Reflections

A Journal of Writing,
Service Learning,
and Community Literacy

New City Community Press

Learning about Scholarship in Action
in Concept and Practice

A White Paper
From the Academic Affairs Committee of the University Senate
Syracuse University

Written on behalf of the Committee by Louise Wetherbee Phelps, Chair

Syracuse University
August 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In her inaugural year (2005), Chancellor Nancy Cantor announced her vision of Syracuse University as a campus that would be deeply engaged with the world, in activities and partnerships with communities that she named "*scholarship in action*." Recognizing the difficulty of fitting such public or community-engaged scholarship into the traditional framework for defining and evaluating faculty work, she called on the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate (AAC) to study the issues related to implementing this vision. The Committee responded to this request by undertaking in Spring, 2005 a study of scholarship of action both as a concept and as a set of faculty practices on the Syracuse campus. This white paper reports on what the Committee has learned from this inquiry.

Although Chancellor Cantor encouraged the AAC to tackle the problem of <u>evaluating</u> excellence in scholarship in action, the project focused instead on understanding what is meant by scholarship in action (and related terms) and exploring the questions it raises about values, disciplinary differences, and the relationship between this concept and the traditional categorizing of faculty work as research, teaching, or service. The Committee decided to educate itself on these fundamental issues before trying to solve problems of evaluation.

The Committee adopted a strategy of examining scholarship in action from three angles: "outside in" (the external context), "top down" (administrative leadership), and "bottom up" (faculty practices and views). The "outside in" and "top down" perspectives provided the context in which we examined Syracuse faculty practices and views. This approach provides the structure for the white paper.

To address the first two perspectives, the Committee researched the literature of higher education and the speeches and writings of Chancellor Cantor, aided by research assistant Dianna Winslow. We drew on many sources for the faculty perspective, including interviews and discussions with faculty and administrators on campus, as well as the Committee itself as a resource. The richest source of insights into the variety and complexity of scholarship in action at Syracuse was a series of panels comprised of tenured and tenure-track Syracuse faculty, who were asked to describe their own faculty work as exemplifying scholarship in action. The Committee organized a total of five such panels, hearing from 22 tenured and tenure track faculty. In the course of planning these panels, the Committee identified a set of interdisciplinary models or roles for scholars in action that cuts across the traditional categories of research, teaching, and service.

The paper begins by tracing the evolution of engagement as an important commitment of higher education. This research was important because of faculty fears that "scholarship in action" was idiosyncratic to Syracuse or represented a passing fad in higher education.

The concept of "engagement" arose in response to a widespread perception that the academy had become disconnected from society and lost public support. This response, beginning in public institutions with a history of commitment to outreach, has been developed, debated, and advocated over the last decade by many stakeholders in and out of the academy. In one of the most influential statements, a series of reports from the Kellogg foundation, this definition was offered:

> Engagement goes well beyond extension, conventional outreach, and even most conceptions of public service. Inherited concepts emphasize a one-way process in which the university transfers its expertise to key constituents. Embedded in the engagement ideal is a commitment to sharing and reciprocity. By engagement the Commission envisions partnerships, two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table (Kellogg, Executive Summaries 13).

As this idea has been advocated and implemented, it has two dimensions, which reinterpret the core missions of research (as "discovery") and teaching (as "learning") and couple them to a transformed notion of public service, the "third mission" of the academy. The first dimension treats engaged work from the faculty perspective as a form of scholarship, a topic of intense debate and controversy because of its confusing and contested intersection with the current system of faculty roles and rewards. The second dimension is a focus on educating students to participate actively as citizens in a democratic society and global community, exemplified in the service-learning movement and the effort to rank institutions on their level of "student engagement."

As commitments to engagement moved across the landscape of U.S. higher education, the concept (and the terms) mutated subtly to fit different institutional histories, missions, geographies, demographics, and intellectual traditions. American education's historically diverse missions, and the tensions and contradictions among the values they represent, show up in the concept of engagement as it is interpreted and implemented across this landscape. The Committee's research showed that it has also become an international theme, for example, among the universities of the Commonwealth nations.

Because the ability to implement engagement as an institutional mission, especially in research universities, depends critically on how it is integrated into the system that governs what kinds of faculty work can be valued and rewarded, attention has focused intensively on how the categories of the "roles and rewards" system might be used or reconceptualized to accommodate engaged faculty work. Many accounts of "engaged scholarship" treat it as an integrative practice, in which engagement unifies and blurs the boundaries between research, teaching, and public service. Nancy Cantor's "scholarship in action'" falls within this paradigm of faculty engagement work, as does the work of Imagining America (IA).

The next section examines the administrative (top-down) perspective. When Syracuse Chancellor Nancy Cantor, a national leader of the engagement movement, came to Syracuse University, she faced the challenge of adapting these commitments and understandings to the Syracuse environment. She introduced the term "scholarship in action" to capture the distinctive interpretation of engagement at Syracuse, historically and today. In speeches and writings, as well as concrete actions, Chancellor Cantor has elaborated and exemplified this concept. We draw on these sources to explain her interpretation of scholarship in action:

1. *Emphasis on scholarship and the impact of engagement on the future of research itself*
2. *A parallel emphasis on enabling students to learn by means of their own engaged scholarship and direct involvement in campus-community partnerships*
3. *The need to put scholarship to work, to "test" the excellence of scholarship in the "marketplace"*
4. *Partnerships and reciprocal exchanges with communities and publics. Involving all sectors of society as co-agents and collaborative peers in an expansive and inclusive notion of "community," working together in a "third space." The creative campus as having no boundaries.*
5. *An emphasis on valuing "local public scholarship"*
6. *A thoroughgoing commitment to diversity, broadly conceived, as a necessary feature of excellence. Guaranteeing intellectual richness through multiple perspectives; attracting and retaining young scholars and entrepreneurial students "from all socio-economic and cultural spheres to come to Syracuse and experience the creative campus on and off the 'Hill"* ("Vision" 2).

The summary ends by naming some of the obstacles to scholarship in action identified by Nancy Cantor and others.

Next we describe the evolutionary process by which the Committee planned and modified its strategies for studying scholarship in action. The first stage of the project was difficult because participants lacked a common understanding of what "scholarship in action" meant or referred to in their own and other disciplines, particularly in relation to the traditional categories of faculty effort (research, teaching, service). Ultimately the Committee decided to address the problem by studying concrete examples, in a series of panels inviting scholars to explain

how they conceived and valued their work as scholarship in action. After an initial disciplinary panel featuring scholars from the humanities and arts, the Committee made the rest of the panels interdisciplinary, organizing them instead around models derived from the first panel.

We presented panelists with provisional descriptions of three proposed models of scholarship in action:

• **public intellectual, public communicator**: "A faculty member draws on scholarly expertise to communicate about academic knowledge and public issues with publics and communities in a variety of media."
• **community partner-in-action**: "A faculty member engages in complex, collaborative projects with community partners from various sectors of society to accomplish problem-solving and constructive action."
• **community-engaged teacher**: "A faculty member either teaches outside the bounds of the university campus to nontraditional students and audiences, or engages SU students in research, action, and/or interaction with communities outside the institution to enhance their learning—or both."

The role of public intellectual is controversial among educators developing and implementing a culture of engagement. Many assume this role lacks the qualities of collaboration, partnership, reciprocity, and full participation of communities attributed to engagement. Because this role had been among those identified from the first panel, the AAC confronted this problem immediately. Since the AAC had taken a principled position that it would conduct the inquiry with no preconceptions (as a committee) about either the nature or value of scholarship in action, including how particular faculty activities would "count" in these terms, the Committee included this role in its panels, pairing public intellectuals with public communicators in any media to study expression and (inter)communication as a broad function not otherwise accounted for in the more familiar prototypes of scholarship in action. The conflict over the public intellectual role proved to be deeper than it first appeared because it evokes strongly felt, historically rooted differences in American higher education over the purpose of the university and its relationship to the public world. The debates and disagreements over the public intellectual role allowed the AAC to trace many of the concerns and conflicts about scholarship in action voiced by faculty to these historically based, competing views of the mission and role of the academy in society.

Panelists were asked to answer a set of questions about their own work as examples of scholarship in action. In the heart of the paper, we present a detailed account and analysis of the themes of their responses (and ensuing discussions with the Committee). It begins with a synthesis of how and why panelists regard their work as scholarly despite their belief that in most cases it wouldn't "count" in their fields as scholarship (i.e., research or creative work). When these answers are compared to the reasons they believe such work doesn't (and perhaps shouldn't) count toward tenure, the discrepancy reveals an important distinction between "scholarly" as a global attribute of faculty work and "scholarship" as a narrower, more precise, discipline-specific category for evaluation of research or creative activity. Taken together, panelists' remarks suggest that, to them, being scholarly means most broadly *to set certain expectations for oneself and strive to meet them in carrying out academic work.* These expectations, which are rooted in intellectual communities and traditions, translate into questions scholars ask themselves critically as they carry out projects, to guide them in the process and assess the work and its outcomes. The panels show that these questions are similar in kind no matter how disparate the answers. All are concerned with, and have standards for, ways of doing the work; means of legitimating the work; connecting to prior/current scholarship and to an intellectual community; qualities of the work; and significance. But these aspects of their work diverge significantly from normative expectations in their fields. Most of the differences panelists listed flow from the very concept of engaging publics and communities other than (only) academic peers, which entails an array of new purposes generated with and by these partners and beneficiaries and often developed or revised in the course of the project. In these new contexts, panelists' departures from disciplinary norms (not only for research or creative work, but for teaching) represent the manifold ways they have adapted, translated, or even transformed traditional criteria to fit their projects' goals and needs, while striving to sustain scholarly ideals.

Scholarship-in-action projects often blend traditional and nontraditional forms of the core university missions (scholarship and teaching) with practice and problem-solving activities that are not easily classified. But taken

together, panelists communicate a broad sense of what it means to be scholarly that is <u>prior</u> to any categorization of their work in traditional terms as scholarship, teaching, or service. They see their projects as scholarly primarily because they <u>are</u> trained scholars. Their descriptions represent themselves as behaving like scholars: addressing academic missions; motivated by scholarly passions and professional ideals; building on previous scholarly work—their own and others'; drawing on (and constantly extending) a scholarly repertoire of skills, methods, knowledge; judging their own work by scholarly standards (which may be more or less indebted to normative expectations in the evaluating units). In sum, their engaged work expresses their scholarly identity and strives for scholarly integrity.

That said, characterizing engaged work as scholarly in this global sense leaves open the questions of how it should be categorized for evaluation and, more broadly, how substantive and valuable it is in a given case or in general, and on what grounds. While panelists themselves do not view the "scholarly" nature of their work as necessarily meaning it should count as "scholarship," especially for tenure, many are not satisfied with the way it is handled in the current system for evaluating faculty work. Although there are significant problems with valuing community-engaged teaching, most of the controversy focuses on the category of research or creative work and whether engaged work should count as "scholarship." In deciding how their work should count (i.e., be classified and valued), panelists differ based on whether or to what degree they accept the traditional norms of their fields. Comparing panelists' attitudes to Thomas Green's description of an array of attitudes that members of a group can adopt toward a norm, which includes *obedience*, *compliance*, *observance*, and *defiance*, we find all of these stances and nuanced variations of them represented among our panelists.

Most panelists were deeply concerned with how scholarship in action should be handled in the rewards system, but, with respect to their own work as scholars in action, their values horizon was much wider than the reward system or even the academy itself. Panelists named extremely varied public goods that their work could contribute to through the roles featured on the panels—public communication, community-engaged teaching, and action-oriented partnerships. Many described the personal gratifications of their work and its sometimes transformational effect on their own scholarship and/or teaching. For some it was a mid-career shift that Donald Schon describes as shifting the balance between rigor and relevance at a certain level of maturity. Still, scholars frequently acknowledged costs and weighed these against benefits, both for themselves and their units.

Other questions dealt with the best way to evaluate engaged work and the challenges and difficulties it presents, other than the tenure and promotion system. One point frequently made was the need to expand the pool of reviewers beyond academic peers to nonacademic experts or peers who were qualified (in some cases, the only ones fully qualified) to review the work for its quality and impact. Many also thought it was appropriate or necessary to include a different kind of evaluation (on the model of student evaluations of teaching) representing the beneficiaries and audiences of the work. However, some working in complicated environments and complex partnerships cautioned about the delicacy, difficulty, and, sometimes, unreliability of such evaluation, and the need to contextualize it.

Answers to previous questions had made clear that the conditions and goals of engaged work challenge scholars' ingenuity, flexibility, commitment, and determination. The challenges panelists faced in the projects themselves were inventional, organizational, financial, interpersonal, and self-educational (new learning). For most panelists, engagement was time and work-intensive beyond the already high norm for academic life. They also identified some challenges that, while affecting them personally, they saw as broadly institutional rather than project-specific and individual. Broadly, they looked to the institution for resources—not just financial, but intellectual and social, that would not only support but also connect scholars in action on campus.

The next section summarizes and integrates what was learned from the panels. The panels refocused the Committee's inquiry from **scholarship in action** as a general concept to **scholars in action** working in engaged roles, creating more generative starting points and terms for discussion. We evaluate the usefulness of the panel format, including the roles or models, questions, and value of bringing scholars together in dialogue.

Whenever policy makers or administrators promote change, skeptical faculty ask "How do we distinguish substance from sound byte?" The panels provided one answer: *scholars' descriptions of their own engaged work substantiate the concept of scholarship in action*. Panelists disabused us of any notion that scholarship in action is any single thing: the substance of scholarship in action, as they presented it, was extremely heterogeneous for both disciplinary and functional reasons. As one Committee member put it, "the referent of scholarship in action will never be singular or monolithic," and "values will shift in their inflection from unit to unit." Seeing the variations in these projects also made it clear that *identifying a project or pattern of faculty activity as "scholarship in action" was not in itself either a claim to its specific value or proof of it. Just like any other faculty work presented for evaluation, contributions to scholarship in action can be major or minor efforts, represent different degrees of novel intellectual or creative work, have varied benefits and values, and achieve different levels of qualitative excellence*.

The revelatory distinction between the panelists' concept of "scholarly" and the category of "scholarship" allowed the Committee to understand the detailed, varied reasons that, in fact, *engaged work does not map in any easy or consistent way onto the current system*. The panelists' characterizations of their work as scholarly is compatible with Chancellor Cantor's notion of "scholarship in action" as distributed over any and all university missions. However, mapping work into these categories case by case shows how imperfectly engaged work matches traditional concepts of such missions, or is simply unintelligible in a particular disciplinary paradigm. The detailed reports from the panels clarified why it is so hard, and often inappropriate, to fit engaged work into that system. To the extent it might qualify by intent as "scholarship" or "teaching," it frequently failed to be recognized as such, or was judged as not meeting conventional standards. Misfits in those cases, as well as anything else unclassifiable, were relegated to "service" as a default category. But service as conventionally understood is inadequate to the purpose (of evaluating engaged <u>scholarly</u> work) because of its identification with non-scholarly functions like institutional and professional service or charitable contributions to the community. As a whole, the problem is that engagement introduces new goals that modify or require context-sensitive adaptation of the scholarly features that developed in disciplinary paradigms to fit a different purpose. The inability to map engaged projects, patterns of activity, or scholarship in action in general onto the tenure and promotion categories suggests that the types and variety of faculty members' scholarly work, quite apart from engagement as recently defined, may be far richer than we have been able to appreciate by viewing it primarily through the lens of the three-part evaluation system.

Many faculty, including some scholars in action themselves, have serious reservations about counting work for tenure that doesn't satisfy traditional research expectations. But even among those who argue strongly that it must count for tenure if the institution is to implement an institutional vision of engagement, there was no agreement about how to do so. At least three possibilities emerged from panels, discussions, and interviews for future consideration, separately or in combination. First, many panelists argued for changing traditional norms, more or less radically. Some envisioned making them more inclusive, expanding them to include a broader range of work and work products or allowing alternate options (for example, norms for scholarly work that is applied, practice, or action-oriented). A smaller number wanted more radical transformation of research and/or teaching, making engaged scholarly work the new norm (at least, for their own fields). Some Committee members and interviewees prefer modifying the categories of teaching and service, following the Newhouse example, to allow more accurate reporting of the full range of engaged work and create new models for tenure based on achievements primarily in these categories. These faculty members emphasized the importance of respecting disciplinary differences and making standards field-specific. Finally, some suggested an option to submit an integrated portfolio for faculty who emphasize scholarship in action, which would present the work as a whole rather than divided into teaching, scholarship, and service.

As Committee and campus discussions continue working on the problems of categorizing and counting engaged scholarly work, participants may want to reflect on some of the lessons learned from the AAC experiences. For

us, these were principles of process, but they may have implications for future decisions about evaluation categories and processes:

• *When concerned with how to evaluate individuals' work, to* **focus attention on scholars in action rather than on "scholarship in action" as a concept for defining what they do.**

We discovered it was a mistake to try to treat scholarship in action—a <u>collective</u> responsibility and commitment of the institution—as a new category of evaluation applying criteria to <u>individual</u> achievements. Scholars talking about their work demonstrated what it means in practice for individuals to contribute in varied ways to the whole enterprise, which we concluded has no single referent or interpretation.

• *Reversing the conventional order, to ask scholars to* **describe before categorizing***.*

Soliciting descriptions of scholarly work that presented it on its own terms allowed us to appreciate its goals and novel features before the categories filtered out much of what scholars want evaluators to know. Ultimately, current and proposed categories need to be compared to such descriptive accounts and judged for their adequacy, based on what evaluators decide they want to accomplish by sorting faculty work into categories. Even then, following this principle might help keep the categories honest, pressuring them to remain flexible enough to evolve as scholarly work does.

A corollary is this:

• *In evaluating, to* **treat value as intrinsic in the work and its use***, rather than predetermined by how it is classified.*

We adopted this as a process principle, in order not to prejudge what we were trying to study, in contrast to the way the current system works, building a value judgment into the classification of work as "scholarship," "teaching," or "service." Many of the proposals try to remove this presumption in evaluation, for example suggesting that traditional and engaged scholarship should each be judged on its own merits, or that teaching and service categories should be renovated to make contributions in these categories a potential basis for tenure. The principle applies equally to scholarship in action itself, meaning that presenting work as "engaged" doesn't automatically confer value on it. It must be judged according to (appropriate) standards for significance, excellence, novelty, impact, and so on.

For our last panel, we invited experienced colleagues to help us identify and understand such concerns and translate them into advice about implementation. We asked, if scholarship in action is to be implemented, what needs to be done to make change positive for faculty and to protect them and the institution from potential risks? The last section summarizes faculty thoughts and advice on these matters.

The vision of scholarship in action brings into play competing values within the academy itself. Some faculty worry that emphasizing engagement with the world as an institutional priority will lead to devaluing traditional scholarship—and, more broadly, the ideals it represents, such as disinterested inquiry, independent thought, basic research, the pursuit of knowledge, or a critical relationship to social institutions—in favor of advocacy, applied research, problem-solving, and collaborative action with all sectors of society. Some associate closer relations to nonacademic partners in the "marketplace" with perceived threats to the independence of the academy like commercialization, politicization, or accountability through regulation and governmental oversight. Other faculty fear a dilution of standards will result from any modifications of traditional paradigms to accommodate and evaluate scholarship in action. Some scholars in action themselves acknowledge the tension between what Schon called rigor and relevance and the difficulty of reconciling the two in their careers.

For most faculty, the answer is to strike a balance so that scholarship in action can be supported and rewarded, but not at the expense of continuing to appreciate and reward traditional scholarship. Obviously, this would mean working very carefully when making changes to the system (i.e., addressing the mapping problems in order to include, evaluate, and reward engaged work) so as to avoid simply reversing the current privileging of traditional research and making scholarship in action, perhaps in only one role, the new norm. In addition, some stressed the importance of guarding against risks they fear to the objectivity and independence of scholarship. Many advocated negotiations between the administration and academic units about how faculty would be expected to allocate their time (mediated through the reward system) between idea generation and action, reflecting discipline-specific goals and unit's missions. Others thought such negotiations should (also) apply to individual faculty members as their priorities shift over a career.

These issues are closely related to deep concerns about faculty autonomy. Committee members and many panelists urged that scholarship in action, even though it represents a university-wide commitment affecting all missions, should not be imposed on faculty as a top-down administrative requirement. Faculty cautioned that if it is to be successfully implemented as a university-wide cultural change, scholarship in action must be invented and "owned" by the faculty, growing organically from the activities already going on and creating avenues for people who choose to do it, respecting other traditions and avoiding imposition of any one model.

Panelists detailed what they believe to be the most important kinds of resources needed to make engaged work possible and effective, focusing primarily on those that support the faculty.

An obvious first step is to formulate and enact policies that support scholarship in action, including the kinds of formal changes in the tenure and promotion guidelines and systems of evaluation discussed in this paper. Faculty noted that institutional commitment and even formal policies remain theoretical until they are acted on in tenure (and promotion) cases, hiring practices, and so on. Many pointed to the importance of designing memos of understanding for hiring that would clarify expectations for faculty members, including commitments to engaged scholarly work, in relation to tenure criteria, as well as similar agreements for senior faculty shifting emphasis to public scholarship and engagement.

Panelists called for financial resources needed to ease the burden to themselves and their units of doing engaged work. The main issue was the time and energy added to or taken away from other responsibilities, which became costs to them or their departments. Panelists argued that the institution needs to systematically address the costs of investing faculty time in scholarship in action, because it is not an inexhaustible resource.

Although it is generally recognized that young scholars in action need help to prepare tenure dossiers, the Committee's inquiry revealed many less obvious needs for supporting engaged work, which amount to building a social and intellectual infrastructure for scholarship in action. There is a need for role models, mentors, peers, and preparation or instruction at all levels from undergraduate students to senior faculty who do engaged work.

Finally, perhaps the most fundamental issue underlying faculty concerns about scholarship in action is what the Committee called "*sustainability*." Rightly or wrongly, many faculty perceive many higher education trends as transitory fads. If they are going to go through the personal and professional transformations it takes to do scholarship in action, or to accept and facilitate the cultural changes necessary to incorporate engaged work into the academic value system, they want to be assured that it is a longitudinal, sustainable commitment that will outlive particular administrators or circumstances—and not just at Syracuse.

There is another side to sustainability besides the faculty perspective: the perspective of some communities or publics who are the partners sought by an engaged institution. Communities and partners want assurance that SU's commitment will be deep and sustained, and that they will not simply be used as research objects or exploitable opportunities for student learning.

The Committee realized increasingly during the inquiry that scholarship in action is a collective notion and, therefore, an institutional responsibility. From this perspective, evaluation needs to be thought about somewhat more broadly than in the context of tenure, promotion, or other individual rewards, yet also in relation to that context.

Although scholars bear significant responsibility for demonstrating the effectiveness of their engaged work (the benefits to their discipline, to students, to communities and publics), panelists showed us that often this task is well beyond the capability of individual faculty members acting alone. Further, many projects involve multiple faculty members, disciplines, units, and community partners. Experienced panelists pointed out how extremely difficult it is to make judgments in situations of conflicting interests and different views about what is "useful" or a "public good" among such constituencies as business interests, labor, consumers, faculty, students, community members, and so on. A number of Committee members raised the concern that some of what is promoted as "community engagement" and "public service" can be exploitive rather than of lasting value to the communities themselves. Some local communities express this fear, referring to past experiences with the "university on the Hill," often cases where relationships were not sustained past a specific research project. Faculty recommended that the university develop the institutional capacity to help participants monitor and evaluate these projects and relationships in order to learn who (if anyone) benefits in the communities.

Broadly, both graduate students and undergraduates, in their role as learners, are intended to benefit from their participation in scholarship in action, as well as to serve the public good. These benefits must be evaluated alongside those to the communities and publics served. In both cases it is important to take into account unforeseen consequences. Again, the institution must find ways to help design and carry out such evaluation.

As one member remarked, much of the rhetoric of engagement emphasizes the positive nature of the encounter between scholars and students of the academy and members of communities, without sufficient consideration of the possibility for negative experiences on both sides. Those who have actually practiced scholarship in action are the first to point out that there are many risks, practical problems, and ethical dilemmas involved in such projects that need to be thought through and monitored, requiring institutional attention and support. In the end, it is not just scholars and their works that are subject to review and assessment. Scholarship in action itself as a concept and a practice at Syracuse, and engagement as practiced across higher education institutions, need to be continually evaluated as they affect both the academy and society. Syracuse can benefit both from systematic data gathering and evaluation of the impact of scholarship in action at Syracuse and also from careful study and comparison with the results of engagement policies at other institutions.

INTRODUCTION

In an address to the campus at the end of her inaugural year (April, 2005), Chancellor Nancy Cantor announced her vision of Syracuse University as a Creative Campus whose faculty and students would be deeply engaged with the world, interacting with local and global communities in productive relationships and activities that she named "***scholarship in action***" ("Scholarship in Action: Building").[1] Recognizing the difficulty of fitting such public or community-engaged scholarship into the traditional framework for defining and evaluating faculty work, she called on the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate to study the issues related to implementing this vision.

The Academic Affairs Committee (hereafter, AAC) responded to this request by undertaking in Spring, 2005 a study of scholarship of action both as a concept and as a set of faculty practices on the Syracuse campus. This white paper reports on what the Committee has learned from this inquiry, which remains a work-in-progress. The Committee expects to continue contributing to the campus-wide effort to address the cultural changes associated with adopting this vision and interpreting it for the Syracuse context.

Although Chancellor Cantor encouraged the AAC to tackle the problem of <u>evaluating</u> excellence in scholarship in action, the project developed into a broader and more fundamental inquiry. It focused on understanding what is meant by scholarship in action (and related terms) and exploring the questions it raises about values, disciplinary differences, and the relationship between this concept and the traditional categorizing of faculty work as research, teaching, or service. The Committee saw this as a process of self-education, a necessary prerequisite to any future work it might undertake, including sponsoring campus forums on scholarship in action and analyzing or developing possible models of evaluation.

Early on, the Committee adopted a strategy of examining scholarship in action from three angles, which we called "top down" (administrative leadership), "bottom up" (faculty practices and views) and "outside in" (the external context). The "top down" and "outside in" perspectives provided the context in which we examined Syracuse faculty practices and views, our primary focus. For the external context, we commissioned a research report from Dianna Winslow, a doctoral candidate in Composition and Cultural Rhetoric who served as Research Assistant to the project.[2] For the administrative perspective, we consulted Chancellor Nancy Cantor's speeches and writings to study her concepts, language, and actions in promoting a vision of "scholarship in action" as a campus president and national leader. In addition, we have benefited from the perspectives of central administrators on the committee, including the Provost (originally Deborah Freund, now Eric Spina) and Associate Provost Karen (Kal) Alston. Committee members also attended meetings on campus in 2006-07 with national leaders on community engagement and public scholarship, Ira Harkavy (Associate Vice President and Director of the Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania) and Timothy Eatman (Project Director for Research and Policy for Imagining America).

For the "bottom up" perspective we drew on multiple sources from the Syracuse campus community. The first was the membership of the AAC itself, organized during part of our inquiry into three subcommittees (with occasional outside participants). A second source was the views of department chairs. Louise Phelps, Chair of the Committee, discussed scholarship in action with participants at annual Chairs Conferences and conducted in-depth interviews on this topic with 18 department chairs across schools and colleges. Some deans and associate deans were also interviewed. But the richest source of insights into the variety and complexity of scholarship in action on this campus was a series of panels comprised of tenured and tenure-track Syracuse faculty, who were

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, Nancy Cantor's speeches and writings cited here are available at <u>http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/vision/</u>.
[2] In addition to her Research Report, Winslow helped assemble and select reading materials for the Committee and provided additional bibliography and research contributions to the Background section of this white paper.

asked to describe their own faculty work as exemplifying scholarship in action. The Committee organized a total of five such panels, hearing from 22 tenured and tenure track faculty (listed in Appendix A).[3]

This white paper summarizes and integrates what the Committee has learned from these multiple sources and three distinct perspectives.

BACKGROUND

"OUTSIDE IN": ENGAGEMENT AS A MISSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Upon first hearing Chancellor Cantor's ideas about engaging with the world through "scholarship in action," many faculty wanted to know whether this was a personal vision, a unique strategy designed specifically for Syracuse University, or an important trend in higher education. They wondered (and worried): Is this concept idiosyncratic—will it outlast Nancy Cantor's presidency? Is it just another passing fad in higher education? Junior faculty asked how doing scholarship in action, especially focused on the local community, would affect their marketability in a national or global economy of knowledge based on disciplinary expertise. One department chair cautioned about "getting out ahead of the marketplace." Many senior faculty who found the concept attractive nevertheless insisted that they could not in good conscience mentor young faculty to do it as long as they would be judged by other scholars, locally and nationally/internationally, in terms of traditional research criteria.

These responses made it very important for the Academic Affairs Committee to learn about sources or parallels to "scholarship in action" in the broader landscape of higher education, and to determine what cachet these ideas have at peer institutions and in the academic marketplace.

Historically, higher education in America has periodically reinvented itself in response to the evolving needs and demands of a developing democracy (Geiger). During the 1990s, influential voices began to call for radical change, warning that once again higher education must comprehensively transform its missions and structures to meet new expectations and conditions. Although many forces —economic, demographic, technological—were driving change and creating an array of specific problems for academic institutions, they identified the core issue as a disconnect between the academy and its communities and publics, who had lost faith in higher education as a public good. An avalanche of published critiques pictured the academy as insular and disengaged from ordinary life, neglectful of students, public needs, and local communities. This disenchantment, coupled with economic pressures and competing public priorities, manifested itself in a massive loss of public funding and ever-increasing demands for greater accountability. Calls mounted from the American higher education community itself to renegotiate what historians describe as its "social compact," a "covenant" with society that commits the academy to serving societal needs in return for public support and investment.

In response to this crisis, a remarkable consensus developed among leaders in higher education to make "***engagement***" with communities and publics the new agenda for higher education. They advocated engagement as a transformative ideal, a commitment to re-energize the social compact through a new partnership with other institutions, organizations, and communities to contribute to the public good. They hoped to reclaim the civic traditions of the American academy from earlier periods like the Progressivist era, when universities embraced an ideal of public service that became known as the "Wisconsin Idea," based on "the conviction that informed intelligence when applied to the problems of modern society could make democracy work more effectively" (Rudolph 363).

The concept of "engagement" has been developed, debated, and advocated over the last decade by higher education scholars, policy organizations, foundations, and institutional leaders in countless articles, books,

---

[3] Four of the panels were taped for internal Committee use. All references to panelists' specific comments are with permission.

commission reports, declarations, mission statements, strategic plans, and conference presentations. Here are a few formulations representing a variety of such stakeholders:

"**Engagement** is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good" (CIC)[4]

"[N]ow is the time to boldly claim the authority and ability to focus our energy on the civic purposes of higher education. . . . The challenges facing higher education go beyond the need to add more service-learning experiences or to reward faculty for community-oriented research. . . . [T]he more fundamental task is to renew our great mission as the agents of democracy. This task points to deep strategic challenges: how to tap and free the powers and talents of all elements of our schools—our faculty, our students, our staff, our administrators—for **public engagement**? How to break down the artificial and arbitrary 'silo cultures' that now stifle creativity, connection, and community? How to renew throughout our institutional life and cultures a robust sense that our work contributes to the commonwealth of our communities, our nation and the world?" (Wingspread 9).[5]

"By **engagement**, we refer to institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined" (Kellogg, Executive Summaries 13).[6]

As this idea has been advocated and implemented, it has two dimensions, which reinterpret the core missions of research (as "discovery") and teaching (as "learning") and couple them to a transformed notion of public service, the "third mission" of the academy.[7] The first dimension treats engaged work from the faculty perspective as a form of scholarship, a topic of intense debate and controversy because of its confusing and contested intersection with the current system of faculty roles and rewards. The second dimension is a focus on educating students to participate actively as citizens in a democratic society and global community. This theme is exemplified in the service-learning movement and the effort to rank institutions on their level of "student engagement." In the context of criteria for promotion and tenure (which raise core issues of academic values), the problem of evaluating faculty engagement as scholarship tends to overshadow the teaching/learning functions of engagement. This was often the case in our Committee's discussions and panels on "scholarship in action." But in practice, the student side of the engagement agenda is well-advanced on many campuses, including Syracuse, entailing new responses and expectations for the faculty as teachers.

This two-sided nature of engagement is articulated clearly in the recently established elective Carnegie classification of "Community Engagement" (described on the website of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). Institutions can be classified under "Curricular Engagement," "Outreach & Partnerships," or both. In Curricular Engagement, "teaching, learning or scholarship engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution." Outreach refers to "the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community," while "Partnership focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of

---

[4] From the Committee on Engagement of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, a consortium of 12 research universities, including the 11 members of the Big Ten Conference and the University of Chicago.

[5] From participants in the 1998 Wingspread Conference on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, which included 44 representatives of institutions, professional associations, private foundations, and civic organizations.

[6] From the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, in a series of reports on "Returning to Our Roots."

[7]Each of these dimensions has generated a rich vocabulary of engagement: from the student/learning perspective, for example, "civic learning," "service learning," and "student engagement"; from the faculty/scholarship perspective, terms like "engaged scholarship, "community-based scholarship," and "the scholarship of engagement." Other terms treat the university itself as an agent: calling it the "engaged institution"; referring to the university as "citizen," "entrepreneur," or "force" for social change.

knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.)." In the first list of institutions classified under Community Engagement (2006), Syracuse University was recognized under both categories.

The focus on engagement was initially associated with an effort by state and land-grant institutions to renew and revitalize their heritage in public education. A commission on the future of state and land-grant universities, sponsored by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and funded by the Kellogg Foundation, prepared six reports on "Returning to Our Roots," which concluded with one that called for "renewing the covenant" by refocusing the mission of "the engaged institution" from "research, teaching, and service" to "learning, discovery, and engagement." The most influential of these reports was "Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution," from which the last definition above was drawn. This passage goes on to say:

> Engagement goes well beyond extension, conventional outreach, and even most conceptions of public service. Inherited concepts emphasize a one-way process in which the university transfers its expertise to key constituents. Embedded in the engagement ideal is a commitment to sharing and reciprocity. By engagement the Commission envisions partnerships, two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table (Kellogg, Executive Summaries 13).

The Wingspread Declaration on the Civic Mission of the Research University was published in the same year as the Kellogg Report on engagement (1999). One of its multiple organizational sponsors was Campus Compact, which had been promoting civic engagement since 1985. However, it was not until 2006 that a coalition of major public and private research universities published a statement through Campus Compact ("New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement: A Leadership Agenda"), which reflected the diffusion of the engagement agenda beyond the state and land-grant institutions.[8] By this time, the theme of engagement had been taken up by all different types of institutions as well as scholars and policy makers across the spectrum of higher education's organizations, sponsors and supporters, and influential stakeholders.

As commitments to engagement moved across the landscape of higher education, the concept (and the terms) mutated subtly to fit different institutional histories, missions, geographies, demographics, and intellectual traditions. American education's historically diverse missions, and the tensions and contradictions among the values they represent, show up in the concept of engagement as it is interpreted and implemented across this landscape. Many of these tensions center around the relationship between scholarship and engagement, or between "engaged scholarship" and service. That is because the ability to implement engagement as an institutional mission, especially in research universities, depends critically on how it is integrated into the system that governs what kinds of faculty work can be valued and rewarded. Therefore, attention has focused intensively on different ways that the categories of the "roles and rewards" system might be used or reconceptualized to accommodate engaged faculty work.

In 1996, in the first issue of the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, Ernest Boyer's essay on "The Scholarship of Engagement" was posthumously published. In earlier work, Boyer had argued for a new taxonomy of scholarship to replace the traditional triad of "research, teaching, and service" (*Scholarship Reconsidered*). His proposed categories were the scholarships of teaching, discovery [i.e., research], integration, and application [i.e, professional practice or public service]. While these categories have been widely discussed and in some instances adopted by institutions for the classification and evaluation of faculty work, they remain controversial. The scholarship of application as he defined it was felt to be inadequate to explain relations between scholarship and service. Building on work by Ernest Lynton as well as Boyer, many had been trying to expand and enrich the concept of service as a faculty role that required disciplinary expertise and was therefore "scholarly." The development of engagement as a mission posed a comparable problem, and the two projects converged (Rice). As

---

[8] This document emerged from a conference at which 13 public and private universities organized themselves as a formal network to promote engaged scholarship and civic engagement at research universities.

a result, the notion of "engaged scholarship" or a "scholarship of engagement" emerged and has essentially replaced "professional service" as a way to specify engagement from a faculty perspective. Although in the Kellogg Report, which focused on the institution rather than the individual faculty member, "engagement" directly replaced "service" or "outreach" in a new triad (discovery, learning, and engagement), the trend in discussing faculty work has been to treat engagement as a mode in which all three of the traditional missions can be carried out. Indeed, many accounts of "engaged scholarship" treat it as an integrative practice, in which engagement unifies and blurs the boundaries between research, teaching, and public service.

Nancy Cantor's "scholarship in action'" falls within this paradigm of faculty engagement work, as does the work of Imagining America (IA), an organization focusing on the arts and public humanities that is relocating to Syracuse University. The IA's Tenure Team Initiative, co-chaired by Chancellor Cantor and Steven Levine, uses the term "public scholarship," defined for the humanities, arts, and design) as "scholarly or creative work integral to a faculty member's academic area. It is jointly planned, carried out, and reflected on by co-equal university and community partners. And it yields one or more public good products" (Ellison 13). The TTI specifically notes that, in comparison to definitions rooted in the historic outreach and service missions of the state and land-grant institutions, it emphasizes scholarship: ". . . while we are mindful of service and outreach, we are trying to create a vocabulary that emphasizes inquiry, discovery, and creation. We make a stronger claim than others have done for the intellectual 'generativity' of public scholarship and artistic creation" (11). In addition, its definition privileges the <u>integration</u> of scholarship, teaching, and public engagement as a "distinct aspect of scholarly excellence," while retaining the requirement (carried over from the original formulations of engagement) that such scholarship involve community members as co-agents of both practice and inquiry.

Faculty who identify community work with service (still largely understood on campuses as good citizenship) tend to suspect terms like "engaged scholarship" or "scholarship in action" as efforts to elevate the status of public service without meeting strict disciplinary criteria about what is to count as "research" or artistic creation/performance. But a closer look shows that in some contexts the argument for engagement has become an argument about the future of research itself. In this view, 1) engaged scholarship is actually a qualitatively different form of research, complementary to traditional scholarship; and 2) engagement has the potential to enhance research capabilities as well as to solve some of society's most complex and difficult problems, which require interdisciplinary collaboration across boundaries between academic and nonacademic communities.

This position is compellingly stated in international contexts: for example, the American scholar Barbara Holland, in a keynote address given in 2005 to the Australian Universities Quality Agency Forum on "Engaging Communities"; and in "Engagement as a Core Value for the University," a document prepared for the Association of Commonwealth Universities, 2001.[9] Drawing on European work by Dominique Foray and Michael Gibbons, et al., Holland describes "global shifts in research paradigms. . . driven by the rapid creation of new knowledge and the expansion of access to data across societies and economies" (3). Gibbons and his colleagues describe Mode II research (in contrast to Mode I, a traditional academic model) as "'transdisciplinary,'. . . produced in the *context* of application rather than in the more controlled context of an academic discipline and its paradigms" (Holland 2-3). Holland summarizes their argument:

> Disciplinary traditions, subject-driven academic programmatic hierarchies, and organizational boundaries inhibit the exploration of some intellectual problems. In part this is because technology has made knowledge, data, expertise and information so widely available that much research now can draw upon dynamic, interactive networks across different organizations, sectors, individuals, and even nations to address problems that were until now unresearchable. Research networks form, work, and dissolve or transform as dimensions of a problem are solved. Results are diffused as they emerge: production and dissemination are often merged. . . . . Gibbons and his colleagues argue that traditional criteria will continue, but that elements of efficiency, application, and utility will become increasingly valued. In some research

---

[9] The ACU represents 500 universities in 34 Commonwealth countries in Africa and Asia, Australasia and the South Pacific, Canada and the Caribbean, the United Kingdom, Cyprus and Malta.

that involves transdisciplinary modes, validation of quality and impact of findings may arise from sectors and sources outside the exclusive realm of the disciplines. (3)

Holland also argues that "accountability systems, policy environments, and reputational factors" have already established a new, competitive *global* climate for pursuing and evaluating engaged scholarship. She references the consultation document on engagement prepared for universities of the Commonwealth nations. The consultation document advises their Executive Heads:

> Commonwealth universities. . . will be judged, and learn to judge themselves, by the variety and vitality of their interactions with society. . . . To maintain our essential freedoms, universities must show they are *useful*. The task is not so much to offer the world packages of freshly discovered knowledge as to set examples of rigorous, relevantly-focused and objective enquiry. Universities need to be part of the conscience of democratic society and students helped to gain skill not just for their working life but also to participate as citizens. Increasingly, academics will accept that they share their territory with other knowledge professionals. . . . Knowledge is being keenly pursued in the context of its application and in a dialogue of practice with theory through a network of policy-advisers, companies, consultants, think-tanks and brokers as well as academics and indeed the wider society. Engagement implies strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world in at least four spheres: setting universities' aims, purposes, and priorities; relating teaching and learning to the wider world; the back-and-forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners; and taking on wider responsibilities as neighbors and citizens. ("Engagement as a Core Value" i)

In this interpretation, while engagement is from one perspective an idealistic renewal of American institutions' commitment to civic education and contributions to communities as public goods, from another it is a strategic choice for universities who want to remain on the global forefront of research. This pervasive national and international commitment of higher education to an increasingly sophisticated and forward-looking notion of engagement is the broader context for "scholarship in action" at Syracuse.

Originally a defensive reaction to public disillusion with American higher education and a perception of its decline, the commitment to engagement has evolved toward a proactive, transformational goal of reconceptualizing American higher education in all its functions for the new century. A powerful advocate for this approach is Michael Crow, president of Arizona State University, who aspires to set a new "gold standard" to replace the model of the research university that has dominated American education for the last century.[10]

> . . . I spoke of the fifteen distinguished American universities, institutions of such influence that, to this day, every university in the nation measures itself according to their standards. . . . [T]hese universities represent the gold standard, but a gold standard of the past. The new gold standard will be represented by the university that is inclusive, rather than exclusive, the university that is fully committed to its community, the university that directly engages the challenges of its cultural, socioeconomic, and physical setting, and shapes its research initiatives with regard to their social outcomes. ("A New American University" 37)

> I wish to foster a different kind of university, one that is linked to its setting and the needs of our day, one that does not measure its success based on an historic and in many ways antiquated set of design elements. . . . I propose various new design imperatives . . . to respond to the explosion in knowledge production, increased specialization in academic disciplines, the rise of new disciplines, and the collapse of disciplinary boundaries. . . during the past half century. ("A New American University" 10)

The eight design imperatives identified by President Crow to make ASU a model for the new American university, emphasizing social embeddedness, responsiveness to real-world problems, global engagement, entrepreneurship, and interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary programs, are deeply compatible with Chancellor Cantor's conception of "scholarship in action."

---

[10] See http://www.asu.edu/president/ for writings and speeches on President Crow's vision for the "new American university."

Given the ubiquity of this ideal of engagement in higher education, some participants in the inquiry raised questions about the extent of implementation at other research universities and the impact of putting it into practice. Further research is needed to determine what changes in policy and practice have resulted at other institutions (as well as Syracuse University to date) from the promotion of engaged scholarship.

"TOP DOWN": NANCY CANTOR'S VISION OF "SCHOLARSHIP IN ACTION" AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Nancy Cantor brought to Syracuse University a longtime commitment to "engaging the world"; in an early talk with Senate committee chairs, she referred to "research, education, and engagement" as the University's tri-partite mission, and her 2004 inaugural speech touched on many of the themes of this movement. From one perspective, as shown by our research on the external context, this agenda reflects a peer culture of academic leaders—national and international—that mandates engagement for all institutions. That imperative translates into criteria for assessment and benchmarks that assign extremely specific responsibilities to campus presidents (from advocacy to action) and, indeed, to every participant in an "engaged institution" from students and faculty to staff, administration, and trustees.[11] But the Chancellor is herself a national leader and prolific spokesperson for this movement—passionate, eloquent, and proactive in shaping its meaning, character, and directions. When she came to Syracuse University, she faced the challenge of adapting these commitments and understandings to the Syracuse environment.

Chancellor Cantor introduced the idea of deep engagement with external constituencies in her speeches and actions during her inaugural year, from exploring the "Soul of Syracuse" with the campus and local community to moving Syracuse students and faculty into the Warehouse in downtown Syracuse and proposing a Connective Corridor between the campus and downtown Syracuse.[12] Her focus on the city and its environs and diverse communities echoes the emphasis in many accounts of engagement, including Imagining America's "public scholarship," on valuing the local and regional as much as the national and global. Many of the most "engaged" institutions are urban ones newly conscious of their responsibilities to their neighborhoods. But during her first year Chancellor Cantor was refining a notion of engagement specifically for Syracuse that sprang in part from her own inquiry into the "soul" of the city and the university. In keeping with her own concept of engagement, she invited all stakeholders to join her in this exploration. In her April, 2005 keynote speech, she presented "scholarship in action" as the outcome of this inquiry: a concept arrived at inductively and collaboratively; reflecting the character of faculty scholarship at Syracuse, the university's intellectual heritage and focal areas of excellence, historical precedents and current examples of community engagement by faculty and students, and the historical and contemporary landscape of the region ("Building"). In subsequent speeches and writings, as well as concrete actions, Chancellor Cantor has elaborated and exemplified this concept.

Scholarship in Action: In the Words of Nancy Cantor

Comparing it to the literature and practice of engagement that we have reviewed, "scholarship in action" (a new variant of the many terms in use) is a distinctive articulation of engagement, selecting certain directions and emphases that reflect the Chancellor's own intellectual and ethical vision and the strengths, heritage, and potential she saw as specific to Syracuse. Overall, she advocates scholarship in action both in idealistic and in strategic terms: as a stance and a practice that will benefit the university as much as it does the communities it engages.

---

[11] For examples, see the Wingspread Declaration; the new Carnegie classification requiring documentation of engagement; and the CIC Resource Guide, which includes benchmarks on engagement from the North Central Accreditation Association. Such benchmarks task institutions and their leaders, for example, with changing reward systems and re-allocating resources to engagement.

[12] For detailed accounts of the actions Chancellor Cantor took to realize her vision during her first two years, see two speeches: "Universities and Their Connected Communities," given at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in March, 2006, and "Scholarship in Action: The Case for Engagement," given at Wesleyan University in November, 2006—both archived on the Chancellor's website under "scholarship in action." See also "Vision Statement," which divides engagement commitments into 3 sites: international, national, and Syracuse downtown.

Here in abbreviated form are some of the major themes and expressions woven through Chancellor Cantor's characterizations of scholarship in action.

1. *Emphasis on scholarship and the impact of engagement on the future of research itself*

Engagement is intellectually generative, entrepreneurial, enhancing potential for scholarly excellence: it is not simply "service."[13]

2. *A parallel emphasis on enabling students to learn by means of their own engaged scholarship and direct involvement in campus-community partnerships*

This student learning dimension of scholarship in action is underappreciated in many discussions (because of the focus on figuring it out as a faculty responsibility or activity). But it is one of the most pervasive ways that scholarship in action is actually realized on campus through the Chancellor's initiatives. Student participation in engagement was highlighted dramatically in 2006, when new students were "immersed" in the University's vision of scholarship in action, focusing on intellectual and community engagement and featuring an introduction to downtown Syracuse: "With its emphases on excellence, access, support and engagement with the world, Scholarship in Action is also the theme of Syracuse Welcome 2006: A Slice of SU Life, the University's signature new-student orientation program" (Snyder).

In this aspect, engagement is applied to the core mission of education (student learning) and, in Chancellor Cantor's conception, it is linked to student participation in research and action in public settings. Student scholarship in action has important implications for faculty teaching responsibilities, explored in our panels.

3. *The need to put scholarship to work, to "test" the excellence of scholarship in the "marketplace"*

Private universities, in Chancellor Cantor's view, should be "poised between the monastery and the marketplace." Because this idea is controversial, Chancellor Cantor has taken pains to historicize it, recalling Chief Justice John Marshall's view that private colleges and universities have a special role that requires a certain distance from the world with its practical interests and political pressures ("Universities" 3). Acknowledging that engagement is a departure from the tradition of private universities as the "monastery" or ivory tower, she has responded directly to those who resist more involvement:

> Historically, work in the marketplace for the public good has been most identified with American public universities. . . . [P]rivate universities have perhaps been closer to the monastery, identified as ivory towers of thought and experimentation, somewhat detached from any explicit mandate to work directly in the public interest. . . . [But] the time is right. . . for private institutions to join vigorously in the public agenda, and they (and we) are responding well to the challenge. There is some concern, of course, over whether this can be done while also protecting the independence of private universities. . . that some see as fragile in the face of the commercialization of universities and the blurring of boundaries between campus and community. ("Universities" 4).

Her response to these critiques is that, while these are genuine concerns, "we can protect the experimentation and freewheeling debates so constructive on our campuses—and still become more inter-dependent with our cities and regions" ("Universities" 4). She argues vigorously that

---

[13] Cf. Ellison; Holland; "Engagement as a Core Value"; Crow; Cherwitz and Sullivan.

Great universities, even private ones, cannot be ivory towers, for we arise out of and must exist within a public sphere of responsibility. This intimate relationship between the university and society provides us our very identity and informs everything we do—not just what can be labeled as our "service mission." ("Collaborations" 6.)

4. *Partnerships and reciprocal exchanges with communities and publics. Involving all sectors of society as co-agents and collaborative peers in an expansive and inclusive notion of "community," working together in a "third space." The creative campus as having no boundaries.*

[W]e must learn to construct these local collaborations in shared 'third spaces' where talented people of all backgrounds and different expertise can live and work together. We must create two-way streets for vibrant exchanges of people and ideas, and in so doing contribute actively to building communities. . . . ("Scholarship in Action: The Case" 3)

We work with local citizen groups, public officials and agencies, not-for-profits, artists and business people, and we use the resources of both the campus and the city interchangeably, moving physically up and down the 'hill'" ("Scholarship in Action: The Case" 10).

5. *An emphasis on valuing "local public scholarship"*

"Local" in the vocabulary of engagement is usually taken to mean the city and surrounding region, in contrast to international or global scholarship and action. Surely Nancy Cantor does mean that institutions, scholars, and students have special responsibilities and opportunities for scholarship and learning in their own urban neighborhoods and regional settings. That implies that work nearby one's institution is as valuable in principle as work on the international scene. But in elaborating this concept, drawing on the work of scholars in Imagining America, she refines it to mean something more like an orientation to place:

I do not intend here to contrast local and global, but rather to reflect the embedding of public scholarship in partnerships with communities of experts outside the campus with deep ties to local communities, whether they be situated at home or abroad" ("Scholarship in Action: The Case" 3, FN 6).

6. *A thoroughgoing commitment to diversity, broadly conceived, as a necessary feature of excellence. Guaranteeing intellectual richness through multiple perspectives; attracting and retaining young scholars and entrepreneurial students "from all socio-economic and cultural spheres to come to Syracuse and experience the creative campus on and off the 'Hill"* ("Vision" 2)*.*

The Chancellor has repeatedly linked diversity to engagement in all the features of scholarship in action listed here. Diversity has multiple applications in the Chancellor's speech and writing: it signifies inclusion of all constituencies in the notion of "community" and as potential partners; respect for forms of vernacular and expert knowledge other than those recognized and validated by academic methodologies and traditions; and access for all social classes and cultural groups. On the latter, Chancellor Cantor emphasizes that engagement promotes inclusion of "new voices with democratizing effects" from both on and off campus. With respect to faculty, "Valuing public scholarship helps build a diverse faculty. Faculty of color, particularly in interdisciplinary fields and particularly on urban campuses, are committed to experimental public practice" ("Scholarship in Action: The Case" 6). And her initial plan for scholarship in action included student access initiatives emphasizing recruiting students from diverse backgrounds as well as campus programs exploring difference ("Scholarship in Action: Building" 11).

Obstacles to Implementing Scholarship in Action

Nancy Cantor has identified many features of scholarship in action that she believes make it difficult to practice and value within higher education institutions. For example, public work involving multiple disciplines and diverse constituencies as partners can be difficult to coordinate and subject to political pressures and intense

conflicts. Local communities may be suspicious of the academy, its motives, and its interest or capability in sustaining long-term relationships. But she, like many other proponents of engagement, locates the most difficult problem in the culture of the academy itself and, specifically, the difficulty of valuing and rewarding scholarship in action within the traditional tenure and promotion system:

The current tenure and promotion system extracts a high price. It is costly to communities, because they aren't getting access to educational partners. It is costly to students, because opportunities for significant public work often are not available through the curriculum. It is costly to faculty scholars, who can't claim community-based intellectual work in a way that counts at tenure time. (AACU/ACE 5).

In this talk, she listed eight particular features of scholarship in action (projects) that make engaged work genuinely difficult both to practice and to evaluate in relation to the usual academic norms and structures: for example, the length and timing of the work (mismatched to the tenure clock and the academic calendar); its interdisciplinarity; and the way it integrates or blurs the categories in which work is normally evaluated (4-5). These and many other difficulties emerged in our panels.

THE EVOLUTION OF OUR PROJECT

The First Year: Spring 2005-Spring 2006

In Spring 2005, the AAC indicated its interest in conducting a project on scholarship in action and was subsequently charged with this task by Chancellor Cantor. She was invited to meet with the committee in April to discuss her vision and its implications for faculty work and policies. At this meeting, Chancellor Cantor asked the AAC to think about the leadership role that SU might take in expanding the guidelines of promotion and tenure for faculty excellence, particularly in public scholarship. She pointed to the examples of such work taking place on campus across disciplines and in partnerships with industry and the community. She encouraged the Committee to study this problem in light of features of scholarship in action that don't fit well with the traditional model for tenure evaluation—for example, its collaborative and interdisciplinary nature, its partnerships with practitioners, its demands for increased mentoring, and the difficulty of measuring and objectifying productivity. The Chancellor and the Committee agreed that it was a considerable challenge to change faculty culture to accept and encourage this kind of scholarship.

The Committee thought it was essential to take up this issue in a spirit of inquiry, without preconceptions about the nature and value of such work or its distribution among disciplines. The project was announced to department chairs at the Summer 2005 Chairs Conference, framed with this initial question representing the Chancellor's charge: "*How can we evaluate and reward scholars who work across academic/public boundaries in nontraditional forms and integrations of scholarship, teaching, and action*?"

In preparation for the project, Chair Louise Wetherbee Phelps conducted exploratory interviews with department chairs during Summer and Fall 2005. These conversations focused on the kind of engaged work (if any) that chairs were familiar with in their fields or departments and on differential faculty practices and attitudes about conducting, valuing, and evaluating this kind of work in each field. Because the Committee included representatives from all schools and colleges at SU, we tried to extend this discipline-based approach in our own preliminary conversations and the initial design of the project, adopted in January 2006. The Committee envisioned two phases: first, to educate ourselves about the meaning and practice of scholarship in action (from the "top down," bottom up," and "outside in" perspectives); later, to extend that process to a campus-wide dialogue, sharing the results of our inquiry and sponsoring forums for discussion and debate. We deferred decisions about further steps and a final outcome or product until the self-education phase was complete.

Our initial plan was based on the hypothesis that differences about scholarship in action, both definitional and value judgments, would reflect disciplinary differences. In Spring 2006 the AAC was organized as a committee-

of-the-whole into three groups, keyed to areas of excellence that Chancellor Cantor had singled out as "most likely to produce strategic investment opportunities": (1) technology and science; (2) human needs, social policy, and community and economic development; and (3) public humanities, public communications and the arts.[14] A steering committee was formed to prepare for discussion of the issues, organize materials for distribution to the Committee, and plan project events.[15] Dianna Winslow was appointed to research the engagement movement as a context for scholarship in action, as well as Nancy Cantor's talks and writings. Members were asked to discuss scholarship in action with colleagues in their own units and compare responses within the subcommittees. In April, the steering committee organized a panel featuring faculty members in the public humanities and arts, who were asked to explain their own work as scholars in action. It was intended to be the first of several panels representing each of the subcommittee disciplinary clusters.

Discussions during the spring centered on a set of evolving questions about scholarship in action (Appendix B), developed from preliminary conversations and interviews. By the end of this semester, we had failed to make progress on these questions through a comparative approach organized by discipline; more often than not, discussions came to an impasse. Our many exchanges within and outside the Committee revealed a fundamental conceptual and definitional problem underlying different responses to valuing and evaluating scholarship in action. Participants lacked a common understanding of what "scholarship in action" meant or referred to in their own and other disciplines, particularly in relation to the traditional categories of faculty effort (research, teaching, service). Often disagreements over value and evaluation turned on how engaged activity was classified in these terms. This was the source of some differences ascribed to disciplinarity, because disciplines conceive and operationalize these categories differently. Readings about engagement in higher education literature, or in Chancellor Cantor's writings, only compounded the difficulty because of the ambiguities and confusion created by variations and nuances in terms and their meanings across institutions and organizations.

These problems also made it evident that abstract definitions were elusive and vague to most Committee members and colleagues we talked with; what was needed was definition by example. The April panel of Syracuse colleagues talking concretely about their projects taught the Committee more about scholarship in action as a form of faculty work than any of our previous discussions or readings. However, the panel also changed our minds about organizing future panels around discipline-based clusters. It revealed a set of roles played by scholars in action across fields that formed the basis for a new approach.

The Second Year: Fall 2006-Spring 2007

Based on what had been learned from the work in 2005-2006, especially from the April panel of scholars, we revised the plan for the following year to focus on learning about the nature and value of scholarship in action through the exemplary practices of Syracuse faculty as they themselves perceive and value their work. Rather than relying on preconceived ideas about disciplinary differences, we reorganized our inquiry around three prototypes of scholarship in action that we had inferred from faculty examples. We interpreted these models as roles that could be played (separately or in combination) by scholars in any discipline, embodying different relationships to communities and publics. The Committee recruited three interdisciplinary panels, each focused on one of these models, asking participants to test our hypothetical categories and descriptions against the reality of their own work and experiences as scholars in action. We concluded this semester with a final panel in which we asked colleagues to help us understand the views of critics and skeptics and the genuine, important concerns faculty have about implementing a vision of scholarship in action.

---

[14] Investment Focus 1: Faculty Excellence and Scholarly Distinction," in "Vision Statement: Scholarship in Action."
[15] Subcommittee chairs during this semester and the following included Norman Faiola, Larry Elin, Peter Castro, Barbara Fiese, and Harvey Teres. They constituted the Steering Committee for the scholarship in action project, along with Louise Phelps and Dianna Winslow.

In proposing these models as different modes of "engagement with the world," we intended to make some distinctions and account for some differences that we had observed among Syracuse faculty members who regard themselves, or are regarded by others, as practicing scholarship in action. Their primary purpose was to help the AAC locate and compare scholars and their projects and open up the questions we had about engaged faculty work. As prototypes, we knew they wouldn't match perfectly with scholars and their projects, and that many examples would blend two or more roles. But we hoped they would provide a good prompt for scholars to provide descriptions of their work and analyze the issues surrounding it.

PRACTICING SCHOLARSHIP IN ACTION

MODELS OF ENGAGEMENT: THREE FACULTY ROLES

We presented panelists with descriptions of three proposed models of scholarship in action (Appendix C). In brief, these are the roles as we imagined them:

• **public intellectual, public communicator**: "A faculty member draws on scholarly expertise to communicate about academic knowledge and public issues with publics and communities in a variety of media."
• **community partner-in-action**: "A faculty member engages in complex, collaborative projects with community partners from various sectors of society to accomplish problem-solving and constructive action."
• **community-engaged teacher**: "A faculty member either teaches outside the bounds of the university campus to nontraditional students and audiences, or engages SU students in research, action, and/or interaction with communities outside the institution to enhance their learning—or both."

Panelists were chosen because of projects or career patterns that appeared to fit one of these descriptions. We invited them to present examples of their work in that role, but to comment freely on how they blended roles in a specific project or career (as many did). All panelists received the same set of questions to think about and address, addressing the "scholarly" nature of their work, its challenges and difficulties, and issues of value and evaluation (see sample in Appendix D).

Conflicts over the Public Intellectual Role

Although we derived these roles and descriptions from actual faculty examples, they do have historical sources and contemporary currency. For example, two of these roles ("community partner" and "engaged teacher") correspond directly to the Carnegie categories of community engagement for which Syracuse was recognized. However, the third role has a problematic relationship to the engagement movement. If one understands the contemporary "public intellectual" in certain terms (academics writing on their expertise or commenting on public issues for nonacademic public audiences, especially in the role of social critic), this role appears not to fit the definitions of engagement we found in the literature. Specifically, many assume this role lacks the qualities of collaboration, partnership, reciprocity, and full participation of communities in every aspect of engaged work that they regard as defining features of engagement. Imagining America has explicitly excluded public intellectuals from its concept of public scholarship:

> Public scholarship does not mean simply the delivery of knowledge to the public in accessible forms. Nor does it mean that faculty scholars become service providers. Public scholarship is not the same as public intellectual work (academic production that has a public audience) or faculty investigations of public culture or the public sphere." (Ellis 14, drawing on work by Harry Boyte and David Scobey).

At the same time, self-identified (academic) public intellectuals themselves have mixed and varied responses to the agenda of engagement. Some are extremely wary of the goals of this movement on grounds that range from concerns about academic freedom and corporatization of the academy to fears about partisanship or politicization

subverting an ideal of disinterested scholarship. Others argue strongly for a "partisan" or socially engaged concept of the public intellectual role as requiring "the integration of scholars' lives and values with their scholarship to enact a profound commitment to social justice" (Swartz 1). Within the Syracuse community, we heard these positions voiced but also many others, reflecting the fact that definitions and contemporary enactments of the public intellectual role are much more diverse and contested than is suggested in Ellis's definition.[16] Certainly it was easy to identify colleagues who viewed themselves, or were viewed by others, as "scholars in action" based on their roles as public intellectuals or public communicators. But some of those colleagues harbored reservations about the relationship between their own work as public intellectuals (in a traditional sense) and the new agenda of scholarship in action.

The AAC learned early in its inquiry that there was conflict, both among such scholars themselves and in the rhetoric of engagement, over the status of the public intellectual role. This role (and divergent positions about it) was represented both among our own Committee members and also on the first panel, from which we conceptualized models for subsequent panels. Thus the Committee had to confront the issue of whether to include public intellectuals in studying scholarship in action, specifically as a prototype role for the panels. It was not difficult to decide. The AAC had taken a principled position that it would conduct the inquiry with no preconceptions (as a committee) about either the nature or value of scholarship in action, including how particular faculty activities would "count" in these terms. The panels were organized precisely to discover from scholars themselves how they think their work constitutes scholarship in action or engagement with communities and publics in various relationships or partnerships. This position required us to explore with an open mind any faculty work identified by practitioners with scholarship in action, before making our own judgments. In setting up the panel, we paired public intellectuals with public communicators in any media to study expression and communication as a broad function not otherwise accounted for in the more familiar prototypes of scholarship in action.

During our ongoing discussions, we came to see that the conflict over the public intellectual role was deeper than it first appeared because it evokes strongly felt, historically rooted differences in American higher education over the purpose of the university and its relationship to the public world. Traditionally, many have believed that the ability of the academy to serve society lies in its protected status as an "ivory tower" that guarantees academic freedom for the university to function as, in Robert Hutchins's words, "a center for independent thought and criticism." The role of the academic "public" intellectual can be interpreted as aligned with this view (though that interpretation oversimplifies the concept in historical accounts, contemporary practice, and our panels). Members of two groups of public intellectuals often take positions against particular forms of community or public engagement that they see as corrupting the academy—though for different reasons: traditional humanists who champion disinterested scholarship, unfettered inquiry, and independent thinking; and contemporary cultural critics on the Left who oppose relations between the academy and the "marketplace" on ideological grounds. Both can see their roles, and the independence of the academy, as requiring critical detachment from corporations and government or avoiding entanglement with the partisan interests of communities and tides of public opinion. These views stand in contrast to the ideals of engagement, particularly its emphasis on forming co-equal community partnerships and dissolving boundaries between the academy and its publics. The debates and disagreements over the public intellectual role allowed the AAC to trace many of the concerns and conflicts about scholarship in action voiced by faculty to these historically based, competing views of the mission and role of the academy in society.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

---

[16] Historically, academic public intellectuals includes figures who are quite diverse in their modes of engagement, including, for example, John Dewey, Margaret Mead, Hannah Arendt, W.E.B. DuBois, and Reinhold Niebuhr. The status of the public intellectual in contemporary society and the academy is the subject of much recent academic and popular literature and has been extensively debated by scholars of rhetoric and communication. See McKerrow and St. John for a review of recent literature, focusing on the evolution toward a more socially engaged conception of the public intellectual; and Brouwer and Squires for a study of controversy on this issue in the public press that connects it explicitly to changing relationships between the university and society.

Panelists validated the heuristic value of the models by accepting them readily as descriptors and specifying their work richly in these terms. Even though the roles are not necessarily sharply distinct, they do appear to present different challenges, can express different values, and sometimes come into conflict or competition. Roles were frequently combined in a particular project or a scholar's career, but panelists easily distinguished them as distinct functions with different goals and features. The use of these models for organizing panels proved extraordinarily productive.

"BOTTOM UP": SCHOLARS IN ACTION TALK ABOUT THEIR WORK

This section presents what the Academic Affairs Committee learned from studying the nature of engagement work on the Syracuse campus through the eyes of those who do it, along with the diverse concepts and views of scholarship in action held by SU faculty. This summary, while drawing on all our interviews and Committee discussions, focuses on the themes that emerged from panelists' responses to the questions we asked them about their own work as examples of scholarship in action. These matters entail sensitive issues of academic culture that generate anxiety and conflict, including faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion; disciplinary variations in standards and practices; changes in university mission and priorities; generational differences; tensions between freedom and accountability, rigor and relevance. The willingness of panelists to share their career experiences and exchange views in a spirit of openness and mutual respect was essential to our learning as a committee.[17]

A thematic summary can only begin to capture the rich detail of these thoughtful, candid panel presentations and the Committee discussions they generated. Here are just a few examples of "engaged" faculty activities:[18]

• Designing and implementing, with a local teacher, a social justice project with 170 middle-school students, then learning documentary film techniques to record and disseminate the work (Susan Hynds, Education)

• Collaboratively teaching an Honors seminar on the values underlying historic preservation and sustainable design; SU students and teachers worked with a local church to research and organize its archives, conduct an energy audit of the facility, and explore strategies for improving resource use (Elet Callahan, Management; Gary Radke, Fine Arts)

• Working with arts organizations and businesses to alter mundane objects and stories in projects that insert them into interactive contexts utilized by diverse populations, like the World Financial Center during the recovery effort after September 11th, to model, witness, and transform cultural meanings across social and geographical divides (Anne Beffel, Art and Design)

• Creating opportunities and channels to give students and community members a public voice: for one panelist, by founding a community press dedicated to supporting the work of university/community collaboratives; for another, by establishing a local newspaper staffed by SU students and community members, to be turned over to the community; for a third, by offering women training in digital photography to capture and exhibit images of their neighborhood's strengths and weaknesses (Stephen Parks, Writing; Steve Davis, Newhouse; and Kishi Animashaun, African-American Studies, respectively)

---

[17]Although we taped panels, we restricted viewing to AAC members in order to encourage panelists to recount personal experiences and express controversial views freely. To focus on themes rather than on individuals and observe confidentiality where appropriate, this paper cites panelists by name only in direct quotations.

[18] These descriptions are adapted from statements provided by panelists.

• Applying expertise to global public policy debates about the internet, as one of a group of scholars that combines policy advocacy with research-based analysis about issues like privacy, intellectual property, and freedom of expression (Milton Mueller, Information Studies)

• Investigating and taking action against genocidal rapes during war in Croatia and Bosnia by means that include publicizing the crimes through an international conference with survivor participants, a book, and extensive media work; advising the U.N. international court; facilitating student work in refugee camps; creating courses on violence and representation, genocide and the humanities (Beverly Allen, French, Italian, and Comparative Literature)

 • Offering lectures and facilitating social interactions with graduate and undergraduate students for residents of a senior retirement community, in conjunction with carrying out a study of aging there (Martin Sliwinski, Psychology)

The following sections are organized around the questions panelists were asked to respond to (Appendix D).

On the Scholarly Nature of Engaged Faculty Work

• *Please describe in some detail your activities or projects that fit into our topic of scholarship in action and, specifically, describe examples of your work as [a community-engaged teacher, public intellectual or public communicator, or community partner-in-action].*
• *In what aspects or ways do you view this work as 'scholarly'? How does it connect with your scholarly interests and knowledge, or with your other scholarly projects? Is it disciplinary? Interdisciplinary?*
• *How is your work valued in your own field and at SU, in your department and school or college? How does it figure in the tenure and promotion process, or other rewards?*

With a few exceptions, panelists saw their engaged work as "scholarly" in some sense or to some degree, but not necessarily in terms that would "count" toward tenure within their home field. This formulation of "what counts" reveals some key assumptions. First, panelists generally viewed tenure (not promotion or salary, for example) as the most critical test or measure of academic value. Second, for most of them "not counting" toward tenure was equivalent to "not counting as scholarship," since in their fields that category—i.e., "research or creative activity"—was decisive in evaluating faculty for advancement.[19] Before evaluation even begins, work is sorted into the categories or "bins" of scholarship (creating new knowledge or works), teaching, and service. If engaged work doesn't fit the governing paradigm for "scholarship" within the scholar's field, it disappears from the radar screen of evaluators, classified as a "service" contribution (equated with good citizenship) or perhaps a teaching overload, neither significant for judging scholarly excellence.

Although this conventional interpretation oversimplifies disciplinary and generational differences in panelists' experiences, it is the universal generalization that emerges first from their accounts. Discrepancies between "scholarly" as a global attribute of faculty work and "scholarship" as a narrower, more precise category for evaluation generated extensive explanation and discussion among panelists and Committee members, suggesting that this disparity is a major source of confusions and controversies surrounding the definition and practice of "scholarship in action." The following analysis describes that gap as it relates to value judgments of engaged work, and reports how panelists respond to it.

---

[19] Panelists from the I.A. Newhouse School of Public Communications were an exception because their engaged work can count significantly toward tenure without falling in the category of "scholarship and/or creative activity." Newhouse tenure guidelines (Newhouse School Rules) allow for candidates to select one of four models for evaluation, comprising different combinations of strengths in teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service. High-quality contributions in any of these three categories can, in the appropriate combinations, qualify faculty for tenure.

Panelists' understanding of their work as scholarly was expressed mainly through descriptions that highlighted relevant features or characteristics. Here is a sample of the kinds of things they say about their work in presenting it (explicitly or tacitly) as scholarly.[20]

• *It follows particular processes or methods for inquiry.*
• *It sets and meets goals; makes plans and carries them out systematically.*
• *It addresses serious, consequential issues and problems.*
• *It is tied to theory.*
• *It is historically informed.*
• *It is situated in an intellectual tradition.*
• *It belongs to a creative or intellectual community with identifiable peers.*
• *It contributes to a greater body of current intellectual work.*
• *It serves the professional ideals of a field, specialization, or interdisciplinary area.*
• *It forwards my own scholarly agenda and builds on my previous work.*
• *It "advances the discourse" or contributes to knowledge or insight [in a field or intellectual tradition].*
• *It is intellectually rigorous.*
• *It is intellectually generative.*
• *It is novel, creative, innovative, cutting-edge.*
• *It requires me to constantly learn new things: information, problems, methods, technologies, media, theories of other fields.*
• *It transcends the immediate circumstances; it is applicable to situations other than where it originated.*
• *It incorporates critical reflection and self-assessment.*
• *It is subject to rigorous review and criticism by experts as well as beneficiaries.*
• *It is documented and/or represented and disseminated in appropriate media.*
• *Its outcomes or products are shared and made public.*
• *It is supported by competitive grants.*
• *It has changed/transformed my own scholarship and/or teaching.*
• *It is a source of what and/or how I teach.*
• *It has substantial and lasting impact, beyond the immediate benefits and direct participants in the project.*
• *It contributes to the stature or resources of the department or university.*

Although these remarks are generalized here, they were expressed by panelists with a vividly detailed particularity that made a powerful first impression of diversity in what scholars mean by "scholarly." For example, an architect, applied anthropologist, cultural critic, and chemist specify scholarly process or method, goal-setting, novelty, rigor, and documentation so differently that they may not recognize any commonality in using these terms. Indeed, in probing these differences panelists and Committee members often traced them to deep-rooted paradigms that differentiate forms of academic work by their distinctive missions, epistemology, methods, language, professional ethics, communication style, tradition of engagement, and more. These paradigms have their origin in relatively recent (late 19th-20th century) divisions among the faculties (liberal vs. professional, or research vs. creative/performance and practice fields; natural sciences vs. human sciences) and still tend toward these prototypes.[21] One example of a paradigm difference relevant to engaged work, for example, is how a field or specialization treats knowledge that is not produced in and by the academy or accepted as its equivalent (like, for instance, research in industrial science or a public policy think tank). Some fields acknowledge and incorporate forms of nonacademic knowledge in their scholarship—vernacular or indigenous knowledges, public memory, oral traditions, practitioner knowledge, user knowledge; while others define knowledge more strictly, in

---

[20] These statements are framed as claims, but were often aspirational. For example, "I ask myself, does this work contribute to the reputation of the university?" or "I'm not interested in popularizing, but in cutting-edge work."
[21] These divisions still have relevance, if only for the way they shape expectations and beliefs faculty have about one another's practices. But the fields they organize don't necessarily conform to divisional stereotypes (or school/college affiliation), which are poor predictors of the detailed differences among our panelists, created by their own subfields and specializations, new interdisciplinary communities, collaborations across divisional lines, and even the projects themselves.

terms of an academic tradition in which it is systematically developed and legitimated. This difference could profoundly affect how scholars interact with community partners.

Further reflection, however, reveals some striking commonalities underlying the conspicuous differences. Taken together, panelists' remarks suggest that, to them, being scholarly means most broadly *to set certain expectations for oneself and strive to meet them in carrying out academic work*. These expectations, which are rooted in intellectual communities and traditions, translate into questions scholars ask themselves critically as they carry out projects, to guide them in the process and assess the work and its outcomes. The panels show that these questions are similar in kind no matter how disparate the answers. We can see this better by grouping the scholars' responses above into broad concerns:

Ways of doing the work: e.g., formulating problems, choosing topics of inquiry, framing questions, using systematic processes or methods, setting goals, making and carrying out plans, sustaining a scholarly agenda, observing ethical standards
Means of legitimating the work: e.g., providing theoretical foundations, making reasoned arguments, documenting the work, representing it in various media, disseminating it to appropriate audiences and users, assessing outcomes or projects through review by appropriate evaluators
Connections to prior/current scholarship and to an intellectual community: e.g., drawing on other scholars' work, contributing to current work, building on a scholar's own previous work, placing work in an intellectual tradition, collaborating with others
Qualities of the work: e.g., commitment, passion, rigor, objectivity, caution, currency, originality, generativity, independence of thought, a critical stance
Significance: e.g., audiences addressed, importance of goals, relevance beyond immediate project, degree and scope of impact (effect on field, contribution to the public good).

The majority of panelists reported that in their units the type of work they did as engaged scholars did not count substantially toward tenure (or for other rewards) in their units.[22] There were some exceptions to that general claim. Some panelists, as well as others in Committee interviews and discussions, reported that certain kinds of engagement with publics or communities already fit well within the norms of evaluation for tenure and promotion in their fields. For example, in the creative arts or fields of public communication, engagement with nonacademic communities is often a characteristic feature of scholarly publication, communication, or performance. In other fields (for example, engineering and chemistry), researchers are already heavily engaged with outside partners, both governmental and corporate. In the latter cases, the stringent criteria for scholarship as discovery, along with the means of legitimating it through grants and publication, already apply, and engagement is not perceived as changing them. However, faculty in these fields may not perceive the work they already do as "scholarship in action," or value engagement per se. Moreover, some question how such scholarship contributes to a public good, citing potential conflicts of interest in its partnerships with government and the private sector.

The other exception applies to units in which guidelines or practices already allow engaged work to be counted significantly toward tenure when it is classified as teaching or service. We already noted that tenure and promotion guidelines in the Newhouse School provide models for different combinations of strengths, which allow faculty to weigh teaching or service more heavily in tenure decisions. In our discussions the Committee occasionally heard faculty members state that their highly research-oriented units could tenure a candidate based on "extraordinary" teaching and/or service, but panelists in such fields generally perceived this as unlikely or rare—an exception to the rule.

---

[22] Panelists spoke from historical experience and normative understandings of disciplinary practice at a time Syracuse University is just beginning to implement new polices and clarify standards for tenure from the institutional perspective. Junior faculty, especially, anticipated major changes based on the new vision of scholarship in action, while senior faculty tended to reserve judgment about what the impact would be in future tenure cases. One panelist whose work exemplified community-engaged teaching was subsequently granted tenure; she had emphasized the appeal of Syracuse University as a welcoming environment for such work.

Here's a sample—by no means exhaustive—of the many, varied reasons scholars offered to explain why their work or kind of work doesn't count for rewards in their fields or units, remembering that "counting" usually means not counting <u>as</u> scholarship and <u>toward</u> tenure.

• *The issue addressed is not recognizable or intelligible as a problem or question in this field.*
• *The goals of the project don't fall within the parameters the field sets for its research or teaching missions.*
• *The topics are too diverse and the body of work too generalist for a field that expects highly specialized, focused work.*
• *The work only partly meets the methodological requirements for conducting publishable research in the field, because of the complex conditions and constraints of engaged projects.*
• *The work doesn't fit with the field's norms regarding collaboration.*
• *The work takes a normative or advocacy stance in a field that sees scholarship as objective, neutral, independent, and/or a-political.*
• *Communities or partners prioritize action goals and community benefits over research goals; participants are unwilling or unable to conform with research protocols.*
• *Time constraints make it impossible to fully meet the criteria for scholarly process, peer review, or publication.*
• *The pace of the work is much faster or slower than the tempo by which faculty work is normally conducted, validated, communicated.*
• *Some information or materials necessary to document the project are confidential, sensitive, and/or not owned by the scholar.*
• *The outcome of the work is not a "product" as traditionally defined for evaluative purposes—e.g., a publication or exhibition.*
• *Outcomes of complex action projects are hard to determine and document, especially within the academic time frame for evaluation.*
• *The work isn't/can't be placed in accepted discipline-specific venues of publication or performance.*
• *The work is addressed primarily to publics other than scholarly peers.*
• *The work is expressed and communicated in non-technical language rather than the technical language of the field.*
• *The work is transdisciplinary and falls between paradigms with respect to process, epistemology, publication channels, peers for review, and so on.*
• *The work doesn't fit with the paradigm of those who judge it (e.g., applied vs. basic research).*
• *The work meets a different, alternate set of norms, with its own intellectual peers, standards of judgment, distribution channels, performance venues, and so on.*
• *The experts most capable of evaluating the work are not academics.*
• *The project has a local setting and scope and doesn't have national or international impact.*

Such divergences from the norms of a given field or home unit explain how efforts to evaluate engaged work as scholarship fail, and it falls by default into service, which is not normally considered a category of intellectual work for tenure or promotion. In addition, many scholarship-in-action projects focus on community-engaged teaching, which we chose as a primary model for the panels. Thus, we need to add one more global reason that engaged projects may not count meaningfully toward tenure, along with two corollaries:

• *The work fulfils a teaching mission.*
  • *Though associated with normal teaching duties, it has extraordinary aspects that can't be accounted for by traditional measures of teaching.*
  • *It is a form of nontraditional teaching (i.e., not on load, not credited, not directed to traditional SU students) not recognized as teaching or evaluated as such.*

Most of the differences panelists listed flow from the very concept of engaging publics and communities other than (only) academic peers, which entails an array of new purposes generated with and by these partners and beneficiaries and often developed or revised in the course of the project. In these new contexts, panelists'

departures from disciplinary norms (not only for research or creative work, but for teaching) represent the manifold ways they have adapted, translated, or even transformed traditional criteria to fit their projects' goals and needs, while striving to sustain scholarly ideals. These changes can be grouped into the same areas of concern as the criteria themselves:

Ways of doing the work: Engaged work typically introduces new topics, problems, and goals for the scholar, which may be more or less compatible with a field's traditional scholarly, teaching, or professional practice missions. For example, an Information Studies professor's goal was to affect information technology policy by feeding informed policy analysis into the decision-making process. He explained that such normative stances are appropriate to the professional goals of his field (which, as a practice, is about management and governance of information technology), but not always accepted as academic scholarship. The engaged teaching and community partnerships of a Nutrition professor fit well with the professional mission of her field and often fulfilled broad responsibilities for the department, for example providing students with service learning experiences or independent experience credits. So this work is accepted as a positive contribution, but broadly viewed as service; the research projects she incorporates into her projects often require adaptations that make them unpublishable, although they can be reported at conferences.

At least in these cases engagement only stretches the limits of the traditional core missions; but the more radical impact of engagement is to introduce a new (third) mission, layered on the core missions (and often dependent on them as means).[23] Broadly, the purpose is to produce public goods directly through collaborative action and communication with nonacademic communities on issues and problems they help to determine. The goals and intended outcomes are very different from the standard products of knowledge, artistic creations, or (SU) student learning: for example, institutional innovations, changes in cultural attitudes or social behavior, new technologies, policy decisions, artifacts, solutions to multi-faceted problems, community or organizational learning, or new organizations and systems.

Except for some fields of professional practice, these goals and activities of engagement may fall outside the domain the field recognizes as its own, so that there are no mission-specific norms in process or method, problem-definition, and so on for scholars to appeal to. (Standards for "service," primarily construed as institutional citizenship, offer little guidance on how scholarly criteria might apply to such activities.) Ways of doing the work in these projects—goal-setting, processes, rules, ethical standards, tempo and timing, and so on—are in any case likely to be interdisciplinary and highly negotiated among scholarly and public partners, whose heterogeneous habits, customs, and principled ways of doing things must be reconciled with one another as well as adapted to meet the needs of the project.

Because engaged work ventures outside what one panelist called the "cloistered environment" and controlled conditions of much academic work, and often involves immediately consequential action, scholars had to adapt plans and behaviors to complex real-world conditions and constraints, mostly beyond their direct control and changing unpredictably during the project. For example, Newhouse professor Steve Davis wrote about the lessons learned from the first experiment in sending students into the South Side neighborhood as reporters, which proved to be very difficult and intimidating for students. One of his conclusions is that it is important to give such assignments to students, to challenge them and change bad habits, suggesting "The lesson is the same for students, teachers, reporters, editors and managers: It's about the way we work, and how we need to change it" ("Reporting Out of the Comfort Zone").

---

[23] "New" is a relative term when applied to engagement as a mission at Syracuse University. For public universities, it is a new interpretation of an old mission—outreach; and for many professions at Syracuse, it is a dimension of their professional practice, although not necessarily well accounted for in the rewards system. Still, Syracuse faculty and panelists generally perceived it as new, both as an administrative initiative redefining the institutional mission and also as a new factor in evaluating faculty for rewards, including tenure.

In essence, then, panelists' ways of doing things had to become more flexible because they were doing new things, or doing familiar things with new purposes, conditions, and intellectual colleagues. The shift in basic premises—starting point, setting, desired outcomes, partners and constituencies—that engagement brings to academic work accounts for how panelists had to find new ways to fit means to ends. They did it by borrowing, revising, or adapting elements of the scholarly repertoire they had inherited and by learning, inventing, and integrating new ones from both traditional (academic) and nontraditional sources. One humanities professor's effort to expose and stop genocidal rape as a war crime in Bosnia took her completely outside her field into a multi-disciplinary study, adopting methods that one colleague called "qualitative sociology" and another called "investigative journalism"; yet she views this work as dependent on her scholarly skills for textual analysis, adapted to the social text.

Means of legitimating the work: In traditional academic evaluation, scholarship is largely equated with products that are published texts, either constituting the outcomes (e.g., humanistic criticism, history, or theory) or documenting them (e.g., scientific articles, research reports). The work is legitimated by external funding to conduct the work, peer review of the products, and the venue in which they are published. Creative and performing arts have equivalent products (artifacts, performances), reviews, and venues. As panelists noted, most fields have little provision for evaluating anything that that doesn't take these familiar forms as products or outcomes, or which can't be documented by traditional means in traditional venues and media for a particular field. Panelists had to find or invent alternate ways of making their work public and disseminating it in formats and media that were both possible and appropriate to the need, in terms of timing and audience, for example. The IST professor mentioned above used a blog and RSS feed in order to disseminate information fast enough to affect decision-making about internet governance. Two other panelists decided that their projects required learning documentary film techniques in order to present their work effectively to a range of audiences.

These formats and media were designed to reach a much greater array of audiences than scholarly peers or even experts outside the academy, for several reasons. First, in some cases communication was itself a primary goal of the project: for example in an economist's monthly newspaper column; or an artist's tiny mirrors sewed into a dress worn as she biked around the site of the 9/11 attack, inviting workers and residents to place the mirrors as an expression of resilience, resistance, and reclamation. In others, it is essential to the project as a method, as in the case of a sociologist's community brochure and briefings to organizations and community groups to inform them of environmental risks. Nonacademic audiences for our panelists' work on these grounds included, for example, policy makers, organizations, government agencies, community partners, a project's beneficiaries, interest groups, other public intellectuals addressing the same issues, and the general public.

Second, the outcomes of practical activity like problem-solving, construction and design (of a curriculum or building), or providing technology and expertise to give a community a public voice, are legitimized in large part in use and by their effective use. Effectiveness can be challenging to document, especially through recognized methodologies for legitimizing work by assessing its outcomes (which differ from field to field). As with some formal research processes, often such methods of assessment are just too expensive, difficult, unfamiliar to the primary scholar, inappropriate to the task, time-consuming, or unacceptable to the communities or constituencies involved. Traditional forms and media for reporting work to the scholarly community were similarly inappropriate or unavailable to some panelists for the same kinds of reasons.

Ultimately, legitimacy in disciplinary terms is tied to the goals and problems recognized as intelligible and relevant in the field, and these goals in most cases remain far narrower in scope and less oriented to real-world problems or situations than those taken up by scholars in action.

Connecting to prior/current scholarship and to a scholarly community: Scholars always located themselves in an intellectual tradition and a scholarly community or communities, but not necessarily in, or solely in, the one by which they would be judged. For example, a historian identified with a generalist tradition that addressed important public issues rather than with a single, hyperspecialized subfield. Many panelists had developed interdisciplinary and inter-institutional (academic and nonacademic) expert communities, both as sources of ideas

or methods and as partners in their work. However, these communities were not necessarily compatible with one another, or even in contact, and panelists had to translate between paradigms (with their different epistemologies, methods, language, and so on) in communicating or publishing their work. In some cases, primary intellectual communities had been constituted outside the academy altogether or blended academic and nonacademic members. Public intellectuals in Newhouse and English, who addressed such a blended audience, pointed out that their work was subjected to fiercely rigorous review and critique by editors of opinion magazines more selective than many peer-reviewed academic journals.

In some cases, because departments and schools or colleges are multidisciplinary, or because of an unusual placement, there is a misfit between the scholar's paradigm and the prevailing one in the evaluating unit. For example, one applied social scientist described himself as carrying out engaged scholarship according to a hiring mandate, doing work the department appointed him for and presumably valued, but having his work judged for tenure solely in terms of a paradigm for basic research. Another was doing work that she described as valued by a multidisciplinary home unit, but not normative for her home field or easily published in its journals, raising problems for reviews by outside scholars in her own discipline.

Qualities in the work: Many of the scholarly qualities that panelists sought or achieved in their work were the same as those of the disciplines they were trained and socialized in. But in some cases they changed qualitative ideals or adopted new ones to fit their goals of engagement. For example, action projects or communication directed at affecting public policy typically require giving opinions, taking positions, making decisions, or carrying out actions that may violate expectations of disinterested inquiry and objectivity or neutrality in research paradigms. As we see next, some panelists made powerful personal investments in the public goods they sought to achieve through their scholarly resources.

Significance: Panelists redefined significance to match the goals and values of different types of engaged work. Traditionally, fields look for impact on scholarship itself—theories, research methods, critical and interpretive practices, other scholars, the knowledge of the field. The academy has less well-defined criteria for scholarly impact in teaching, but generally evaluators look for changes and benefits that translate from the original context (classroom or curricular) context to other teachers, learners, and settings. As noted above, because engaged work is directed toward communities and publics outside the academy, it must define impact in terms of a wide range of audiences affected by products and outcomes. But at the same time, engaged projects can have an intentionally narrower scope, local rather than national or international, because they are focused on particular communities, situations, and needs. In these cases, to evaluate broader impact, criteria like repeatability, transferability, or generalizability have to be reinterpreted to fit practice situations. Donald Schon, scholar of professional practice, argues that outcomes of action research, verbalized by practitioners, can generalize through what he calls "'reflective transfer,' that is, by carrying them over into new situations where they may be put to work and tested, and found to be valid and interesting, but where they may also be reinvented" (10).

Scholarship-in-action projects often blend traditional and nontraditional forms of the core university missions (scholarship and teaching) with practice and problem-solving activities that are not easily classified. But taken together, panelists communicate a broad sense of what it means to be scholarly that is prior to any categorization of their work in traditional terms as scholarship, teaching, or service. They see their projects as scholarly primarily because they are trained scholars. Their descriptions represent themselves as behaving like scholars: addressing academic missions; motivated by scholarly passions and professional ideals; building on previous scholarly work—their own and others'; drawing on (and constantly extending) a scholarly repertoire of skills, methods, knowledge; judging their own work by scholarly standards (which may be more or less indebted to normative expectations in the evaluating units).[24] In sum, their engaged work expresses their scholarly identity and strives for scholarly integrity.

---

[24] In one case, a panelist did not describe his engaged work as scholarly, since he identified scholarly behavior completely with the paradigm for conducting scholarship in his science field. This is discussed below.

That said, as panelists themselves would agree, characterizing engaged work as scholarly in this global sense leaves open the questions of how it should be categorized for evaluation and, more broadly, how substantive and valuable it is in a given case or in general, and on what grounds. On these matters, they are as divided as the rest of the academy.

On Valuing and Evaluating Engaged Faculty Work

In Committee discussions faculty sometimes expressed a concern that "scholarship in action" is too amorphous and fuzzy to be subject to evaluation. What panelists told us is that, apart from how their engaged work is categorized, counted (toward tenure), or valued in their home fields, scholars in action themselves do have criteria for making their work scholarly, including communal standards for quality, channels for dissemination, peers capable of judging their work, and so on. These sound a lot like familiar academic ideals. However, when they tell us their work doesn't count for tenure, they are applying a more specialized set of criteria, those of a particular home unit and the habits and norms it has enshrined in its evaluation guidelines. Panelists differ greatly in their acceptance of such norms and the degree to which their notion of "scholarly" is tied to those norms.

In the current system for categorizing and evaluating faculty work in your field at Syracuse, how would work like yours be handled? How do you think it should be done?

While panelists themselves do not view the "scholarly" nature of their work as necessarily meaning it should count as "scholarship," especially for tenure, many are not satisfied with the way it is handled in the current system for evaluating faculty work. At issue are both *how it is categorized* (often predetermining how it can be valued) and *whether panelists accept the traditional norms* that govern each category.

Engagement and the Teaching Mission

We observed earlier that the focus on identifying and evaluating engaged work as "scholarship" tends to obscure the importance of the second dimension of engagement—a new vision of student learning. Yet Nancy Cantor has consistently defined scholarship in action in terms of student as well as faculty engagement: in our summary, *enabling [SU] students to learn by means of their own engaged scholarship and direct involvement in campus-community partnerships*. To implement scholarship in action in both dimensions implies making community-engaged teaching a high priority.

Where panelists' projects were versions or direct extensions of SU courses, there was no controversy about categorizing and evaluating them as teaching. The question was whether the engaged dimension of these teaching projects could be accounted for in evaluating them for substantive intellectual or creative contributions going beyond normal expectations for teaching, and potentially requiring new forms and criteria of evaluation. Most often, panelists said, such teaching was not treated as different from traditional teaching contributions by virtue of its community engagement, even though they themselves perceived the projects as introducing substantially different problems, difficulties, criteria for judgment, appropriate reviewers, and standards of excellence, as well as (more than one panelist estimated) "doubling the effort" and time commitment. The traditional measures for teaching simply overlooked the difference or called it "service." Separately, since many such projects incorporated student and teacher research, often in complex partnerships with others, panelists pointed to problems associated with meeting traditional criteria for publishable research when adapting disciplinary expectations to these circumstances. They described the challenging task of balancing student needs and community goals with research aims, while accounting for the limitations and constraints each of these imposed on the situation.

Most people treat the teaching mission as institutional in scope, defined for evaluation purposes in terms of courses, credits, and learners officially recognized as SU students. With most of our panelists on community-

engaged teaching, the connection to SU courses and students made it easy to recognize faculty projects as teaching. In contrast, activities fulfilling a broader educational mission outside the institutional framework are almost invariably classified as service, and were usually reported by the panelists themselves as exemplifying the roles of public intellectual/ public communicator or community partner-in-action. But these cases illustrated surprisingly how often scholarship in action in those roles extended the educational mission outside the institution and its traditional students to nontraditional learners (communities and publics), in familiar pedagogical modes like workshops, seminars, textbooks, tutoring, lectures, experiential learning, institutes, and conferences. For example, a Law professor and international expert on national security law and counterterrorism has directed an institute to train national security experts, given lectures around the world, written textbooks on national security and counterterrorism law, and developed a curriculum on security for civic leaders. Panelists also used other formats and media for educational purposes, including museum exhibitions, articles in magazines targeted to particular publics, CDs and DVDs, brochures, community briefings, consulting and advising relationships, newspaper columns, service on community or government boards, radio interviews, testimony, and blogs. Other examples of the extraordinarily diverse audiences for these educational efforts include the FBI and CIA, the Senate, teachers in the public schools, docents and visitors to museums, rural communities in East Africa, community labor organizations, U.N. agencies, an international court, and NGOs.

Scholarship, Engagement, and Disciplinary Norms

Most of the controversy, however, as in national discussions, focused on whether and how some forms of engaged work can or should "count" as research and creative activity, given their admitted variations from what panelists' disciplines—and often panelists themselves—currently define as tenurable scholarship.

In engaging communities and publics as scholars in action, panelists acknowledged they were working in new ways that reinterpreted, or at least bent, traditional disciplinary rules and models for scholarship, and sometimes radically challenged them. Yet most of them articulated criteria for being "scholarly" that bore the strong imprint of their academic training and experience, functioning as social norms. As Thomas Green explains, "A social norm does not describe how members of a group behave. Rather, for them it prescribes how they ought to or should behave" (44). "Normation . . . provides the standards against which the actual community is assessed by its members" (57). Green goes on to describe an array of attitudes that members of a group can adopt toward a norm, which fall along a continuum from complete acceptance and adherence to the authority of the rule (*obedience*) to *defiance*, rejecting the authority of the rule (perhaps in favor of a different norm). Between these two poles he describes other stances, including *compliance* (following rules pragmatically, without internalizing them as an ideal), and *observance* (accepting rules as ideals, whether obeying or disobeying them). All these stances, and nuanced variations of them, were represented among our panelists.

At one pole, the purest example of accepting the disciplinary norm was that of a research psychologist doing experimental research in a senior retirement community, where he rented an apartment. He and his students also interacted socially with residents—attending plays and social gatherings, offering lectures on topics in psychology. He described this engagement with residents as community service (citizenship), made possible by his presence in the community but entirely distinct from scholarly work. For this scholar, "scholarly" and "scholarship" were essentially the same; he identified scholarly behavior completely with the tightly specified paradigm for conducting scholarship in his field. He followed standard protocols for the project that required subjects not to participate as equal partners in designing or conducting his study. However, he hopes in the long term to implement a "consumer-scientist" research program that would recruit and train members of communities to become active participants in academic research projects.

Perhaps the majority of panelists would be described in Green's terms as *observant*, respecting and largely accepting the social norms of their fields despite the ways they actually diverge from them in engaged projects. In one variant of this position, panelists seemed to accept norms for research or creative activity and tried to follow them to the extent possible under the conditions of their work, but recognized that in many instances it was

impossible or not appropriate to do so fully. For example, a Nutrition professor integrated research projects for herself and her students into her community-engaged teaching, which were modeled on expectations in the discipline from applying for grants and research methods to publication. However, she noted that time and community attitudes often made it difficult to set up IRB-approved projects or use randomized control, which meant research results could not be reported in journals or counted in reporting her own work as "scholarship." In many cases of community-engaged courses, like a collaborative course project in a local church on historical preservation and sustainable design, the research component was conducted in part or in whole by students and/or community members, without the goal or possibility of scholarly publication. The "products" in such cases might be student and community learning on the one hand and action (preserving church archives, changing energy use in the building) on the other, while "publication" would consist of diffusion by media like parish newletter or pamphlets.

These examples show scholars trying to integrate traditional research into community-engaged teaching. Other situations, in community partnerships or engagement as a public intellectual, called for novel scholarly approaches to research or teaching themselves. Panelists' observant relationship to the academic norms of their training and experience showed up here in the way they drew on the resources these had given them, used and adapted them, and translated the spirit of those norms into new practices and standards. Often the result was a set of parallel or corresponding norms—for example, alternate ways of sharing, making public, disseminating, and subjecting to critique that parallel the way publication and review operate in traditional scholarship.

It is a common "observant" position for faculty to support scholarship in action as a late career option, but to argue that it should be undertaken only by tenured senior faculty members who have already met conventional expectations for scholarship in their fields. A number of senior panelists had made dramatic changes in their careers post-tenure: becoming public intellectuals; expanding their pedagogical goals to translate disciplinary knowledge to broader communities and publics in various media and contexts; or applying research skills and creativity to important public issues and problems. Panelists making such career shifts persuasively affirmed the value of their engaged work and the professional gratifications it provided. But most expressed some uncertainty or ambivalence about the role of scholarship in action in relation to traditional academic work,. They saw themselves, their units, and the academy as trying to strike a difficult balance between competing values, both of profound importance and compelling interest.

The career changes of these panelists often prompted questions about whether junior faculty should undertake such work in panelists' fields, or receive significant credit for it. They leaned toward postponing such work until after earning tenure, for reasons shading from pragmatic observations to normative beliefs, from compliance to obedience. These points were weighed in thoughtful, non-dogmatic exchanges:

• *that engaged work like theirs could not be done without the kind of knowledge, skills, and prestige they had acquired through traditional research*
• *that the credibility of recognized expertise allows established scholars to connect with nonacademic audiences to undertake new responsibilities for communication and action*
• *that traditional, rigorous, funded research and original knowledge-production was such an important mission for their field that it should be the highest priority for junior faculty*
• *that their own current work would not /should not have won them tenure*
• *that work like their own scholarship in action competed with traditional research and productivity, in a zero-sum game*
• *that it is tenure (based on credentials in traditional scholarship) which provides the academic freedom to violate norms.*

In contrast to such mainly observant positions, some panelists were pragmatists, whose compliance reflected attitudes from reluctance and frustration to resignation or simple acceptance of the status quo. For example, some described giving up, postponing, or limiting engaged activities, including applied scholarship, during the pre-

tenure period in order to meet department and university expectations for traditional scholarship. The compliant position led faculty not only to obey the rules but to enforce them: some senior panelists (and department chairs interviewed) believed that realistically they should mentor junior faculty to comply with disciplinary norms until they had won their credentials and tenure. Many, unaware of the wide currency of engagement and its impact on research universities, were concerned with consequences of disobeying norms not only for tenure at Syracuse University, but for young faculty members' careers in the discipline. Others noted that, although higher education has embraced the rhetoric of engagement, and many institutions are translating it into official policies, there is little evidence yet about what difference it makes in practices like hiring, retention (especially of high-achieving faculty), and tenure and promotion, or in measures of effectiveness in teaching and learning.

Green's stance of *defiance* translates among our panelists (less melodramatically) to a spectrum of positions that might be called transformative, moving at the extreme to simply reject the discipline as a reference point at all. Most positions fall somewhere between advocating alternate paradigms to coexist with those that govern scholarship and/or teaching in their fields and calling for a more or less radical transformation of traditional norms. One senior panelist provided a detailed comparison showing this transformation (putting scholarship into "action") for her disciplinary paradigm, addressing the differences in roles, data, time, representation, knowledge building, relationships, and outcomes. She was a passionate advocate for incorporating engagement into academic norms, which is a way of trying to maintain but convert the original social group. Others find a new set of peers, colleagues, critics who will judge public scholarship according to alternate standards with their own rigor and distinctive ways of doing and legitimating the work.

Rather than challenging a disciplinary paradigm, the faculty member on our panels who best represented this extreme pole (opposition to norms) simply found the original codes and conventions (although not the skills and methods) of her disciplinary training irrelevant to her new scholarly activities. Such scholars don't even reference disciplinary rules in order to break them; they ignore them, moving into a fluid interdisciplinary space where they conduct their projects.

How would you describe the value of this work to communities or publics that it engages? How would you describe the value of this work to your discipline(s) or the academy? Does the accomplishment of this work contribute to knowledge or to teaching and learning in your field, or change it in some way?

Attitudes about how scholarly work should be evaluated for tenure is not the same thing as how it is valued in toto. This question elicits responses that include, but go well beyond, the specific grounds for valuing work that we call "counting." For one thing, it involves post-tenure careers and other kinds of rewards for academic success: promotion (which at Syracuse University is not an administrative decision, and therefore is more dependent on disciplinary norms as interpreted by departments); external funding; salary; professional awards; prestige. Perhaps the most important extrinsic reward is that which tenure confers—the freedom not to conform: to break rules, violate norms, try to transform conventional academic values and practices, or just ignore them. Second, this question asked respondents to think about differentiating constituencies in terms of what they value and who benefits, and to weigh how they prioritize conflicting values. They had to consider the impact of their engaged work not only on their field, but on their departments, the university, their students, external communities and publics, and—significantly—themselves. In discussing these trade-offs, panelists brought out an often neglected aspect of value: the intrinsic personal gratifications of engaged work, which can be at least as important a motivation as the extrinsic rewards of the academic system.

Most of our panelists were tenured and some were highly distinguished senior professors. Certainly they were deeply concerned with how scholarship in action should be handled in the rewards system, and felt a strong sense of responsibility for thinking through the important implications for junior faculty who might want to do such work and present it for evaluation. But, with respect to their own work as scholars in action, their values horizon was much wider than the reward system or even the academy itself. Engagement introduces a new factor in making value judgments—public goods and their impact on communities. As we've seen, new goals emerge from

engagement and entail changes in how scholarly work is conceived, conducted, legitimated, and valuated. Some scholars believed that these changes were transformational for them as scholars and persons and, potentially, for the core missions of the academy itself. But panelists also pointed out tensions between the goals of public benefit and the more traditional aims of academic work.

Within the traditional reward system, impact on the field—its scholarly methods, its knowledge, the scholarly community—is valued most highly. This value system may seem self-reflexive or self-serving, as some critics of the academy have argued, and incompatible or competitive with engagement goals of "serving the public good." But that oversimplifies the conflict. The faculty's assumption in prioritizing scholarship is that advancing knowledge within the work of the disciplines does (best) serve the public good. Victor Bloomfield describes this function of academic work as "'universal public scholarship, which he defines as scholarship that 'benefits humanity, without a specific local context in mind, and with roots that depend on interlocking developments from researchers around the world'" (Cantor, "Scholarship in Action: The Case," 1-2, citing Ellison). Some faculty argue that societies—and educational institutions—thrive through specialization, and a research university like Syracuse serves society best by prioritizing discovery, providing a continuing source of new and tested ideas for others to translate into action.

However, Nancy Cantor, re-emphasizing the public responsibilities inherent in all academic missions, argues that more direct contributions to social needs and problems in collaboration with nonacademic communities (local or place-based public scholarship) are of equal value and rising importance ("Collaborations"). These contributions define a different set of values—"public goods"—instead of or in addition to the goods associated with scholarship (or traditional teaching). To some degree, engaged work that is most substantive and important elevates these public benefits, in conjunction with student learning, above research goals in a given situation. Knowledge becomes instrumental or supplemental rather than the primary end of a particular project.

Panelists named extremely varied public goods that their work could contribute to through the roles featured on the panels—public communication, community-engaged teaching, and action-oriented partnerships. Here is a sample, in no particular order:

• *translating and interpreting expert knowledge for nonacademics*
• *enabling others (individuals and communities) to express themselves and communicate in the public sphere*
• *solving a social or technological problem*
• *providing advice and consultation*
• *feeding expert policy information into the policy-making process*
• *mediating, negotiating, facilitating conflict resolution*
• *facilitating creation of high tech companies*
• *improving national security*
• *bridging the academic and popular*
• *educating specialized groups*
• *saving lives*
• *creating relationships between academic and nonacademic communities*
• *integrating nonacademic knowledges into academic thought*
• *modeling cultural values of the center and margin*
• *facilitating communal reflection*
• *playing the role of witness to others' experiences and stories in traumatic events*
• *answering questions people ask (that academics don't)*
• *spurring conversations and debate*
• *promoting public health*
• *creating a [non-SU] curriculum*
• *providing counseling*
• *giving communities new tools for advocacy.*

At the same time, panelists did point to strong self-reflexive effects on the academy as valuable consequences of their work. In responding to our questions about what might be called scholarly or academic goods, panelists surprised us by emphasizing first the value of their work to their <u>own</u> scholarship or teaching—answering a question we didn't ask. Scholars described ways that engaged projects had revolutionized their own scholarly work—priorities, problems or questions addressed, ways of conducting research, the scope and reach of intellectual communities, and the satisfactions that make their work self-rewarding. We've noted many of these changes as specific ways that scholars inventively transformed features of prior scholarship or teaching and borrowed or learned new ones, in part by entering into new, intellectually generative networks. But here, scholars described the effect on themselves as scholars: the quality of their experiences, the transformation of their scholarly agendas, the expansion of their perspectives, and the pleasures and rewards of the work they were doing.

We described earlier how a number of senior scholars had experienced a distinct shift at a certain point in their career, when—no matter how important they still considered fundamental scholarship in their fields—they began to ask themselves questions about how they could have a broader impact, beyond their specialized audiences, and to change priorities for their own time and effort. Donald Schon has described this evolution in scholarly goals as the dilemma of rigor and relevance, using a metaphor of high ground versus swamp:

> On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the use of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowlands, problems are messy and confusing and incapable of technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or to society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern. The practitioner is confronted with a choice. Shall he remain on the high ground where he can solve relatively unimportant problems according to his standards of rigor, or shall he descend to the swamp of important problems where he cannot be rigorous in any way he knows how to describe? (27)

According to Schon, "People tend to feel the dilemma of rigor or relevance with particular intensity when they reach the age of about 45. At this point, they ask themselves, 'Am I going to continue to do the thing I was trained, on which I base my claim to technical rigor and academic respectability? Or am I going to work on the problems—ill-formed, vague, and messy—that I have discovered to be real around here?'" (27). This is exactly how many senior panelists explained what led them to take up scholarship in action—and to feel ambivalence about it.

For some scholars, late career experiences motivate transformationalist stances toward their fields, in contrast to those scholars who continue doing traditional scholarly work and retain their allegiance to its norms. But younger faculty who see themselves as scholars in action have usually entered the academy with this commitment (sometimes validated by a hiring mandate or memo of understanding). Even if they don't have departmental endorsement or institutional authorization, they have adopted engagement as a fundamental part of their understanding of scholarly work, and are often prepared to risk tenure to do it. In many cases they take strongly transformational positions about the value that engagement can bring to their fields, and the academy as a whole. One Architecture faculty member aspired to change the paradigm for teaching in her field, while a Writing professor had successfully shaped his career around community-based action research and teaching, serving as a mentor and model to graduate students with the same goals.

Despite the high value that scholars placed on engagement for its impact on their own scholarly work, they frequently acknowledged costs and weighed these against benefits. Some of these costs were to themselves: for example, pre-tenure, risks to their success in establishing scholarly credentials and winning tenure; post-tenure, reduced productivity in traditional research. Scholars at all levels, especially in the role of community-engaged teacher, were often stressed by heavy investments of time and energy not accounted for in load. Conversely, some public intellectuals or scholars whose work took them into communities off campus or required extensive travel worried about the impact on their departments of reductions in their teaching and service contributions. Some

scholars felt their departments were either negative or ambivalent about their focus on engaged work, or time spent off campus on agendas that didn't correspond to what the department saw as its primary responsibilities or source of reputation. Such perceived cost to their departments translated into disapproval, discouragement, or at best tolerance of scholars' activities, among senior faculty, and unfavorable environments and negative reviews for junior faculty.

How do you think work like yours should be evaluated? Specifically, how did you, or could you, make this work public and disseminate it? How did you, or could you document it (e.g., for a dossier)? Who should evaluate it: e.g., academic peers, expert professionals, community partners, students, beneficiaries?

As we've seen, panelists didn't agree, or even know their own minds, about how scholarship in action should be classified, counted for tenure, tolerated or rewarded pre- and post-tenure. Some were focused on surviving, or mentoring others how to be successful, in the current system; others, on modifying or radically changing it.

Many panelists, while unsure how it should be handled, at least knew they wanted their work to be evaluated as serious intellectual work when they presented it as such. . . and not treated as service, which prejudged it as not so. But probably the most common sentiment expressed by panelists about how their work, or type of work, should be handled was expressed this way: "At least we shouldn't be punished for doing it!"

Panelists were well aware that to fairly evaluate work with such different goals and conditions would require extensive modifications in evaluation processes and criteria. Many of the evaluation problems along with possible solutions are implicit in their answers to other questions, starting with the problem of what criteria are applied (from which category and in what paradigm). For example, panelists described at length how they found media in which to communicate their work and appropriate audiences to which they made it public. But panelists had less to say about specific measures for evaluation or processes of legitimization and documentation, in part because they thought these changes needed to be systematic, institutionally constructed and endorsed, rather than purely individual, and in part because many had little experience trying to construct dossiers or annual reports for this purpose. A number said it wasn't worth bothering since the work would not be evaluated or rewarded.

One point, however, that was extensively discussed was the need to expand the pool of reviewers beyond academic peers, in two ways. First, many panelists pointed to nonacademic experts or peers who were qualified (in some cases, the only ones fully qualified) to review the work for its quality and impact. Scholars would need to help evaluators define the intellectual community and traditions in which they placed their work, if these differed by virtue of their engaged work. If a scholar was working in a paradigm different from the dominant one in a unit (for example, applied rather than basic research), or if a scholar's work was interdisciplinary, panelists recommended including reviewers to represent these perspectives. Second, many thought it was appropriate or necessary to include a different kind of evaluation (on the model of student evaluations of teaching) representing the beneficiaries and audiences of the work. However, some working in complicated environments and complex partnerships cautioned about the delicacy, difficulty, and, sometimes, unreliability of such evaluation, and the need to contextualize it. Constituencies involved in a multi-partner project, as in one international scholar's work with U.N. agencies and local communities in rural regions, may have conflicting interests and political agendas that bias evaluations and create inconsistencies among them.

Most panelists regard engagement in public life as self-rewarding. In some cases, they had made such a personal investment in their goals, and saw the benefits as so profoundly important and gratifying, that academic rewards seemed relatively trivial. In fact, some said it was inappropriate to subject such deep ethical commitments to normal competitive evaluation or treat them as instrumental to career success.

What are the challenges and difficulties of doing this work?

The answers to previous questions have already unfolded many of the ways that scholars believe the conditions and goals of their engaged work challenge their ingenuity, flexibility, commitment, and determination. Earlier sections have dealt amply with what many regard as the greatest obstacle—the traditional system for evaluating academic work. We've also identified many of the conflicts and costs that panelists themselves struggle with internally as well as institutionally, in their efforts to balance or reconcile competing values and goods. The challenges panelists faced in the projects themselves were inventional, organizational, financial, interpersonal, and self-educational (new learning). For most panelists, engagement was time and work-intensive beyond the already high norm for academic life.

Besides those already discussed, panelists identified some challenges that, while affecting them personally, they saw as broadly institutional rather than project-specific and individual. Scholars sometimes felt isolated from other engaged scholars and dependent on themselves to create and energize projects without sufficient resources—intellectual, financial, social, and administrative—to support them. Some commented on the need for mentoring from others both inside and outside the academy who were experienced in the roles and the kinds of work they were taking up. Even senior faculty moving into new roles needed models, mentors, and peers. Individuals can't create or sustain new norms by themselves—by definition, they need a social group. Many did not have networks and systems comparable to those that support the current paradigms for academic work— colleagues of a research group, department, or cross-institutional organization. In some respects, the panels themselves functioned that way, highlighting a community of cross-disciplinary peers at Syracuse University that panelists, especially young scholars in departments or fields where their engaged work was pioneering or anomalous, had not known about or been in contact with. Many were inspired to meet scholars in other fields with common interests or complementary projects, and a number made plans for further conversation and possible collaborations. This response suggests that connecting scholars in action with one another should be an important priority for the institution. These are all issues of implementation, taken up in the next section.

SUMMARY AND INTEGRATION OF LEARNING FROM THE PANELS

The panels featuring peer scholars in action were originally set up to solve a problem in our inquiry. We began discussions and interviews with a preliminary list of questions, intending to probe faculty attitudes, disciplinary differences, and ideas or models about how to evaluate scholarship in action. But debates were inconclusive, returning constantly to the same dilemma: without understanding scholarship in action concretely enough to identify examples of it, Committee members felt they couldn't effectively offer or solicit opinions, debate its merits in relation to traditional scholarship, figure out how to evaluate it, or answer most of the questions we had posed. Many thought the concept too hazy and diffuse to apply consistently or evaluate by a single clear standard. The problem was compounded by the fact that the term was unique to Syracuse, and it was not immediately clear how "scholarship in action" corresponded to or differed from similar ideas in the engagement literature.

In response, the panels were designed to make this concept meaningful through examples, explained by faculty scholars themselves. They were far more effective than expected, in more ways than we had imagined. In retrospect they made clear that unexamined assumptions were leading us to ask the wrong questions, or to frame them in unproductive ways. For example, many asked how, in a particular case or in general, to distinguish scholarship in action (as true "scholarship") from service. Many of the assumptions underlying this binary choice turned out to be mistaken. Another problem was that our search for the meaning of scholarship in action anticipated that a certain kind of definition was possible, one that would precisely state a finite set of common features (as criteria) for any activity to which the term applied. That seems not to be the case.

The panels got the Committee past these roadblocks by helping us develop a concrete knowledge base for recognizing and rethinking many of our preconceptions.

Put simply, the panels refocused our inquiry from **scholarship in action** as a general concept to **scholars in action** working in engaged roles. The immediate, refreshing effect was to create more generative starting points

and terms for discussion. New questions, problems, and specific issues—often bearing on the initial questions—emerged from detailed, realistic accounts of what scholars do, how and why they do it, and how this work is (or has been) viewed and evaluated by academic peers. These accounts enabled debates that were solidly grounded in authentic, first-hand information about the motivations, consequences, implications, and challenges of undertaking work that engages communities and publics, including its relationship to traditional research and teaching. Differences were genuine, principled, and strongly felt, but participants respected all the experiences and competing values brought to the table.

Why the Panels Worked

The Roles

There was an intrinsic value in bringing together scholars in action to talk about what they do, but some features of how the panels were organized contributed to the learning of the Committee. The first of these is the prototype roles of engaged faculty activity—roughly, action, education, and communication—around which we constructed interdisciplinary panels. It was quickly evident that, although these models are rough and imperfect approximations of the roles faculty can play as scholars in action, they were serviceable for the heuristic purposes we intended. They served as useful prompts for descriptions of faculty projects and activities, which were the heart of the panels. These relatively concrete but open-ended models allowed panelists to portray their work as exemplary of scholarship in action without worrying about measuring it against predetermined criteria or an abstract definition (particularly helpful in the case of the role of public intellectual or communicator, where the work might have been ruled out by such definitions). Faculty were comfortable using these terms to characterize their work and explain how they combined or blended roles in their projects.

Whenever policy makers or administrators promote change and publicly articulate new visions for higher education, skeptical faculty ask "Where's the beef?" Or, as they put it in the case of scholarship in action, "How do we distinguish substance from sound byte?" The panels provided one answer: *scholars' descriptions of their own engaged work substantiate the concept of scholarship in action*. Panelists disabused us of any notion that scholarship in action is any single thing: the substance of scholarship in action, as they presented it, was extremely heterogeneous for both disciplinary and functional reasons. As one Committee member put it, "the referent of scholarship in action will never be singular or monolithic," and "values will shift in their inflection from unit to unit." Seeing the variations in these projects also made it clear that *identifying a project or pattern of faculty activity as "scholarship in action" was not in itself either a claim to its specific value or proof of it. Just like any other faculty work presented for evaluation, contributions to scholarship in action can be major or minor efforts, represent different degrees of novel intellectual or creative work, have varied benefits and values, and achieve different levels of qualitative excellence*.

Although these three roles proved flexible enough to accommodate the work of our panelists, we suspect they don't capture every type of scholarship in action. The Committee's discussions and interviews brought up several kinds of engaged, scholarly work that didn't seem to fit naturally into any of these models, including 1) developing patentable inventions; 2) forming and operating a start-up, high tech company staffed by faculty and students; and 3) under certain circumstances, practicing a profession (e.g., a clinical psychologist evaluating traumatized victims on scene after a catastrophic event). In addition, the models may have obscured some distinct functions that were reported in more than one category. For example, panelists on both the public intellectual/communicator and the community partner-in-action panels described similar activities, using terms like consulting, advising, negotiating, advocating change or enabling advocacy by communities, facilitating conflict resolution, taking normative stances, and intervening to shape action or policy. Together, these seem to constitute a spectrum of activist roles that scholars take in bringing expertise to bear on public problems through interactions with constituencies, moving from primarily educational at one end to proactively interventionist on the other. This role and its variations could be important to recognize and study in view of the controversy over

preserving a disinterested ideal of scholarship versus promoting advocacy, political action, or "partisanship" for social justice or change.

The AAC panels only sampled scholarship in action, and there is much to be learned from additional accounts and efforts to discover more about the roles faculty play in engaged work. But in the end, it didn't really matter whether the models we worked with were comprehensive and accurate in covering and explaining all faculty activities, since we didn't intend or need them to be. The point was not to produce definitive new categories as bins to contain faculty work, but to learn from the specific examples the models helped us to recognize and analyze. For example, in hearing from public intellectuals and communicators the Committee realized that the current understandings of these roles need to be refined to understand them as engaged in the full sense, even though they do not fit the classic model of community partnerships. Scholars described this role as involving mutual communication, interaction, collaboration, and influence, not just one-way transmission of an expert's knowledge to a lay audience.

Beforehand, we didn't know whether the three roles explored in the panels would turn out to correspond to the traditional missions that structure the reward system—scholarship, teaching, and service. They did not—which is precisely what made the models useful tools of inquiry. As descriptive prompts, the models directed attention away from these tightly defined, discrete categories of faculty work and toward functions and relationships that cut across the missions of higher education, relating any or all of them to public goods through engagement. In doing so, many panelists argued, they illuminate and potentially change the ways those missions are conceived and carried out by individual scholars, disciplines, and the university.

As functional categories, the roles provided a way to analyze scholarship in action that contrasts to at least two other possibilities. The first alternative is to apply to any case of engaged work the more abstract, high-level descriptions (of aims, qualities, and some features) found in the engagement literature and in Nancy Cantor's writings and speeches. But these definitions apply at an institutional level; the examples provided in public statements tend to represent collective action, multi-faceted projects with many participants and constituencies, and broad consequences for society and the academy, rather than what an individual faculty member does and thinks about what he or she does. While these are important and meaningful statements of institutional commitment, they do not translate easily to the level of individual faculty action, choices, attitudes, and judgments of value. In other words, "scholarship in action" is a mission-level characterization of collective actions and commitments, to which the faculty scholar's individual work makes contributions, rather than instantiating the whole in every aspect.

Implicit in the initial discussions of the Committee was the second alternative: trying to fit scholarship in action into the traditional system (without modifying its categories). In fact, many faculty took it for granted that this was the only way it could be understood and evaluated, so that we spent considerable time debating where in general any work claimed as "scholarship in action" should be placed, without considering the possibility that there was no general answer to that question. The panels shifted the problem to the level of the individual project or activity, where it became a question of how particular examples fit into the existing system. However, unlike our original discussions, our invitation to the panelists did not presume any answers about where to place their work, or even whether the existing system could in fact accommodate and account for their work as engaged scholars.

The Questions

The specific questions the AAC asked scholars to address played a very important role in making the panels productive. It was fortunate that, warned by our earlier impasses, we didn't directly ask panelists to describe their work as "scholarship" (i.e., to place it descriptively within the traditional system), or even to characterize it as "scholarship in action," but to begin by describing their work as scholarly, a qualitative feature rather than a category. Only after they had answered this question did panelists go on to explain how their work was viewed

from the perspective of the traditional evaluation schema. This had the powerful effect of reversing the usual order ("categorize, then describe") so that panelists provided a full, rich description of their work in fresh terms before they addressed the question of how it did or should count in the categories of the system.

Second, this approach allowed the panels to reveal, and the Committee to appreciate, a surprisingly fruitful distinction between the concept of "scholarly" and the category of "scholarship": "scholarly" as an attribute that may apply to any work conducted as a scholar and expressing a scholarly identity (not intrinsically tied to a particular discipline); and "scholarship" as an evaluation category rooted in disciplinary paradigms for creative activity or research. This distinction allowed the Committee to understand the detailed, varied reasons that, in fact, *engaged work does not map in any easy or consistent way onto the current system*. The panelists' characterizations of their work as scholarly is compatible with Chancellor Cantor's notion of "scholarship in action" as distributed over any and all university missions. However, mapping work into these categories case by case (which is what panelists are doing when they argue about how it does or should "count") shows how imperfectly engaged work fits the traditional concepts of such missions. As we saw, to the extent it might qualify by intent as "scholarship" or "teaching," it frequently failed to be recognized as such, or was judged as not meeting conventional standards. Misfits in those cases, as well as anything else unclassifiable, were relegated to "service" as a default category. But service as conventionally understood is inadequate to the purpose (of evaluating engaged <u>scholarly</u> work) because of its identification with non-scholarly functions like institutional and professional service or charitable contributions to the community. A large part of the scholarly work described by panelists, then, has no obvious or comfortable home in the system for organizing faculty work for evaluation. Much of it, perhaps the work most characteristic of scholarship in action, applies scholarly expertise in real-world actions that affect the world materially, socially, culturally, and produce nontraditional "goods."

While many (including Chancellor Nancy Cantor) have pointed out the difficulty of evaluating engaged faculty work in terms of the traditional categories, the detailed reports from the panels clarified why it is so hard, and often inappropriate, to fit engaged work into that system. As a whole, the problem is that engagement introduces new goals that modify or require context-sensitive adaptation of the scholarly features that developed in disciplinary paradigms to fit a different purpose. The inability to map engaged projects, patterns of activity, or scholarship in action in general onto the tenure and promotion categories raised questions that go beyond engaged work itself. It suggests that the types and variety of faculty members' scholarly work, quite apart from engagement as recently defined, may be far richer than we have been able to appreciate by viewing it primarily through the lens of the three-part evaluation system. Much of it has simply been invisible, tolerated but not noticed or evaluated.[25] The panels confirmed that there is a long history of underappreciated community and public commitments, relationships, actions and interactions by individuals and disciplines that predates the current engagement movement. Finally, Committee members pointed out that in some cases panelists' difficulties in counting their work within a given unit reflected disciplinary struggles over competing paradigms, not necessarily precipitated by engagement (although often associated with it): for example, between basic and applied research in a social science, or between quantitative or qualitative methods.

As the panels and Committee discussions made abundantly clear, while everyone recognizes the mapping problem, and our participants now better appreciate the reasons for it, there is no consensus about what to do about it. As we saw in the range of attitudes toward academic norms, some faculty, including some scholars in action themselves, have serious reservations about counting work for tenure that doesn't satisfy traditional research expectations. But even among those who argue strongly that it must count for tenure if the institution is to implement an institutional vision of engagement, there was no agreement about how to do so. The Committee

---

[25] This failure to appreciate the actual diversity of faculty contributions was one of the findings of the MLA Commission that studied faculty work in all three categories, with special attention to service, as represented by the title of its report: "Making Faculty Work Visible." Although responsible to the constituency of faculty in language and literature, the Commission consulted widely with other disciplines and designed its model to be general. The report constructs a matrix to map what is valued by the academy ("intellectual work" and "institutional and professional citizenship") against the traditional three categories of work. The matrix provides for adding values, like "engagement."

has not yet examined this problem systematically, but at least three possibilities emerged from panels, discussions, and interviews for future consideration, separately or in combination. It was not always clear how field-specific such proposals were intended to be, but the great variations we observed among fields and even subfields suggest that a cookie-cutter approach is unworkable.

First, we saw that many panelists argued for changing traditional norms, more or less radically. Some envisioned making them more inclusive, expanding them to include a broader range of work and work products or allowing alternate options (for example, norms for scholarly work that is applied, practice, or action-oriented).[26] A smaller number wanted more radical transformation of research and/or teaching, making engaged scholarly work the new norm (at least, for their own fields). Instead, some Committee members and interviewees (who want to preserve the traditional sense of "scholarship") prefer modifying the categories of teaching and service, following the Newhouse example, to allow more accurate reporting of the full range of engaged work and create new models for tenure based on achievements primarily in these categories. These faculty members emphasized the importance of respecting disciplinary differences and making standards field-specific. Finally, some suggested an option to submit an integrated portfolio for faculty who emphasize scholarship in action, which would present the work as a whole rather than divided into teaching, scholarship, and service.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

As Committee and campus discussions continue working on the problems of categorizing and counting engaged scholarly work, participants may want to reflect on some of the lessons learned from the AAC experiences. For us, these were principles of process, but they may have implications for future decisions about evaluation categories and processes:

• *When concerned with how to evaluate individuals' work, to **focus attention on scholars in action rather than on "scholarship in action" as a concept for defining what they do.***

We discovered it was a mistake to try to treat scholarship in action—a <u>collective</u> responsibility and commitment of the institution—as a new category of evaluation applying criteria to <u>individual</u> achievements. Scholars talking about their work demonstrated what it means in practice for individuals to contribute in varied ways to the whole enterprise, which we concluded has no single referent or interpretation.

• *Reversing the conventional order, to ask scholars to **describe before categorizing**.*

Soliciting descriptions of scholarly work that presented it on its own terms allowed us to appreciate its goals and novel features before the categories filtered out much of what scholars want evaluators to know. Any terminology screens out some things in order to focus attention on others (and scholars in action introduced new lenses of their own). Ultimately, current and proposed categories need to be compared to such descriptive accounts and judged for their adequacy, based on what evaluators decide they want to accomplish by sorting faculty work into categories. Even then, following this principle might help keep the categories honest, pressuring them to remain flexible enough to evolve as scholarly work does.

A corollary is this:

• *In evaluating, to **treat value as intrinsic in the work and its use**, rather than predetermined by how it is classified.*

---

[26] See an argument for action research by Schon, who defines norms for producing knowledge distinct from those of "technical rationality—the prevailing epistemology built into the research universities." (26). He advocates opening up the academy to include the "new scholarship" as an alternative, requiring its own "communities of inquiry capable of criticizing such research and fostering its development" (33). His concept, like scholarship in action, covers all kinds of scholarly work including teaching.

We adopted this as a process principle, in order not to prejudge what we were trying to study, in contrast to the way the current system works, building a value judgment into the classification of work as "scholarship," "teaching," or "service." Many of the proposals try to remove this presumption in evaluation, for example suggesting that traditional and engaged scholarship should each be judged on its own merits, or that teaching and service categories should be renovated to make contributions in these categories a potential basis for tenure. The principle applies equally to scholarship in action itself, meaning that presenting work as "engaged" doesn't automatically confer value on it. It must be judged according to (appropriate) standards for significance, excellence, novelty, impact, and so on.

IMPLEMENTING SCHOLARSHIP IN ACTION: FACULTY CONCERNS AND ADVICE

Throughout our inquiry, the Academic Affairs Committee predictably encountered a wide range of attitudes toward scholarship in action, ranging from unreserved enthusiasm to ambivalence and skepticism. Most of the panelists, of course, presented the positive benefits of engaging the world, many of them voicing compelling ethical commitments and expressing intellectual delight in their work. We have tried to represent their views as fully as possible. But we also wanted to take into account the views of skeptics and critics, and the broad middle ground of what might be called wary optimism, where attraction to the concept is tempered by concerns about the implications and process of implementing it. For our last panel, we invited experienced colleagues to help us identify and understand such concerns and translate them into advice about implementation. We asked, if scholarship in action is to be implemented, what needs to be done to make change positive for faculty and to protect them and the institution from potential risks? This section summarizes faculty thoughts and advice on these matters, reflecting not only this and other panels and interviews, but also AAC discussions throughout our inquiry.

COMPETING VALUES

The vision of scholarship in action, as we have seen (and Chancellor Cantor has recognized), brings into play competing values within the academy itself. Some faculty worry that emphasizing engagement with the world as an institutional priority will lead to devaluing traditional scholarship—and, more broadly, the ideals it represents, such as disinterested inquiry, independent thought, basic research, the pursuit of knowledge, or a critical relationship to social institutions—in favor of advocacy, applied research, problem-solving, and collaborative action with all sectors of society. Some associate closer relations to nonacademic partners in the "marketplace" with perceived threats to the independence of the academy like commercialization , politicization, or accountability through regulation and governmental oversight. Other faculty fear a dilution of standards will result from any modifications of traditional paradigms to accommodate and evaluate scholarship in action. Some scholars in action themselves acknowledge the tension between what Schon called rigor and relevance and the difficulty of reconciling the two in their careers.

For most faculty, the answer is to strike a balance so that scholarship in action can be supported and rewarded, but not at the expense of continuing to appreciate and reward traditional scholarship. Obviously, this would mean working very carefully when making changes to the system (i.e., addressing the mapping problems in order to include, evaluate, and reward engaged work) so as to avoid simply reversing the current privileging of traditional research and making scholarship in action, perhaps in only one role, the new norm. In addition, some stressed the importance of guarding against risks they fear to the objectivity and independence of scholarship. Many advocated negotiations between the administration and academic units about how faculty would be expected to allocate their time (mediated through the reward system) between idea generation and action, reflecting discipline-specific goals and unit's missions. Others thought such negotiations should (also) apply to individual faculty members at hiring or as their priorities shift over a career.

These issues are closely related to deep concerns about faculty autonomy. Committee members and many panelists urged that scholarship in action, even though it represents a university-wide commitment affecting all missions, should not be imposed on faculty as a top-down administrative requirement. (In fact, administrators serving on the AAC assured the Committee that was not the intention.) Faculty cautioned that if it is to be successfully implemented as a university-wide cultural change, scholarship in action must be invented and "owned" by the faculty, in the sense that we have said faculty work "substantiates" the concept and dynamically shapes its meaning and value.[27] Our panels showed that Nancy Cantor was right in seeing engagement as part of the fabric of faculty culture at Syracuse. As panelist Kendall Phillips put it, that creates an opportunity to make scholarship in action "a way for the institution to draw organically out of the activities already going on and create avenues for people who choose to do it, [although] I don't think it should be imposed on anybody. . . nor should it totally replace other models that should still be respected."

His words echo advice from Nancy Fichtman Dana and Catherine Emihovich (a dean and faculty member, respectively), reporting on efforts to create an "engaged scholarship culture" in a college at the University of Florida. In discussions like the AAC panels, "for the first time, a space was created to bring together faculty from different departments and areas of the college to dialogue specifically about the nature of their individual work and how it may connect to a collective identity for the college. Second, it was the faculty who were discussing, debating, expressing opinions, and generating the ways a collective identity of engaged scholarship would be defined at University of Florida. This process mitigated a shift in the way the faculty framed the grand engaged scholarship picture at UF, from 'What does our new dean mean by engaged scholarship?' to 'What do we, the faculty, mean by engaged scholarship?" (40). They too note the importance of protecting individual academic freedom: "How do we honor the individual autonomy of faculty members who practice a different model of scholarship as an engagement culture is built?" (45).

Besides the internal struggles to balance competing values within the academy, engagement brings a new set of goals and priorities into the picture—those of the nonacademic community partners and publics, which themselves represent conflicting interests and value systems. We have noted how many panelists in all three roles described managing or negotiating conflict among groups, both in local communities and in international settings. In some cases (for example, complex interdisciplinary projects on Bosnian rape crimes, natural resource conflict management, the public schools, or health education), a great deal is at stake, including lives. Panelists with extensive experience in complex community engagement of this kind caution that enthusiasts for scholarship in action substantially underestimate the potential for conflict in promoting, carrying out, and evaluating such activities.

SUPPORTING AND SUSTAINING THE COMMITMENT

Chancellor Cantor recognizes that rhetorical advocacy is not enough; implementing a vision of scholarship in action at Syracuse depends on providing the requisite resources and institutional support to make it work. Such concrete actions are the most persuasive way to demonstrate to skeptics the seriousness and sustainability of the university's commitment. Panelists detailed what they believe to be the most important kinds of resources needed to make engaged work possible and effective, focusing primarily on those that support the faculty.

An obvious first step is to formulate and enact policies that support scholarship in action, including the kinds of formal changes in the tenure and promotion guidelines and systems of evaluation discussed in this paper. Faculty noted that institutional commitment and even formal policies remain theoretical until they are acted on in tenure (and promotion) cases, hiring practices, and so on. Since tenure is ultimately an administrative decision, the

---

[27] This position needs to be qualified by the recognition that, as an institutional commitment, scholarship in action is not implemented only by full-time tenure track or tenured faculty; students, staff, and administrators also have responsibilities for engagement. Because of its focus on the problem of the reward system, the AAC didn't have opportunity to study a number of instances reported to the Committee where staff or non-tenure track faculty had provided significant leadership and major contributions to engaged projects.

faculty will be watching carefully to see how upcoming cases involving scholarship in action are decided. In this respect, they suggest, the institution will have to anticipate formal changes and cultural changes during a tricky interim period while college and department policies, cultural habits, and institutional vision gradually come into synch. In addition to these final outcomes, many participants in these discussions (including Associate Vice Chancellor Kal Alston) pointed to the importance of designing memos of understanding for hiring that would clarify expectations for faculty members, including commitments to engaged scholarly work, in relation to tenure criteria. Similar memos of understanding might be appropriate for senior faculty who would like to shift priorities toward publicly engaged roles and new purposes in their scholarly work later in their careers.

It is clear that the University is raising external funds and making major investments to support scholarship in action projects at a macro-level. Panelists focused, however, on financial resources needed to ease the burden to themselves and their units of doing engaged work. The main issue was the time and energy added to or taken away from other responsibilities, which became costs to them or their departments. A practical consequence of treating much engaged work as service is that it is not accounted for in load. Community-engaged teaching is much more time-consuming, panelists explained, whether as additional time added to conventional courses, including significant managerial functions, or nontraditional teaching as an overload. Several panelists described interdisciplinary, cross-college collaborations on community-engaged teaching, which involved overload ("service") because there was no systematic means to support assigning co-teachers to one course, especially across school/college boundaries. On the opposite side, departments were absorbing costs for some public intellectuals whose frequent travel or absence from campus required reduced teaching loads; and these panelists pointed out that their scholarly productivity, in conventional terms, was reduced as well.

All this suggests to faculty that the institution needs to systematically address the costs of investing faculty time in scholarship in action, because it is not an inexhaustible resource. Balancing engaged work with traditional scholarly responsibilities (scholarship, teaching, and institutional or professional service) is not just an intellectual or ethical choice; it involves reallocating time, effort, and, therefore, personal and institutional resources.

Although it is generally recognized that young scholars in action need help to prepare tenure dossiers, the Committee's inquiry revealed many less obvious needs for supporting engaged work, which amount to building a social and intellectual infrastructure for scholarship in action. Some faculty members spoke eloquently of the importance of mentorship and models they had found for their engaged work. One junior faculty member appeared on a panel with his mentor in another college (more hospitable to public engagement than his own discipline). Senior faculty members who had made career shifts taking up scholarship in action urged the importance of mentors and models off campus, including nonacademic public intellectuals. Many panelists wanted to network with other scholars on campus doing similar or complementary work.

Panelists proved that scholarly engagement, or scholarship in action, is almost by definition a novel activity that has to be invented in many aspects to fit the purpose. They emphasized how much they had to learn, for the most part without guidelines or models. Some faculty argued that disciplines and institutions should provide more help and instruction for young faculty and graduate students on how to do engaged work in their fields, in ways that emphasized collective responsibility as well as individual efforts. Scientists, for example, argued that it is very important for their fields to educate publics about science, but that young scientists need to learn from mentors how to communicate effectively and when science is ready for popular dissemination. They need help to balance this responsibility with their dedication to their primary job of discovery, especially pre-tenure; it was pointed out that communication need not always be the job of the person who conducted the research.[28] Panelists who had supervised graduate students in community research and action spoke of their vulnerability in complex partnerships, and the need to be prepared for such situations in terms of institutional support and training of students.

---

[28] Richard Cherwitz has pioneered an interdisciplinary program on "intellectual entrepreneurship" aimed at preparing graduate students for putting their own scholarship into action. See https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/.

Finally, perhaps the most fundamental issue underlying faculty concerns about scholarship in action is what the Committee called "*sustainability*." Rightly or wrongly, many faculty perceive many higher education trends as transitory fads. If they are going to go through the personal and professional transformations it takes to do scholarship in action, or to accept and facilitate the cultural changes necessary to incorporate engaged work into the academic value system, they want to be assured that it is a longitudinal, sustainable commitment that will outlive particular administrators or circumstances—and not just at Syracuse.

There is another side to sustainability besides the faculty perspective: the perspective of some communities or publics who are the partners sought by an engaged institution. Panelists familiar with town-gown relations in Syracuse pointed out that some local communities are suspicious about scholars' motives or indifferent to some academic goals and priorities. They want assurance that SU's commitment will be deep and sustained, and that communities will not simply be used as research objects or exploitable opportunities for student learning. This issue was raised by the Psychology professor whose grant-funded project in a local senior residence was the occasion for him and his students to develop a relationship with residents (separate from their role as research subjects) that was important to them socially and intellectually. He and his students had to move out of the home when his project ended. As an individual faculty member, it is impossible for him to take sole responsibility for engaging this community throughout his career. But from the residents' point of view, the relationship is with Syracuse University, not one faculty member. At present, he pointed out, there are no provisions for a faculty member to help find a successor in this situation. In other cases on the panels, longitudinal relationships had been personally sustained by one person through overcommitment, in respond to community desires. But such faculty members may not be able to continue such activities indefinitely.

If the responsibility for engagement is viewed collectively, as the concept of an "engaged institution" implies, faculty members need not be under such a heavy burden to initiate and continue such relationships by themselves. If the University develops an appropriate infrastructure for coordinating and connecting scholars in action, a particular community can enjoy a sustained relationship to the University over time, connecting members successively or simultaneously to various faculty members and projects. Such a concept already lies behind the University's commitment to the South Side neighborhood, for example, or longitudinal commitments made by departments or centers to certain local public schools. But panelists and Committee members suggested developing centralized means for putting individual scholars in communication across schools and colleges to connect their complementary projects or sustain community relationships they have initiated.

EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP IN ACTION ITSELF

Because of the importance of the reward system to implementing scholarship in action as a cultural change that affects and reflects deeply held, contested values, the focus of our inquiry was frequently on evaluating the individual and, by extension, the responsibilities each faculty member has in doing engaged work. However, the Committee realized increasingly during the inquiry that scholarship in action is a collective notion and, therefore, an institutional responsibility. From this perspective, evaluation needs to be thought about somewhat more broadly than in the context of tenure, promotion, or other individual rewards, yet also in relation to that context.

Although scholars bear significant responsibility for demonstrating the effectiveness of their engaged work (the benefits to their discipline, to students, to communities and publics), panelists showed us that often this task is well beyond the capability of individual faculty members acting alone. Further, many projects involve multiple faculty members, disciplines, units, and community partners. This suggests that one of the responsibilities of the university in implementing scholarship in action is to help individuals conduct evaluation of the accomplishments (products and goods) of such complex projects. Experienced panelists pointed out how extremely difficult it is to make judgments in situations of conflicting interests and different views about what is "useful" or a "public good" among such constituencies as business interests, labor, consumers, faculty, students, community members, and so on. Conversely, a number of Committee members raised the concern that some of what is promoted as

"community engagement" and "public service" can be exploitive rather than of lasting value to the communities themselves. Some local communities express this fear, referring to past experiences with the "university on the Hill," often cases where relationships were not sustained past a specific research project. One panelist recommended that the university develop the institutional capacity to help participants monitor and evaluate these projects and relationships in order to learn who (if anyone) benefits in the communities.

There are related ethical responsibilities, mentioned above with respect to protecting and mentoring graduate students who are vulnerable to conflicts within communities and to communities' desires to shape or gain ownership rights to research activities. Broadly, both graduate students and undergraduates, in their role as learners, are intended to benefit from their participation in scholarship in action, as well as to serve the public good. These benefits must be evaluated alongside those to the communities and publics served. In both cases it is important to take into account unforeseen consequences. Again, the institution must find ways to help design and carry out such evaluation.

As one member remarked, much of the rhetoric of engagement emphasizes the positive nature of the encounter between scholars and students of the academy and members of communities, without sufficient consideration of the possibility for negative experiences on both sides. Those who have actually practiced scholarship in action are the first to point out that there are many risks, practical problems, and ethical dilemmas involved in such projects that need to be thought through and monitored, requiring institutional attention and support. In the end, it is not just scholars and their works that are subject to review and assessement. Scholarship in action itself as a concept and a practice at Syracuse, and engagement as practiced across higher education institutions, need to be continually evaluated as they affect both the academy and society. Syracuse can benefit both from systematic data gathering and evaluation of the impact of scholarship in action at Syracuse and also from careful study and comparison with the results of engagement policies at other institutions.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This white paper is published by the 2006-2007 Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate at Syracuse University, but it is the product of the Committee membership over three years of collaborative inquiry, from Spring 2005 through Spring 2007. Although it is individually authored, the voices and language of the Committee members are woven throughout the paper, drawn from notes and minutes of Committee and Subcommittee meetings, recorded panel discussions, and personal communication in meetings and emails (including suggested revisions and additions to this paper). The paper is particularly indebted to the Subcommittee chairs for their contributions throughout the inquiry: Larry Elin (incoming chair of the AAC) and Norm Faiola; Peter Castro and Barbara Fiese; and Harvey Teres. But every Committee member made a unique contribution to the learning represented here, through the discussions they participated in, the questions they asked, and the disciplinary perspectives each explained to one another. The diversity of representation in the Committee assured that we could draw on a rich knowledge base and network of university connections to understand the complex issues of scholarship in action and conduct productive debates that aired a full range of views. But what made it a pleasure to work together was the commitment of all members to analyzing issues from a common perspective—the good of the institution.

Our Committee offers profound thanks to the panelists who taught us so much. Besides their original presentations, represented here in the themes from the panels, many offered additional contributions after reading the draft of this paper. In addition, the Committee is grateful to the many faculty and administrators who were interviewed or participated in discussions in the course of this inquiry.

References

Boyer, Ernest L. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1996): 11-20.

--. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Brouwer, Daniel C., and Catherine R. Squires. "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 39 (Winter 2003): 201-13.

Braskamp, Larry A., and John C. Ory. *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Cantor, Nancy. AACU/ACE Panel. Notes. January 28, 2005.

--. "Scholarship in Action: Building the Creative Campus." Keynote address. Syracuse University, April 11, 2005.

--. "Scholarship in Action: The Case for Engagement." Wesleyan University, Nov. 29, 2006.

--. "Collaborations on the Creative 'Campus.'" Cornell University, May 3, 2005.

--. "Universities and Their Connected Communities: Creating Capital for the Future." Rensselaer Polytechnic University. Troy, NY, March, 2006.

--"Vision Statement: Scholarship in Action." http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/vision/index.html. Retrieved Sept. 24, 2005.

Campus Compact. http://www.compact.org/

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/

CIC Committee on Engagement in collaboration with National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: Council on Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service Benchmarking Task Force. "CIC Reports. Draft Resource Guide and Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement." Feb. 14, 2005. Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Champaign, IL. http://www.cic.uiuc.edu

Cherwitz, Richard A., and Charlotte A. Sullivan. "Intellectual Entrepreneurship: A Vision of Graduate Education." *Change* Nov./Dec. 2002: 22-27. https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/articles/change.pdf

Crow, Michael. "A New American University: The New Gold Standard." Inaugural Address. Arizona State University. November, 2002. http://www.asu.edu/iinaugural/address.

Dana, Nancy Fichtman, and Catherine Emihovich. "Actualizing a Culture of Engaged Scholarship in the College of Education at the University of Florida." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 10 (2004): 29-46.

Davis, Steve. "Reporting Out of the Comfort Zone." *American Journalism Review* Dec.-Jan. 2006: 1-2. http://www.ajr.org/article_printable.asp?id=4030

Ellison, Julie, "Background Study on Responsive Tenure Policies for Public Scholars in the Humanities, Arts, and Design." Discussion draft for participants in Imagining America's Tenure Team Initiative. September, 2006.

"Engagement as a Core Value for the University: A Consultation Document." Prepared for Association of Commonwealth Universities' Conference for Executive Heads, April 2001.

Geiger, Roger. "The Ten Generations of American Higher Education*." In American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges.* Ed. Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.

Green, Thomas F. *Voices: The Educational Formation of Conscience*. Notre Dame, IN: U of Notre Dame P, 1999.

Holland, Barbara. "Scholarship and Mission in the 21st Century University: The Role of Engagement." Based on Keynote Address to the Australian Universities Quality Agency Forum, July 5, 2005, Sydney, Australia. http://depts..washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/AUQA_paperPfinal_05.pdf. Retrieved May 20, 2007.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. Executive Summary. "Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution." National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges." Feb. 1999.

McKerrow, Raymie E., and Jeffrey St. John. "Review Essay: The Public Intellectual and the Role(s) of Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 310-19.

MLA Commission on Professional Service. "Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature." New York: MLA, 1996.

Newhouse School Rules, Syracuse University, 2006.

"New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement: A Leadership Agenda." A Conference Report. A Collective Initiative of Representatives of Research Universities and Campus Compact to Renew the Civic Mission of Higher Education. Writer/editor Cynthia M. Gibson. Tufts University and Campus Compact. 2006. www.compact.org/resources/research_universities

Rice, Eugene. "Rethinking Scholarship and Engagement: The Struggle for New Meanings." 2004. http://portal-live.solent.ac.uk/university/rtconference/2004/marwell2004papers.aspx

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. 1962. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1990.

Schon, Donald A. "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." *Change* Nov.-Dec. 1995: 26. Expanded Academic ASAP. Thomson Gale. Syracuse University Library. Retrieved 21 July 2007.

Snyder, Matthew. "With 'Scholarship in Action' theme, Syracuse Welcome 2006 invites new students to intellectual community engagement." *Syracuse Record* July 24, 2006: 1, 7.

Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University. By Harry Boyte and Elizabeth Hollander on behalf of participants in a Wingspread Conference. http://www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/wingspread_declaration

Winslow, Dianna. Research Report on Scholarship in Action. Spring, 2007.

Appendix A

Panelists on Scholarship in Action for Senate Academic Affairs Committee[*]
Spring 2006-2007

Beverly Allen, Arts and Sciences: Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics
Kishi Animashaun, Arts and Sciences: African-American Studies
William Banks, Law/Maxwell: Public Administration
Anne Beffel, Visual and Performing Arts, Art and Design: Foundation/Time Arts
Arthur Brooks, Maxwell/Arts and Sciences: Public Administration
Lori Brown, Architecture
Elet Callahan, Management: Law and Public Policy
Peter Castro, Maxwell/Arts and Sciences: Anthropology
Fiona Chew, Public Communications: Television, Radio, and Film
Steve Davis, Public Communications: Newspaper
David Hajdu, Public Communications: Magazine /Arts Journalism
Wayne Franits, Arts and Sciences: Fine Arts
Susan Hynds, Education: Reading and Language Arts
Tanya Horacek, Human Services and Health Professions: Nutrition and Hospitality Management
Milton Mueller, Information Studies
Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, Maxwell/Arts and Sciences: History
Steve Parks, Arts and Sciences: Writing
Kendall Phillips, Visual and Performing Arts: Communication and Rhetorical Studies
Gary Radke, Arts and Sciences: Fine Arts
Martin Sliwinski, Arts and Sciences: Psychology
David Yaffe, Arts and Sciences: English
Jon Zubieta, Arts and Sciences: Chemistry

---

[*] Here are the full names of panelists' schools and colleges: School of Architecture, College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, College of Human Services and Health Professions, School of Information Studies, College of Law, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications, L.C. Smith College of Engineering and Computer Science, College of Visual and Performing Arts, and Martin J. Whitman School of Management.

Appendix B

Thought Questions AAC posed and discussed regarding Scholarship in Action (05-06)

1. How should we understand or define the concept of "scholarship in action"? In particular, how do we identify it as "scholarly" and how do we distinguish it from "service"? How can we operationalize that definition so that when faced with a particular case we (the faculty member doing it, colleagues, evaluators) can identify it as "scholarship in action"?

2. What, if any, are the conceptual differences expressed in variant terms like community-engaged scholarship, public scholarship, applied scholarship, scholarship in action, etc.? Are these discipline-related? Related to institutional mission?

3. Does scholarship IN action equate to any or all of these?

  * the application of prior scholarship to a real-world context
  * the performance of traditional scholarship in an external context of action
  * the use or application of scholarship (either 1 or 2) for a social purpose or "the public good"
  * politically activist scholarship
  * action that is intellectually informed by scholarly knowledge and new thinking (research, theory developed for and during the project) but has as its product something accomplished through the action, rather than a contribution through publication to academic knowledge

4. What is meant by "the public good"?

5. Besides engagement with the community, what features typify scholarship in action? (e.g., collaboration, multiple constituencies and actors involved, complex projects, long time-lines, lack of individual control over the outcome, nontraditional products, interdisciplinarity, academic and nonacademic participants, etc.)

6. How might the concept or the actual practice of scholarship in action vary by field? Given such variance, what common features do we find in such activities across disciplines? How much variance needs to be built into the definition and the reward system?

7. What are the products of scholarship in action? How do these vary by field, or is the variance rather by project (since oftentimes projects are interdisciplinary)?

8. Everyone recognizes that activities in which faculty members engage with the community frequently mix and blur the categories of "research," "teaching," and "service" (terms already the subject of debate, redefinition, and alternate proposals like the Boyer model or the MLA model). How does one handle this blurring or mixing in promotion and tenure guidelines and practices, which currently mandate separate evaluations of each category and then balancing them in the reward system?

9. What are the obstacles to DOING scholarship in action, that make it hard to conceive, fund, organize, execute, successfully complete, etc. such work? How does that differentially affect untenured faculty vs. senior tenured faculty members? What special accommodations or support need to be provided, separate from but related to the reward system? (e.g., reduced teaching on campus)

10. What are the most significant motives and reasons for doing scholarship in action? From the faculty member's perspective? That of his/her university or college? That of the academy in general? That of the local or broader community (nonacademic)? That of students at that institution? How are these motives and reasons specific to the

new generation of faculty or to particular social groups? How do these motives balance between personal and societal, institutional self-interest vs. idealism, etc.?

11. Given the products and, particularly the fact that some are not written, how do we define for scholarship in action such features of academic intellectual work as publication, dissemination, peer review, impact? If the products are not written and/or "publishable," how can they be documented and evaluated? To what extent does "credit" for such work depend for a faculty member on the project's dependence on his/her prior (recognized) scholarship or on completing traditional scholarship (and publication) as part of the project itself, e.g., as an evaluative component? (likely right now to vary by field)

12. What models do we have right now for defining, documenting, and evaluating forms of faculty work that we could borrow from? e.g., performance in the performing arts; teaching across fields, esp. when it goes beyond the individual classroom to curriculum development, training, etc.; administration in composition scholarship; current forms of community-engaged intellectual work and applications, esp. in the professions.

Appendix C

Heuristic models or prototypes for Scholarship in Action project/panel discussions

These may be construed as modes of engagement or "roles" a faculty member can play as a scholar in action, often in combination.

Model 1:

public intellectual, public communicator: the scholar communicates with publics and communities beyond traditional academic peers, on both academic knowledge and public issues/topics, based on his/her own expertise. Encompasses traditional and new media for communication.

Alternate/associated terms: public scholar/scholarship; public critic or artist

Examples:
Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, History

Model 2:

(community) partner-in-action: the scholar engages with community/publics, potentially from any sector of society, interactively and collaboratively in pursuing both discovery and learning through research and also application of academic methods and knowledge to problem-solving and constructive action for the "public good."

Alternate/associated terms: the engaged scholar (scholarship of engagement, civic engagement); community-engaged scholar; older terms (still in use) are outreach and [scholarship of] application.

Examples:
Steve Parks, Writing

Model 3:

community-engaged teacher: the scholar engages with community/publics to promote learning both by these communities/publics and also by her/his own students: (a) and (b), often combined.

a—teacher teaches, sets up learning environments, for non-SU students, e.g., teachers; children or adults in a local community; participants in a conference; community leaders; etc. Not offered for SU credit, normally, and may take many forms and formats. May be single teacher or complex partnership.
b—teacher engages students in working with community, learning in/from community.

Alternate/associated term: service learning (for students)

Examples:
Lori Brown, Architecture, and Alison Mountz, Geography

Appendix D

Questions for Panelists on Scholarship in Action [sample for community-engaged teacher]

The Senate Academic Affairs Committee is trying to learn about the varieties of **scholarship in action** on campus. We've identified several models of "engaging the world," as Chancellor Cantor says, and are exploring them with scholars who seem to exemplify that particular mode of scholarship in action. (Since we are testing our models and using them heuristically to understand scholarship in action, we expect to revise them based on what we learn from you!) We have invited you to participate on a panel that centers on how scholars play the role of a **"community-engaged teacher."** In this role, as we imagined it, a faculty member either teaches outside the bounds of the university campus to nontraditional students and audiences, or engages SU students in research, action, and/or interaction with communities outside the institution to enhance their learning—or both. But feel free to comment also on other roles you have played in this project or in your career, since they often blend in practice.

Here are some of the questions we'd like you to think about and address (in any order or combination) in a presentation of about 10-12 minutes when you visit our committee to speak on the panel. After the presentation, we will open up the discussion among the panelists and committee members.

• Please describe in some detail your activities or projects that fit into our topic of scholarship in action and, specifically, describe examples of your work as a community-engaged teacher.

• In what aspects or ways do you view this work as "scholarly"? How does it connect with your scholarly interests and knowledge, or with your other scholarly projects? Is it discipline-based? interdisciplinary?

• How would you describe the value of this work to communities or publics that it engages? How would you describe the value of this work to your discipline(s) or the academy? Does the accomplishment of this work contribute to knowledge or to teaching and learning in your field, or change it in some way?

• How is your work valued in your own field and at SU, in your department and school or college? How does it figure in the tenure and promotion process, or other rewards? How is it accounted for in load?

• What are the challenge and difficulties of doing this work?

• In the current system for categorizing and evaluating faculty work in your field at Syracuse, how would work like yours be handled? How do you think it should be done?

In particular, we'd like to know your thinking on these questions:

--How did you, or could you, make this work public and disseminate it?
--How did you, or could you, document it (e.g., for a dossier)?
--Who should evaluate it: e.g., academic peers, expert professionals, community partners, students, beneficiaries?