL faculty [a term coined by Levy (2019) to indicate "visitors, instructors, TAs, adjunct, and lecturers," though "temporary" now commonly replaces "TAs"] perform numerous roles on college and university campuses in positions that can look either very similar to tenure-line positions or extremely different; they might center on only one part of the formerly bundled faculty role (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015). The substantial variety in VITAL appointments makes fully considering their service roles challenging and more work is needed on the topic, but both existing research and numerous scholarly essays emphasize that the ability to participate in department and institutional roles can be important both for VITAL faculty and for their institutions.

Service can often be unrewarded and unacknowledged—but it is also so very critical to the functioning of the academy. If faculty opt out of service, they leave others to pick up the slack—or administrators to make decisions on behalf of the faculty. Neither outcome is reflective of an academy that should be designed to support one another. With the current presidential administration, defending the pillar of intellectual freedom, and the future of academia writ large will require multiple voices to be engaged in countless ways. Here, we argue that it is even more critical that faculty are aware of their obligations to engage in service—to the university, the profession, and the community.

Service can be multifaceted and overlapping at times. Therefore, in this report we have categorized service into the four following areas: *Department and Program; College, School, and University; Field and Discipline; and Local Community*. Each area engages with relevant literature and is followed by a set of recommendations and calls-to-action that can assist in reconceptualizing and galvanizing the importance of conducting service in our respective areas of influence. We urge the ASHE community to share this

document with their colleagues and institutional leaders and to utilize its knowledge and recommendations in efforts to support researchers, students, and faculty, as well as in reviews for tenure and promotion, annual evaluations, and service-oriented awards and recognitions.

Service to the Department or Program

Nested Russian dolls offer a visual metaphor for faculty engagement in academia and beyond. Each doll represents a different level, or context, in which faculty engage by both contributing to and receiving from each context. The different levels—program, department, college, university, community, and discipline—maintain various norms, values, and actors that set the tone for what is expected and accepted in each level. While some levels are directly affected by what occurs at other levels, the community and disciplinary contexts include local, state, regional, national, and international levels each with their own symbiotic relationships. Likewise, at times, faculty commitments in these contexts outside of the department have implications for service appointments within the department. Thus, in this section, we focus on program and department service engagement. First, we identify the different types of faculty service at the department level and describe who is engaging in these activities, including highlighting inequities in service participation amongst different groups. We conclude by outlining the tensions within these inequities in service workload and identify potential consequences of these patterns for individual faculty and departments.

Faculty engagement in service is a critical element in the success of the academy. In fact, institutions and disciplines require faculty engagement in service at various levels to both function and propagate. Key to understanding faculty engagement in service is acknowledging the time spent on and type of service in which faculty engage. Institutions often assign a portion of faculty time for service engagements signaling its importance and expressed expectations of faculty contributions. Frequently, however, the time allotted by both institutions and faculty often does not align with the amount of time actually spent. Service engagement benefits institutions by providing faculty labor for critical departmental functions such as admitting and mentoring students (Carter & Craig, 2022). Moreover, faculty also lead and staff core committees that facilitate promotion and tenure reviews, curriculum reviews, recruitment, hiring, and supporting departmental leadership.

Although departments and institutions benefit from faculty service, this labor provides many benefits for the individual faculty members, including visibility and power (Carter

& Craig, 2022). Faculty service activities provide different levels of exposure depending on the location of the service (i.e., internal or external to the university), entity requesting the service, and the implications of the service outcomes. Scholars have found gender or racial differences in participation on committees (Guario & Borden, 2017) and instances where faculty hoard certain activities because of the recognition associated with or effort expended on assignments (O'Meara et al, 2020), thus contributing to inequities in who can benefit from what service activities. While faculty service undoubtedly can benefit both the department and the faculty member, the negative side of service is largely experienced by individual faculty. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the reliance on faculty service for departmental functioning and the gross inequities in who performs what types of service (O'Meara et al, 2020).

Although there are various types of service that occur at the departmental level, the distribution of who is doing service and how much labor is being performed is multilayered (Iheduru-Anderson et al., 2022; Johnson et al., 2014; Townsend, 2021). It is common for tenured faculty to take on more departmental service loads so that pre-tenure faculty can focus more on the other requirements for tenure (i.e., teaching and research). Yet, while this is a customary practice, scholarship shows that faculty members of color and women faculty members (at all ranks) are more likely to take on extra service within their departments and programs (Griffin et al., 2011; Griffin et al., 2013; Johnson, et al., 2024; Townsend, 2021). The gender hierarchies within academia diminishes the status of women's work (Soares, 2023), which often manifests in women taking on more "nurturing" roles such as mentoring (Jackson et al., 2022; Njoku & Evans, 2022). For instance, in Griffin et al.'s (2013) study that explored how race and gender influenced the experiences of faculty in the academy, they found that faculty members who identified as men learned how to "say no" to service request as pre-tenure faculty, while tenured women faculty members where still "learning how to say no" to student requests. The personal and professional 'cost' (Griffin et al., 2013) of these gender disparities in departmental service load can lead to faculty discontentment and stress (Myers et al., 2023). Notably, mentoring students is not what drains faculty, but it is the byproducts of interlocking systems of oppression that constantly deplete the emotional, intellectual, and temporal resources of faculty with marginalized identities (Myers et al. 2023).

Additionally, there is an extra cost or "tax" associated with being a faculty member of color especially when they are one of few or the "only one" in the department (Griffin et al., 2011; Griffin et al., 2013; Johnson, et al., 2024; Townsend, 2021). This rings especially true for Black women academics. According to Harley (2008), "African American women faculty members are not only the "maids of academe" but the "work

mules" (i.e., carrying a heavy load) as well" (p. 25). These type castings are problematic because they imply and position Black women academics as the "clean up person" who fix multiple issues, serve on a multitude of committees, all while managing their faculty responsibilities of research and teaching, *and* their overall wellbeing (Griffin et al., 2011; Townsend, 2021; Myers et al., 2023). Echoing the experiences of Black women faculty, other faculty members who possess historically marginalized identities speak about the 'burden' and 'frustration' they feel because the additional service they perform is often undervalued within annual evaluations, promotion, and tenure (Johnson et al., 2024). The implicit expectations placed on faculty of color and women faculty to foster a sense of equity, inclusion and belongingness does not often fall to those who are non-white and identity as men (Iheduru-Anderson et al., 2022). Ultimately, the intersectional expectations for service can be distractions that hinder the success and wellbeing of those within the department (Myers et al., 2023; Simmons, 2017), reduce faculty retention, and erode departmental ethos and collegiality.

Service to the College, School, or University

Internal service beyond a faculty member's academic department can take place at multiple levels, including a school or college, a campus, and, at multi-campus institutions, the university (Guarino & Borden, 2017). Frequently, tenure-line faculty members take on additional extra-departmental service as they consider career advancement toward full or administrative work. This service participation is often viewed as "academic oversight," "institutional governance," and "institutional support" (Finsen, 2002, as cited by Ward, 2003, p. 55). In a study of campus-level faculty service, O'Meara, Kuvaeva, and Nyunt (2017) identified three locales of extra-departmental internal service: college (e.g., membership on awards and strategic planning committees or membership on college governance bodies), campus (e.g., faculty senate roles and membership on various committees and commissions), and other unit (e.g., working on admissions, diversity, and search committees), plus mentoring roles that cut across units.

Campus service activities beyond the department-level can be both an opportunity and a burden. Participation in functioning governance structures, effectual college or university committees, and formal and informal leadership roles both can promote meaningful change and increase connections to and engagement with an institutional home. Shared governance is a core value of U.S. higher education, though one that is under assault (Gerber, 2014). Even when contributing to meaningful institutional outcomes, these activities can distract faculty from the research and teaching work that

is often most valued in promotion, tenure, and job market considerations. Even worse, service activities can be undermined or designed to divert faculty from more consequential efforts. Minor (2004), for example, argued that faculty senates can be subverted, ceremonial, or merely functional; only a portion are influential. Multiple studies and essays have questioned the effectiveness of faculty governance structures (e.g., Duderstadt, 2004; Tierney & Minor, 2003). Again, though, faculty have important roles to play in governance, and the dominance of administrative voices and the decline of faculty voice within higher education contexts present challenges.

Similar to other levels, service opportunities differentially affect faculty. In 1994, Padilla coined the term cultural taxation, which is defined as:

> the obligation to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving its needs for ethnic representation on committees, or to demonstrate knowledge and commitment to a cultural group, which may even bring accolades to the institution but which is not usually rewarded by the institution on whose behalf the service was performed. (p. 26)

Padilla outlined various elements of cultural taxation, including serving on institutional committees and being expected to educate others on diversity or identity matters. Wood et al. (2016) noted an overall "dearth of literature on faculty of color and service" (p. 88), but that what existed pointed to the devaluation or discounting of such service. Their study, involving faculty at three public universities in Arizona, found that faculty of color were more likely to engage in campus-level service, though not at a statistically significant level. While these expectations and burdens are most often viewed as problematic, Baez (2000) emphasized that they can also evince agency and provide opportunities to make change.

Joseph and Hirshfield (2011) expanded Padilla's "cultural taxation" to "identity taxation" in recognition that other faculty with historically marginalized identities face similar expectations and burdens, including women. Substantial research has shown that women spend more time on internal extra-departmental service (e.g., Mitchell & Helsi; O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2017). Guarino and Borden (2017), for example, found that "women faculty report significantly more activity than their male counterparts in the 'campus' service category and marginally significantly more in the university category"; it was these areas, not departmental or college-level efforts that caused the overall imbalance in internal service. Although many studies have focused on research universities, Domingo et al. (2020) found similar imbalances at a comprehensive university. Taken as a whole, research points to the gendered nature of organizations and the fallacy of expecting change by asking women to say "no" more.

Among the most consistent findings in the literature is the increase in service expectations after tenure, with many, especially women, reporting that the expectations delay their progress to full (e.g., Misra, et. al., 2011; O'Meara et al, 2017; Terosky et al., 2014). Mamiseishvili et al. (2015) reported that associate professors were least likely to indicate that they could balance research, teaching, and service. O'Meara et al. (2017) found that associate professors were least likely to be satisfied with how service was distributed. While many of these responsibilities are departmental and addressed elsewhere in this report, some are extra-departmental (e.g., Guarino & Borden, 2017; Neumann & Terosky, 2007). In addition to stagnating a faculty member's career, these overburdens push people to consider careers beyond academe.

Extra-departmental internal service expectations, opportunities, and conditions are also important for the majority of the faculty who work without the protections of tenure or the possibility of earning it. Despite widespread calls for greater ability to participate in governance and related activities (e.g., American Association of University Professors, 2013; American Federation of Teachers, 2005; Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2016), many VITAL faculty, especially those in part-time positions, are excluded (e.g., Jones et. al., 2017) and many union contracts are silent on governance roles (Kezar & Sam, 2010).

Several studies have explored the experiences of visitor/instructor (VI) faculty. Blalock and Stefanese Yates (2024) found that women serving in VI roles took on "extra work" because these service engagements allowed for them to have some say in how the institution was governed. Some participants expressed enjoyment for service work as it was different from the traditional domain of a heavy teaching workload. Rideau (2021) studied how 15 women of color in VI roles encountered campus service work and some expressed feeling excluded from committee work while others experienced overburdening, tokenism, and silencing. Importantly, perhaps even more so that other faculty, service roles (including but also beyond governance) can be fraught for VITAL faculty; they may feel pressured to take them on due to their precarity or may be led to believe that doing so will lead to a permanent position, regardless of whether that is plausible (Fahle Peck, et al., 2023).

Service to the Field and Discipline

Service to the field and discipline can take a number of forms, including service to professional associations as well as service to academic journals. Faculty serve in leadership roles as well as in volunteer roles helping each of the many organizations and journals function. Yet, just as we have seen in other areas, some identity groups are performing more service while others tend to receive the prized service opportunities.

Almost every department, program, and field has at least one academic- or industry-related professional organization (Fernandez & Castellanos, 2024; Rodrigues-Rad et al., 2023). Association services are often centered on networking and an exchange of ideas—whether that be through the construction of academic conferences or forums—or exerting professional authority to recognize key knowledge in the field, impact and improve policies, and grow the field itself (Evans & Ranero-Ramirez, 2016; Haynes & Gazley, 2011; Larson, 2021). Some of these service roles might include training and development, awards and recognition, certification and standard setting, research and knowledge creation, ethical guidance and codes of conduct, leadership opportunities, professional networking and career development, and public service advocacy (Haynes & Gazley, 2011, pp. 54-69).

Involvement with professional organizations differs somewhat by discipline and the priorities of the professional association itself. However, the literature suggests that faculty—particularly graduate students, early-career faculty, and faculty from minoritized backgrounds—feel compelled to engage in professional service due to fear of missed opportunities or unclear expectations about whether such service is required (McGregor & Halls, 2020; Nehls, 2022; O'Meara et al., 2022).

However, the labor performed is not equally distributed given the intersections of identities, with women of color particularly impacted (Linh et al., 2019; Peña, 2023). Faculty who hold multiple minoritized identities and/or intersecting areas of research, fields, or disciplines may belong to and be involved with an increased number of professional organizations. Further, professional service can become an exploitative promise, particularly towards graduate students, adjunct faculty, and non-tenure track faculty, with the "carrot-dangling" of becoming more visible and securing a tenure-track position (Khúc, 2024). In short, as with many types of service, involvement with professional organizations can be fraught, leaving labor on the shoulders of those with minoritized identities. However, unlike service on campus, national service often

brings more recognition and opportunity to cultivate connections across the country and world.

Professional service obligations can also include editorial service, such as serving as a journal editor, associate editor, or a peer reviewer; the time demands associated with each role can be heavy. Women often bear the brunt of editorial service, though are less represented in editor roles. In their study of 111 faculty at 13 research universities, O'Meara and colleagues (2017) found that while 36% of the women faculty respondents served as editors or associate editors, 68% of the men respondents served in a similar role. Editorship also tended to be concentrated among more senior faculty as 61% of full professors versus 40% of associate professors reported serving in this capacity. Given that editorship tends to carry prestige as well as the ability to determine what advances to publication, the underrepresentation of women in these positions is cause for concern.

Women are similarly underrepresented on the editorial boards of some journals, particularly in the sciences (Helmer et al., 2017; Seidel Malkinson et al., 2021). In one study of the journal *eLife*, Seidel Malkinson et al (2021) found that 69% of the editorial board identified as men—and authors were more likely to suggest men as reviewers. Similarly, the senior editors were more likely to select reviewers who were the same gender, thus leading to gender homophily in the reviewer pool, and limiting the types of knowledge deemed publishable. Such findings echo Christine Stanley's (2007) essay detailing her experiences during the review process of an article on the experiences of African American faculty members, highlighting the ways that the white reviewers questioned the contributions of the knowledge generated by her scholarship. The gender and racial composition of editorial boards determines what gets published, often to the detriment of scholars who do not identify with the majority.

Despite their underrepresentation on review boards, women continue to perform more labor than men in the editorial review process (Schmaling & Blume, 2017; Squazzoni et al., 2021; Wing et al., 2010). For example, in their study of editorial reviews for one health-related journal over a seven-year period, Wing et al (2010) found that 67% of reviews were assigned to men editorial board members while 33% were assigned to women. Women generally took a few days longer to complete their reviews, but were more likely than men to be ranked as providing very good to excellent reviews. Schmaling and Blume's (2017) study of reviewer behavior at two behavioral health-related journals over a nine-year period found that women were more likely to accept invitations to review and usually took two days longer to complete reviews than men. Both studies highlight the fact that women are performing more journal-related

behavior than men and often spending more time doing so. Of course, performing service takes away from activities that are more highly valued and lead to promotion, like research. In their review of manuscript submissions and peer review activities at all Elsevier journals between February and May 2018-2020, Squazzoni et al. (2021) found that women's rate of manuscript submission was considerably lower than men's during the first few months of the COVID-19 pandemic; however, their rate of accepting peer review invitations did not change. Such findings suggest that women continue to perform significant service, often at the expense of their own careers. Limited scholarship exists about the peer review experiences and demands placed on scholars of color, though we can hypothesize that similar demands apply.

Service to Local Communities

Despite its broad and sometimes unclear definition, community often functions as a vital space where faculty engage in both research and service activities, creating a central point of interaction between the academy and the public. Scholars have emphasized reciprocity and symbioses between institutional actors and their surrounding communities (Weerts & Sandman, 2010). These forms of giving back may look like utilizing educational expertise to provide a service (e.g., informal consulting or workshops), raising money or resources for a communal cause, or having a leadership role in a local organization (Ward, 2003). Scholars also participate in public scholarship, writing op-eds, engaging with the media, and providing expertise for policy discussions and briefs as a form of community engagement (Boyer, 1990; Taylor et al., 2023).

However, institutional type or disciplinary nuances may determine the specific ways and the degree to which service to the community manifests within academia (Ward, 2003). For instance, community college missions will likely prioritize community outreach "endeavors that bring the community into the college and the college into the community," (Ward, 2003, p. 85) while research universities' service participation may be obscured by research and teaching obligations—despite being more inclined than other institutional types to have programs, institutes, centers, or operational definitions in place to advance civic outreach (Rowley, 2001). A central tension in discussions around faculty service is the undervaluation of public service which serves as an essential bridge between academia and the community, particularly in research-centric universities. This service work is rarely recognized or rewarded in traditional promotion and tenure (P&T) processes, which remain narrowly focused on peer-reviewed publications and grant acquisition in these universities (Taylor et al., 2023). This lack of

recognition creates a disincentive for faculty, particularly early-career scholars and those with marginalized identities, to engage with the community in these ways, despite its potential for broad societal impact.

The type and frequency of civic service are undoubtedly influenced by a person's social identities, personal and professional motivations, as well as unique roles and expectations held within the institution (Albia & Cheng, 2023). For example, Wade and Demb (2009) pointed to factors like graduate/professional socialization and social identities as precipitators of a faculty member's service approach. In particular, service literature consistently demonstrates the heightened levels of both service broadly, and community service more narrowly, undertaken by faculty of color, women faculty, and early-career faculty (Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003). These populations are often tasked to engage in service related to diversity and inclusion initiatives, which is often a form of cultural taxation (Padilla, 1994; Reddick et al., 2020) that is not often recognized as productive or meaningful to the institution.

Further, the disproportionate value placed on types of service may mean that, though feeling a sense of obligation to give back to their communities, faculty, particularly those of color, have to prioritize other types of service (e.g., institutional) (Porter, 2007). More specifically, community engagement has been "consciously discouraged through questioned academic freedoms, more tenuous employment circumstances, and restrictive codes of conduct conditions at several universities [which] has created significant disincentive… for early career academics, women with children, and those seeking a healthy work-life balance" (Star, 2007, p.1). Kiyama and Gonzalez (2019) however, underscored the responsibility faculty of color often feel for their communities identifying that "service is driven not by the institution that employs me nor to the professional field, but to the underserved communities who have long taught me how to fight for equitable educational opportunities" (p. 35). This prevalent sentiment, identified by scholars like Perkins (1983) as "racial uplift," serves as a means to contextualize and problematize the disproportionate service loads faculty of color find themselves charged with—leading us to our calls to action for community service, guided by insights from public scholarship. Ultimately, recognizing community engagement as a legitimate form of scholarly service is essential for fostering stronger ties between academia and society. By reforming promotion and tenure processes and providing meaningful support for public service, higher education institutions can enhance their societal impact and ensure that faculty contributions are fully recognized and valued.

Recommendations and Calls-to-Action

Based on the above, we offer a list of recommendations per area to seriously consider regarding conducting and re-evaluating service at each level:

Departmental and Program Level

- Concretize expectations regarding service requirements and benchmarks for faculty. This is especially important for faculty seeking promotion (whether towards tenure or full), given both the explicit and implicit expectations to "be visible" to the field.

- Address inequities head on. While not all inequities will be easy to fix, some concerns can be readily remedied. Where more intentional intervention is required, we suggest program and department leaders engage faculty to encourage buy-in and contribution to identifying resolutions.

- Create differentiated service plans where faculty strengths, timelines for promotion and tenure, research and teaching agendas are considered with program or departmental needs.

- Support faculty who engage in service opportunities that align with their core commitments, personal histories, and intersectional identities.

- Be more attuned to the ways students also enact service within their respective programs and departments, and what leads them to participate in the shared responsibility and ethos of their departments and program areas. While much of the scholarship on service centers faculty members, students (specifically graduate students) are also performing service and should be considered when thinking about overall service obligations.

- Develop accountability structures that help faculty better understand the required labor for participation in certain activities and provide opportunities for correction when faculty do not fulfill their commitments.

- Reshape the way we frame the language of service. Language matters and influences how service opportunities are perceived, so restructuring the terminology associated with service (e.g., faculty service to faculty leadership) could assist in shifting the narrative from obligatory to possibility-centered.

College, School, or University Level

- Create mechanisms to recognize and reward the care work that is often unnoticed and more likely to be undertaken by women and faculty who are members of historically minoritized populations. This might take the form of university-level service awards to complement the awards frequently given for research and teaching accomplishments.

- Develop mechanisms to track appointments to committee and other leadership positions that may confer prestige and influence, and use the information garnered to assess equity in such appointments and, when relevant, institute change.

- Provide opportunities for VITAL faculty to participate in college and institutional service and provide adequate compensation for those who are paid on a course-by-course basis.

- Ensure that all faculty (especially those without tenure) who are undertaking college/university service maintain robust protections for their freedom of intramural speech.

- Conduct additional studies on faculty service engagement to better understand who is performing what activities and the effort expended.

Field and Disciplinary Level

- Increase representation on editorial boards and in editorships across disciplines. We urge all journals to have editorial boards that, at a minimum, reflect the gender and racial composition of their discipline. Similarly, we encourage journals to ensure diversity in their editor and associate editor roles.

- Recognize and reward service performed to professional associations. Frequently, associations provide awards to recognize members for outstanding research. Given the important role that volunteers play in professional associations' operations, associations might also give an annual award to identify outstanding service to the association and/or field.

- Recognize the tension of how intersectional identities often create compounding effects for service in professional associations and journals—not only related to the potential areas by which these individuals "are tapped" more

often due to their multifaceted interests and expertise, but also because of the representation pressure to advocate, mentor, and serve their communities.

Local Community Level

- Revise promotion and tenure guidelines to include service to the community. Institutions should increase service as a valuable form of faculty intellectual contribution, organizational, and societal engagement. Currently, service still falls within the idea of "caretaking," which is why so many faculty of color and faculty who are women disproportionately perform this work (Sallee, 2014).

- Petition institutions to formally recognize community engagement as an essential component of service. This would involve acknowledging the importance of community-university relationship building, local policy contributions, and leadership roles in local initiatives (Taylor et al., 2023).

- Develop metrics for public engagement. Establishing clear, quantifiable metrics for community engagement will help institutions better measure its value.

- Recognize and support Faculty of Color who are involved in community research and organizations. Given the disproportionate burden placed on faculty of color to engage in public service, institutions should offer targeted support to ensure that their community engagement is recognized and rewarded. This may involve mentorship programs, additional funding for public-facing projects, or leadership development opportunities aimed at amplifying marginalized voices in public discourse.

Conclusion

This Presidential Commission on Service was birthed out of the observations and calls for change within the ASHE community and the field of higher education more broadly. The growing need to call attention to the distributions, recognitions, and overtaxing of service for some shows that more scholars need to re-engage and re-center service. The progression of all fields is heavily dependent on service and will suffer if the decline and over taxation in service continues. We call on all faculty to recognize their responsibilities to their departments, institutions, disciplines, and local communities and use their skills and expertise to contribute toward the public good. We must all collectively work together for the good of higher education and society. We encourage the ASHE community to use this document as a guide with their institutional leaders, department chairs, tenure and promotion committees, annual evaluation committees,

and college deans in efforts to better support students, faculty, and researchers as they engage in meaningful service that we hope can be appreciated and valued properly.

References

Albia, J., & Cheng, M. (2023). Re-examining and developing the notion of academic citizenship: A critical literature review. *Higher Education Quarterly, 77*(4), 709-721.

American Association of University Professors. (2013). The Inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments. https://www.aaup.org/report/inclusion-governance-faculty-members-holding-contingent-appointments

American Federation of Teachers (2007). Academic freedom in the 21st century. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/academicfreedomstatement0907.pdf

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2016). Shared governance: Is ok good enough. https://agb.org/reports-2/shared-governance-is-ok-good-enough/

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*(3), 363–391.

Blalock, A. E., & StefaneseYates, A. (2024). Hierarchies and paradoxes: How women in non-tenure-track faculty positions experience a gendered organization. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *17*(6), 856–868. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000486

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton University Press.

Carter, T. J., & Craig, M. O. (2022). It could be us: Black faculty as "threats" on the path to tenure. *Race and Justice, 12(3), 569-587.*

Culpepper, D. Misra, J., O'Meara, K. & Jaeger, A. (2022, Winter). Addressing workload equity: Seven strategies for department chairs. *The Department Chair*, *32*(3), 8-9.

Domingo, C.R., Gerber, N. C., Harris, D., Mamo, L., Pasion, S. G., Rebanal, R. D., & Rosser, S. V. (2020). More service or more advancement: Institutional barriers to academic careers for women and faculty of color at a large public comprehensive minority-serving institution. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 15*(3), 363–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000292

Duderstadt, J. J. (2004). Governing the twenty-first-century university. In W.G. Tierney (Ed.) *Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm* (pp. 137−157). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gehrke, S. & Kezar, A. (2015). Unbundling the faculty role: Utilizing historical, theoretical, and empirical frameworks to inform future research. In M.B. Paulsen (Ed.). *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 30, pp. 93–150). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12835-1_3

Gerber, L. (2014). *The rise and decline of shared governance*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Griffin, K. A., Bennett, J. C., & Harris, J. (2011) Analyzing gender differences in Black faculty marginalization through a sequential mixed-methods design. *New Directions for Institutional Research 2011*(151), 45–61.

Griffin, K. A., Bennett, J. C., & Harris, J. (2013). Marginalizing merit?: Gender differences in Black faculty D/discourses on tenure, advancement, and professional success. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(4), 489–512. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0040

Guarino, C. M. & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*, 672–694. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Fahle Peck, K., Krane, D. K., Soriano Young, M. L., Hantgen, A.R., & Jenkins, L. (2023). Counting hours: How tracking time can empower NTT faculty and administrators in writing studies. *College Composition and Communication, 75*(1), A1–A16. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc202332679

Haynes, W., & Gazley, B. (2011). Professional associations and public service: Do associations matter? In D. Menzel & H. White (Eds.), *The state of public administration: Issues, problems, challenges* (pp. 54-69). M. E. Sharpe

Harley, D. A. (2008). Maids of academe: African American women faculty at predominately white institutions. *Journal of African American Studies*, *12*, 19-36.

Helmer, M., Schottdorf, M., Neef, A., & Battaglia, D. (2017). Gender bias in scholarly peer review. *Elife*, *6*, e21718.

Iheduru-Anderson, K., Okoro, F. O., & Moore, S. S. (2022). Diversity and inclusion or tokens? A qualitative study of black women academic nurse leaders in the United States. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*, *9*, 23333936211073116.

Jackson, K.F., Mitchell, F. M., Ogbonnaya, I. N., Mackey, C., Crudup, C., & Carver, A. T. (2022). Taking back the narrative: Gendered anti-blackness in predominantly white schools of social work. *Affilia, 37*(4), 565–584. https://doi.org/10.1177/08861099221099322

Johnson, S., Konopasky, A., & Wyatt, T. (2024). In their own voices: A critical narrative review of Black women faculty members' first-person accounts of racial trauma across higher education. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine,* 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2024.2329680

Jones W. A., Hutchens, N. H., Hulbert, A, Lewis, W. D., Brown, D. M. (2017). Shared governance among the new majority: Non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to university faculty senates. *Innovative Higher Education, 42*, 505–519. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-017-9402-2

Kezar, A. (2018). A new vision for the professoriate. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 50*(3-4), 84-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1509616

Kezar, A. (2012). Needed policies,practices, and values: Creating a culture to support and professionalize non-tenure track faculty. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority* (pp. 2–27). Routledge.

Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2010). Beyond contracts: Non-tenure track faculty and campus governance. *NEA 2010 Almanac of Higher Education*, 83–91.

Kiyama, J. M., & Gonzales, L. (2019). "In academia, but not of it" —Redefining what it means to serve. In *The tenure-track process for Chicana and Latina faculty* (pp. 31-43). Routledge.

Levin, J. S., & Montero Hernandez, V. (2014). Divided identity: Part-time faculty in public colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education, 37*(4), 531–557.

Love, C. (2007). Adjuncts with power: Making policy in university governance. In R. Teeuwen & S. Hantke (Eds.), *Gypsy scholars, migrant teachers and the global academic proletariat*: *Adjunct labour in higher education* (pp. 59–70). Brill Academic Publishers.

Joseph, T. D., & Hirshfield, L. E. (2011). "Why don't you get somebody new to do it?" Race and cultural taxation in the academy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 34*(1), 121–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2010.496489

Levy, R. (2019). *VITAL faculty: A growing workforce in colleges and universities*. Blog: Mathematical Association of America. https://www.mathvalues.org/masterblog/vital-faculty

Mamiseishvili, K., Miller, M. T., & Lee, D. (2015). Beyond teaching and research: Faculty perceptions of service roles at research universities. *Innovative Higher Education, 41*, 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9354-3

Minor, J. T. (2004). Understanding faculty senates: Moving from mysteries to models. *Review of Higher Education*, *27*(3), 343–363. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2004.0004

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E. D., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe, 97*, 2–6.

Mitchell, S. M. & Hesli, V. L. (2013). Women don't ask? Women don't say no? Bargaining and service in political science. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 46*(2), 355–369. https://doi/10.1017/S1049096513000073

Myers, M., & Id-Deen, L. (2023). I need you to survive: Black women resisting white supremacy culture for faculty and student wellbeing. *Student Success, 14*(3), 53–64. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.2719

Njoku, A., & Evans, M. (2022). Black women faculty and administrators navigating COVID-19, social unrest, and academia: Challenges and strategies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(4), 2220. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042220

O'Meara, K. (2016). Whose problem is it? Gender differences in faculty thinking about campus service. *Teachers College Record, 118*, 1-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811611800808

O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Misra, J. & Jaeger, A. (2020). *Equity-minded faculty workloads: What we can and should do now*. American Council on Education https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from annual faculty reports. *The Journal of Higher Education, 88*(5), 672–700. http://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., Waugaman, C., & Jackson, R. (2017). Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(6), 1154-1186.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher, 23*(4), 24–27.

Perkins, L. M. (1983). The impact of the "cult of true womanhood" on the education of Black women. *Journal of Social Issues, 39*(3), 17-28.

Rideau, R. (2021). "We're just not acknowledged": An examination of the identity taxation of full-time non-tenure-track Women of Color faculty members. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *14*(2), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000139

Porter, S. R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *Journal of Higher Education*, *78*(5), 523-541. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2007.11772328

Rowley, L. L. (2001). Surveying the terrain: An exploratory analysis of the concept of public service in American higher education. In *ASHE Symposium on Broadening the Carnegie Classification's Attention to Mission: Incorporating Public Service*.

Reddick, R. J., Bukoski, B. E., & Smith, S. L. (2020). (Cultural) taxation without representation? How educational developers can broker discourse on Black faculty lives in the #BlackLivesMatter era. *To Improve the Academy, 39*(1), 31-62. https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0039.103

Sallee, M. W. (2014). *Faculty fathers: Toward a new ideal in the research university.* SUNY Press.

Schmaling, K. B., & Blume, A. W. (2017). Gender differences in providing peer review to two behavioural science journals, 2006–2015. *Learned Publishing*, *30*(3), 221-225.

Seidel Malkinson, T., Terhune, D. B., Kollamkulam, M., Guerreiro, M. J., Bassett, D. S., & Makin, T. R. (2021). Gender imbalance in the editorial activities of a researcher-led journal. *bioRxiv*, 2021-11.

Simmons, J. C. (2017). Life notes about the dual careers of a Black female: Race and gender politics in public school administration and higher education professorship. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, 22. https://doi.org/10.21423/awlj-v22.a261

Soares, L. (2023). "Tuskegee Is Her Monument": Gender and leadership in early public Black colleges. *History of Education Quarterly, 63*(3), 357–377. https://doi.org/10.1017/heq.2023.3

Squazzoni, F., Bravo, G., Grimaldo, F., García-Costa, D., Farjam, M., & Mehmani, B. (2021). Gender gap in journal submissions and peer review during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. A study on 2329 Elsevier journals. *PloS one*, *16*(10), e0257919.

Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(1), 14-24.

Star, C. (2007, January). Whither engagement? Challenges for community engagement within academia. In *Refereed Proceedings of the 2007 International Women's Conference: Education, Employment and Everything... the Triple Layers of a Woman's Life.*

Taylor, M. Y., Taylor, Z. W., & Childs, J. (2023). 'This would not count': Do institutions of higher education support faculty as public intellectuals? *Journal of Higher Education Management, 38*(2), 1-18.

Tierney, W. G. & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report.* Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California. ED482060.

Townsend, C. V. (2021). Identity politics: Why African American women are missing in administrative leadership in public higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49*(4), 584–600. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220935455

Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(2), 5-16.

Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *29*(5). Jossey-Bass.

Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 81*(6), 632-657.

Wing, D. A., Benner, R. S., Petersen, R., Newcomb, R., & Scott, J. R. (2010). Differences in editorial board reviewer behavior based on gender. *Journal of Women's Health*, *19*(10), 1919-1923.

Wood, J. L., Hilton, A. A., Nevarez, C. (2015). Faculty of color and white faculty: An analysis of service in colleges of education in the Arizona public university system. *Journal of the Professoriate, 8*(1), 85–109.