Navigating the Boundaries of the Scholarship of Engagement at a Regional Comprehensive University

Laura Cruz, Gillian D. Ellern, George Ford, Hollye Moss, and Barbara Jo White

Abstract

This study analyzes the translation of the Boyer scholarship model (with an emphasis on the scholarship of engagement) into departmental and college-level culture at a regional comprehensive institution. Through an analysis of promotion and tenure documents, the authors concluded that adoption of Boyer's model was a semi-radical process, characterized by unique definitional, conceptual, and logistical challenges that resulted in a diverse array of practices and approaches across the university's departments and colleges.

Introduction

When Ernest Boyer published *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990, it sparked a national dialogue that continues to this day. Boyer argued for expanding a definition of scholarship to include not simply traditional research, which he called the scholarship of discovery, but also the scholarships of application, integration, and teaching and learning. Boyer saw his work as calling attention to or enhancing the nature of faculty work that was already taking place, as opposed to displacing or overturning the traditional core of research, teaching, and service. In practice, however, his call for a redefinition of faculty roles evoked changes in practice that were radical for some campus cultures *(Johnston, 1998)*. This article examines the experiences of Western Carolina University, a medium-sized, regional comprehensive institution, with integrating Boyer's model, in particular the scholarship of engagement, into its academic culture.

Literature Review

Nationally, as well as internationally, the work of putting Boyer's vision into practice began with a focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning, one of the four areas of scholarship he advocated *(Boyer, 1990; McKinney, 2004)*. In addition to the leadership provided by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement

of Teaching, the scholarship of teaching and learning benefited from the creation of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, a large, active, and multi-disciplinary group of scholars from across the world *(McKinney, 2007)*. Discourse over the years has led to a general understanding of the difference between scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning *(Huber & Hutchings, 2005)*.

A universal understanding of the definition of the scholarship of engagement has not evolved *(Simpson, 2000)*. Although movements to create campus-community partnerships and use service-learning projects in teaching *(Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999)* have made inroads into university culture, the "scholarship of engagement" has not. Boyer himself struggled with the terminology for scholarship that serves the public good. Initially, he used the term "scholarship of application." Later he modified the model and suggested the centrality of the scholarship of engagement under the broader umbrella of application. In practice the two have become largely synonymous, with slight preference for "the scholarship of engagement" *(Boyer, 1996b)*.

Today, the concept of "the scholarship of engagement" continues to be fraught with definitional issues. To Boyer, the "scholarship of engagement" meant work toward solving "social, civic, and ethical" problems *(Boyer, 1996a, p. 11)*. Some equate the "scholarship of engagement" with that of applied research. Applied research is distinguished from "pure" or "basic" research by its intention (i.e., to solve a practical, as opposed to a theoretical, problem; *Collins & Hussey, 2003*). Still others use terms such as "public scholarship," "action research," "civic liberty scholarship," and "participatory research" to describe research with this intent *(Barker, 2004; Giles, 2008)*. University administrators have often adopted the term to represent an institution's increasing leadership in community development with relationships based on stewardship of place, or other partnership models *(AASCU, 2002; Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Brockliss, 2000; Franklin, 2009; Mayfield, 2001; McDonald, 2002)*.

Some scholars are now redefining the conceptual basis of engagement altogether, preferring the term "engaged scholarship." They suggest that engaged, civic-minded research crosses the boundaries among teaching, research, and service *(Barker, 2004; Finkelstein, 2001)*. This shift in terminology increases the need for clarity of definitions. The distinction between "scholarship of engagement" and "service" no longer suffices; now "engaged scholarship" must be distinguished from teaching, research, and service *(Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2010)*. These definitional issues pose

unique challenges for regional comprehensive universities, like Western Carolina University, with strong regional missions as well as emphases on active and integrated teaching and learning. In this article, the experiences of Western Carolina University serve as an example for these challenges *(O'Meara, 2003)*.

Institutional Context

Western Carolina University, nestled in the Appalachian mountains on the western edge of North Carolina, was founded in the late 19ᵗʰ century as a teachers' college in order to produce teachers to serve a rural population. From these foundations, Western Carolina University has evolved into a regional comprehensive university with a student population of almost 10,000 and has been integrated as an institutional partner into the University of North Carolina public higher education system. The faculty are currently divided into six conventional academic colleges, seven if the library is included (see Appendix 1). Because quality teaching is a high priority for the campus, most Western Carolina University faculty carry a 3/3 teaching load and class sizes are relatively small, with an average of just under 25 students in a standard, face-to-face undergraduate class. As Western Carolina University is a Masters Level L institution, many faculty also teach graduate courses and direct master's and Ed.D. theses *(Carnegie Foundation, 2012)*. Because of the university's regional classification, faculty are also expected to engage constructively with the needs of the counties composing the western North Carolina region.

Advocates of the "scholarship of engagement" suggest taking several steps to make such work a meaningful part of an institution's culture *(Driscoll & Sandmann, 2004; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006)*. At Western Carolina University, the first phase, recognizing and rewarding multiple forms of scholarship in the tenure and promotion process, came about through the initiative of the faculty senate. Working closely with the Office of the Provost, senate members called for significant revisions of the existing tenure system in 2007. The provost heeded the call and coordinated a process in which each department or program was asked to redesign its requirements around a template (see Appendix 2) created jointly by faculty senate members and the provost. Departments could determine for themselves how to interpret Boyer based on their own disciplinary, pedagogical, and logistical contexts, a method that had been successfully used elsewhere to preserve the balance between departmental autonomy and cohesive institutional culture *(O'Meara & Rice, 2005)*. These initial revisions, and the resulting

discussions, took place over the course of the 2007–2008 academic year. Once approved, the documents became the basis for tenure and promotion decisions beginning in 2009.

Assessment Methods

Integrating Boyer's model of scholarship into an academic culture can take many forms. At Western Carolina University, departments were allowed flexibility in incorporating the Boyer model into their own promotion and tenure documents. For this article, the authors explored how the various departments and disciplines operationalized the definition of the scholarship of engagement. Having established this definition, the authors then explored how the various departments recognize, evaluate, and reward scholarship that falls under the category of "engagement."

Sample and Data Collection

The authors performed a qualitative analysis of the promotion and tenure documents across all 33 Western Carolina University departments (see Appendix 1). The typical promotion and tenure document at Western Carolina University is about 20 pages and addresses appropriate levels of teaching, service, and scholarship, with sections devoted to each of the four Boyer categories for the purposes of tenure, promotion, and reappointment.

About the Authors

The authors for this project are part of a faculty learning community whose purpose is to examine the adoption of the Boyer model of scholarship at Western Carolina University in a scholarly way. Initially proposed under the auspices of Western Carolina University's Coulter Faculty Commons, this group of volunteers represented four of the seven colleges, two academic ranks (assistant and associate professor), and a variety of research skills. The group had been working together for several years. To control for potential biases toward home departments or colleges, the group employed a checks and balances system. To ensure the consistency of the values as well as to control for researcher bias, two authors (from different disciplines) independently reviewed each tenure, promotion, and reappointment document. In the case of divergent opinions, a third author assisted. The group resolved questions or concerns collectively.

Data Analysis

The authors began by looking at the integration of the scholarship of teaching and learning but quickly realized that the scholarship of engagement had significant variations in interpretation across the university. Using an emergent content analysis approach *(Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009)*, the authors isolated patterns within and among the documents. Those patterns showed four primary points of variation:

- definition(s) of engagement and related terms;

- how appropriate scholarly products were defined;

- how Boyer scholarship of all types was evaluated, relatively and absolutely; and

- how service was defined and valued.

These points of variation were then compared systematically across all departments, using a pattern-coded and cross-indexed spreadsheet. In most cases, departmental documents were assigned values based on the degree to which they moved beyond the template, from low to high differentiation. After reviewing the results, the authors enumerated the emerging patterns using frequency counts and, at appropriate conjunctures, simple correlations. In short, the study employed textual content analysis of these 33 redesigned documents in order to probe what the scholarship of engagement means, or could mean, to a state or regional comprehensive university.

Limitations of the Study

This study presents distinct limitations, some characteristic of qualitative research in general, and some specific to the study itself. The scope included a single university, and the methods used did not allow for differentiating factors that may be unique to the institution, the departments, or even the individuals who participated in the revision process. The results from this study of a single institution may or may not be representative of other institutions or institutional types. Comparative studies would prove fruitful in the future *(Jordan, 2006)*. Further, the quality of the results has not been triangulated with other sources of data (e.g., faculty surveys, tenure decisions), though such efforts are the subject of ongoing research *(Glass, 2008)*. Finally, the quality of the conclusions is limited to the extent of the information contained in the documents, which, as noted earlier, are imperfect mirrors for actual practice.

Findings

Although the documents are imperfect mirrors, they do shed light on the process by which theory is translated into reality, in this case the explication of expectations for tenure, promotion, and reappointment. The institutional scope of the study allowed for an analysis of the divergence of interpretation across disciplines and programs, an aspect that has not previously been explored. The results of the study produced four "sticky wickets," or areas with the greatest degree of differentiation from the baseline (i.e., the template provided by the office of the provost), and thus identified the points of greatest contention within the multiple facets of a single campus.

Point of Contention 1: Definition

Under this university's administrative directive, departments faced their first challenge with the provided descriptions of the Boyer model. Albeit brief, the model stuck closely to Boyer's original categories and asked faculty to consider this definition of the scholarship of application:

> Sometimes called engagement, the scholarship of application goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the University. To be considered scholarship, there must be an application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers such as technical reports, policy statements, guidebooks, economic impact statements, and/or pamphlets. (see Appendix 1, *Western Carolina University Faculty Handbook, p. 22*)

The term suggested was "application," rather than "engagement," though potential definitional problems are apparent even in the first sentence. Perhaps because of this, the departmental documents use the terms somewhat interchangeably, in one case adding the term "scholarly engagement" to the mix. Of the 33 departments, only one (History) suggests that public service work be classified as service or outreach rather than scholarship. Eleven (33%) go beyond the general template and explicitly mention public service as a desired emphasis. The Mathematics and Computer Science Department, for example, lists the purpose of this scholarship as to "aid society or discipline in addressing problems." Several departments include examples of acceptable forms of this scholarship, including leading service-learning projects (Social

Work), participating in programs that enhance health care delivery in the community (Health and Human Services), conducting a study to solve a community problem (Communication Sciences and Disorders), organizing community exhibitions and public art (Art and Design), leading discussions of music for a popular audience (Music), and building "collaborative relationships with their constituencies" (Elementary and Middle Grades Education).

The definition of the scholarship of engagement proved particularly challenging for the departments in the College of Business. The college mission and strategic plan reflect a collective interest in engagement, both in active learning and in regional economic development. Their "business ready" philosophy specifically promotes "academic studies enhanced by practical experience gained from engagement opportunities with businesses and economic and community development agencies in the region and beyond." In the college, it is expected that faculty who work with organizations will use those experiences to enhance their classroom teaching, but how that work fits into scholarship is less clear. The distinction between application and engagement, for example, invites the open question of whether working with any business, regardless of type, suffices as engagement because of its implications for overall economic development, or whether engaged scholarship must specifically relate to the nonprofit sector.

Point of Contention 2: Scholarly Products

A second disputed area concerns the products of activities such as those from the College of Business described above. Traditionally, scholarship takes written form, largely books or articles, but can also include other documents such as grants. The scholarship of engagement, or engaged scholarship more broadly, often works with less traditional scholarly products *(Ellison & Eatman, 2008)*. Not only can engaged scholarship include written work, such as technical reports, guidebooks, funded research grants, client-evaluated consulting engagements, service on boards (with records or products), collaborative work with economic development agencies, or pamphlets, it can also include projects whose public dissemination may or may not include formal documentation, such as presentations, events, mentoring, or facilitation. All but three departments at Western Carolina University suggest that non-traditional products may count toward tenure, but this openness is tempered by a preference for conventional forms. In 16 of the 30 departments (53%) that recognize non-traditional products, at least a foundation of traditional scholarly products is required before a faculty

member may safely consider alternative forms. Some departments suggest examples of non-traditional products, including museum exhibits (History), sponsorship of student research (Engineering and Technology), and assessment of outcomes (Health and Human Sciences), but this was not common. In three cases, the stated examples of non-traditional products included, or focused exclusively on, what would normally be called traditional products, such as journal articles and conference presentations.

Point of Contention 3: Evaluation

With the rise of non-traditional forms of scholarship comes the related task of valuing new products. The standard of scholarly valuation for close to five hundred years has been the double-blind peer-review system *(Spier, 2002)*. More recently, the method has increasingly come under attack, especially in the biomedical sciences, for being unreliable, non-standardized, expensive, conservative, or unfair *(Benos et al., 2007; Horrobin, 1990; McCook, 2006; McNutt et al., 1990; Smith, 1997; Suls and Martin, 2009; van Rooyen et al., 1999)*, but it can be particularly problematic when dealing with non-traditional scholarly products, as few, if any, established processes or agencies exist to support alternative peer-review. Recognizing this problem, the Carnegie Foundation commissioned and published *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, which suggests a universal set of review principles to be applied across the Boyer model *(Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Wise,Retzleff, & Reilly, 2002)*. Two departments at Western Carolina University acknowledged and incorporated these standards, and seven more included them in a modified form. Building on Carnegie's work, the National Project for the Documentation of Professional Service and Outreach produced *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach* in 1999 *(Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Driscoll &Sandmann, 2001)* but this work did not appear anywhere in documentation from the 33 departments, nor did references to its review board. It would appear that despite concerted efforts to establish a universally recognized peer-review framework, this goal has not yet been achieved at Western Carolina University, at least in terms of formal policy and procedures.

On a more positive note, at Western Carolina University, 29 departments included some mechanism for alternative or external peer-review for non-traditional products in the scholarship of engagement category. The major challenge in peer-review of engaged scholarship is the question of who, or what, constitutes a peer. Advocates of engaged scholarship have called for broadening

the definition of "peer" to include non-academic leaders *(Cantor & Lavine, 2007)* or others, such as community members, who might benefit from the scholarly work *(Kennedy et al., 2003)*. Establishing a list of qualified reviewers outside academia has proven to be a challenge for engaged scholarship across the country. Although most departments at Western Carolina University do not explicitly exclude non-academic peers, the processes for finding and vetting such reviewers remain fluid, particularly in the rural environment of Western Carolina University.

Peer-review of engagement projects not only occurs as a post-project review process, but can also involve a peer-review prior to completion of the project or even during the planning stages. Nearly a quarter of all departments (8 out of 33, or 24%) offered faculty members an opportunity for prior review of engagement projects through internal feedback processes, often in consultation with fellow faculty members serving on either department or college-level promotion and tenure committees. The Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education, for example, used a fairly typical statement: "The candidate may request prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the Collegial Review Advisory Committee." This type of prior review process recognizes that some faculty members may favor, or need, greater clarity than the documents provide, and that they should seek that assurance on a case-by-case basis.

For the more summative purposes of estimating quality, all departments indicated that external peer-review for non-traditional products was either strongly encouraged or desired. The processes for that review, however, varied considerably. Some departments (11 out of 33, or 33%) did not indicate specific procedures for external review. Five departments (15%) suggested that the external review process would be accomplished by the individual faculty member as they saw fit. Others (17 out of 33, or 51%) suggested specific procedures. Of those 17, eight (24%) allowed for modified faculty participation, most commonly in the form of the faculty member drawing up a slate of potential external reviewers and the department head or promotion and tenure committee selecting at least one of the reviewers from those faculty-generated choices. Finally, a similar number of departments (9 out of 33, or 27%) indicated that external reviewers would be chosen by an administrative entity, usually a department head or dean, either unilaterally or in consultation with a promotion and tenure committee. Given that these processes are, for all intents and purposes, without precedent on the campus of Western Carolina University,

it appears that the departments are trying to maintain maximum flexibility in determining the quality of non-traditional scholarship. Advocates of engaged scholarship also call for a re-conceptualization of quality standards, and particularly for increased emphasis on measuring public impact, but this issue arose in only a handful of the documents at Western Carolina University, and in most cases quality standards were largely left to be determined on the same highly flexible, case-by-case basis.

Because so much of the work done by its departments could fall between application and engagement and between teaching, service, and scholarship, the Kimmel School of Construction Management and Technology chose to create a college-level engagement committee, consisting of the dean, representatives from each of the two departments, and at least one external reviewer. The primary purpose of the committee is to provide prior review, that is, to determine what kinds of scholarly products are valued and how and by whom they are valued; however, it is also tasked with providing external review at all levels of evaluation. In 2012, the committee had not been presented with a single case for consideration, but the documents make clear that there is an opportunity to do so.

Engaged scholars have called for broadening the definition of *peer* because their work extends outside the halls of academia and into the real world. Outside the campus, the world does not always fit into the same neat compartments as academic life, which gives rise to the need to also reconsider how scholarship is conducted. Engaged scholarship thrives on collaboration across disciplines (multi-, inter-, and intra-disciplinary work is common) and between academic and community partners. Another challenge to rewarding engaged scholarship is apportioning credit for shared projects and rewarding multidisciplinary research. The majority of departments apportion the highest overall values to publications in the top ranks of discipline-specific journals (in several cases, a list of desired outlets is included in the promotion and tenure documents) or presses, a practice that may preclude some types of inter- or multi-disciplinary work. Several departments at Western Carolina University (12 out of 33, or 36%) indicate a preference for or assign higher values to single author or first author publications. On the other hand, a smaller number (10 out of 33, or 30%) indicate a preference for collaborative work. These departments do not necessarily further elucidate desired collaborators (although three departments do specify a preference for work with students). This issue concerns more than credit, however, and hits at the heart

of deep-rooted assumptions in academia. The postmodernists led the revolt against the concept of authorship well before Boyer's career, and it is likely that this boundary dispute is part of a larger epistemological battle that continues to challenge the relationship between knowledge and its creators *(Barthes, 1977; Foucault, 1977)*.

In the School of Construction Management, because faculty come from varied backgrounds (at least in part because it is a relative newcomer to academia), and because of the multi-faceted nature of construction work in the real world, collaboration is explicitly encouraged and rewarded in the department. Faculty can publish the results of collaborative projects in conference proceedings, which are recognized and valued as a convenient way to disseminate best practice information, and in peer-reviewed scholarly and trade journals. Most of the scholarship generated in the department has multiple authors, which can (and do) include community or business partners, and shared scholarship often counts equally with single author publications. According to department members, this has fostered a collegial environment and has also led to an increase in inter-disciplinary scholarship between the department and other colleagues on campus. More research is needed to determine to what extent these opportunities translate into cultural change, but the documents attest to more avenues through which collaboration and integration might be pursued.

Point of Contention 4: Concept

All departments at Western Carolina University had well-developed and generally comprehensive statements and requirements for excellence in teaching. Most had fleshed out scholarship requirements to some degree. In the area of service, however, seven out of 33 (21%) did not move beyond the standard template for explicating expectations, and 15 out of 33 (45%) only modified the baseline slightly, most commonly by providing specific disciplinary examples of exemplary service. The template, or baseline, for the service section makes explicit reference to engagement (as befits the university's mission) and includes the following statement:

> Service includes community engagement (e.g., providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level).

Ten departments (30%) displayed a highly developed service ethos, moving far beyond the baseline to include principles, checklists, criteria, and further differentiation of service types or roles.

Interestingly, an analysis using Pearson's correlation coefficient indicates a statistically significant linear relationship ($n = 33$, $r = .507$, $p < .003$) between highly developed service expectations and value placed on the scholarship of engagement. No other correlations reached this level of significance. This finding suggests that at Western Carolina University, the boundary between engaged scholarship and service is the most robust.

That being said, there was less consistency in differentiating service activities from scholarship. Some departments, for example, valued work on accreditation or program review documents as scholarship, others as service. At times, this was discipline related. For example, the School of Stage and Screen valued work with community theater as scholarship, but other, non-performance-based departments placed analogous work under service. The most contested area concerned grants. For some departments, an unsuccessful grant application, whether internal or external, counted in the scholarship category. For others, the grant application either had to be external or over a threshold amount (e.g., $10,000) to count as scholarship. Yet others ascribe a grant to scholarship only if it was successful, and a handful of departments do not mention grants under scholarship at all.

Because of their distinctive service mission, the librarians faced this definitional challenge in a way that other departments did not. Before the rewrite of the university's faculty handbook and the addition of the Boyer model of scholarship, the word "scholarship" was rarely, if ever, used in any of the library's documents. Across the university, the broader term "professional development" included publications but also other activities such as presentations. Unlike most other departments, the library used the term "professional development" with no specific expectation of published scholarship. In their previous documents, for example, librarians were encouraged to find a way to share their knowledge with others, and could do so in a variety of ways, of which publication was only one possibility. With the new Boyer categories, however, many of these activities count as service rather than scholarship, which changed the equation for their tenure processes. Their example suggests that the conceptual link between engagement and scholarship is also subject to differing interpretations.

Implications

David Schon described Boyer's model as an epistemological shift, but emphasized that the shift was particularly challenging to the "technical rationality" found in research institutions *(Schon, 1995)*. Most faculty at Western Carolina University received their training (and scholarly socialization) at research universities *(Wu, 2005)*, but face different circumstances of academic life and work at a state comprehensive university. Boyer's model still presents a fundamental shift, but one that is only semi-radical because research does not hold the same position in the overall balance of faculty load and service *(Martinez-Brawley, 2003; Neumann & Terosky, 2007)*. Research on the status and identity of state comprehensive universities has shown that among the different institutional levels, theirs is the least defined and falls somewhere between the research focus of research institutions and the teaching focus of liberal arts colleges. This role conflict can often translate into increased demands on faculty time. Faculty are expected to do research as if they worked at a research university, teach as if at a liberal arts college, and provide significant service to the region as if at a land-grant institution *(Henderson, 2007)*. It is no wonder Coser *(1974)* referred to state comprehensive universities as "greedy institutions," and that measures of faculty satisfaction tend to be lower at state comprehensive universities than at other types of institutions *(Henderson, 2007)*. That being said, several state comprehensive universities, including Western Carolina University, introduced the Boyer model in an effort to address this role conflict and to find ways to recognize and reward state comprehensive university faculty for the full range of their scholarly work. In its most robust form, engaged scholarship overlaps with all three areas of faculty work life—teaching, research, and service—and may provide faculty members with a way to integrate different facets of their work life more clearly, a process that research has shown leads to increased faculty well-being *(Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Janke & Colbeck, 2008)*. Whether this will be the case at Western Carolina University remains to be seen.

The larger cultural, logistical, and even epistemological obstacles to the adoption of Boyer have been noted by nearly all those who have studied the topic, and the ineffability of many of these aspects complicates the process of developing effective solutions *(Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Fear, Rosaen, Foster-Fishman, & Bawden, 2001; Finkelstein, 2001)*. It can be tempting to point fingers, blaming faculty for knee-jerk conservatism or administration for trifling commitments, but these complaints lack an analytical basis or

constructive goals. At Western Carolina University, the move toward adoption of Boyer, and engaged scholarship in particular, occurred not so much as a revolutionary shift, but as a semi-radical nudge. While administration provided the initial impetus for change, the translation of the Boyer directive into departmental and college-level cultures necessitated traversing a whole range of definitional borders, including discipline, accreditation bodies, custom, local communities, and more, as the examples presented here vividly illustrate. One faculty member commented (anecdotally) that the process resembled a game of bocce ball, with each unit trying to toss its ball closer to the mark, resulting in a seemingly random constellation.

The constellations surrounding engaged scholarship differed markedly from that of the scholarship of teaching and learning, however, suggesting the degree of penetration also depends on an additional (and often overlooked) variable in evaluating the impact of the Boyer model: the type of scholarship. The experience at Western Carolina University shows that the integration of the scholarship of engagement differed considerably from that of the scholarship of teaching and learning, and faced very different obstacles and opportunities *(Cruz, Ellern, Ford, Moss, & White, 2010)*. One of the most marked differences concerned definitional boundaries. To extend the previous analogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning tosses were more closely clumped together, reflecting a greater consensus on definitions and criteria. Efforts to standardize the definition of engaged scholarship have not been as consistent or universal as those applied to the scholarship of teaching and learning, but engaged scholarship also faces definitional boundaries that the scholarship of teaching and learning does not, particularly in terms of integrating new actors, especially the larger community, into the scholarship equation.

Another potential implication can be drawn here. Boyer intended that his categories would reward and recognize faculty for work that they were already doing, placing him in the role of reluctant revolutionary. In the case of the scholarship of teaching and learning, faculty members had already been teaching, particularly at a state comprehensive university with a strong teaching mission, but had not necessarily been engaging in systematic or empirical studies of that teaching. Before Boyer, in other words, there was not a great deal of scholarship of teaching and learning work being done. On the other hand, many departments, especially in applied disciplines, had already integrated engagement into their *raison d'être*, their curriculums, and their research agendas, as seen in

several of the departments described above. At the same time, comprehensive universities had been stepping up to the plate in terms of their own relationships with local communities and rewarding faculty who contributed to civic engagement and development. So, unlike the scholarship of teaching and learning, engaged scholarship faced a well-entrenched set of practices and processes. Thus, the logistical challenge is not to create a set of standards from the bottom up, but rather to negotiate a composite that can please all parties.

As in many exercises of compromise, the results have not been equally acceptable to all. At Western Carolina University, for example, the adoption of the Boyer model has led to the tightening of some boundaries that had previously been more permeable, a process from which not all have equally benefited. In the case of the library, for example, the move from professional development to engaged scholarship has not necessarily resulted in the liberation that Boyer likely imagined his model would yield. The other unintended consequence of the Boyer model is that it places so many activities in the domain of scholarship that it can lead to the inadvertent neglect of the integrative aspects of teaching, research, and service. The most recent models of engaged scholarship attempt to reach beyond the "four boxes" of Boyer scholarship and give this work a broader, more holistic position in faculty work life that transgresses existing boundaries. This dimension was almost wholly lacking in the tenure documents at Western Carolina University, an observation that gives some food for thought about the next stages of amending recognition and reward systems.

The negotiation of tighter boundaries for engaged scholarship does, however, have its positive side. While the move to adopt the scholarship of teaching and learning was certainly contested at Western Carolina University, supporters and detractors were clearly demarcated by a distinct boundary. For administrative purposes, these clear lines are likely viewed as beneficial. Faculty, regardless of discipline, on the other hand, have been highly trained to wrangle less well-defined issues and often revel in the chance to wrap their heads around complex problems without clear solutions or outcomes, a condition that more closely resembles the adoption of scholarship of engagement.

More than any other aspect of Boyer, the scholarship of engagement with its disputed definitional borders, ambiguous points of intersection, overlapping jurisdictions, and epistemological and logistical challenges, has productively challenged the faculty at Western Carolina University to examine and reflect on what they

do, why they do it, and what it means. As Gil Scott Heron famously wrote, "the revolution will not be televised"; that is, profound change does not occur by passivity, but rather by active engagement with the issues. The experiences of Western Carolina University suggest that while we are not a campus of revolutionaries, we are in many exciting and interesting ways a campus of semi-radical revolution.

Conclusion

In summary, when dealing with a cultural shift this radical, it is not surprising to find differentiated degrees of support and understanding for Boyer's model as a whole, and others may expect to find similar results *(O'Meara & Rice, 2005)*. The experiences of Western Carolina University suggest that a myriad of challenges arise with the use of the term "engaged scholarship," and further questions arise when applying the term across multiple disciplinary contexts. This study has shown that there is much greater variation and considerably less consensus in definitions of the scholarships of application and engagement than in the definition of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Despite these challenges, the intentional move to change the culture at Western Carolina University has given rise to a campus actively engaged in productive and stimulating conversations to discover what it means to be an engaged institution.

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities*. Retrieved from http://www.aascu.org/pdf/stewardsofplace_02.pdf

Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 123–137.

Barthes, R. (1977). The death of the author. In *Image, Music, Text* (pp. 142–148). New York, NY: Hill & Wang.

Benos, D. J., Benos, E., Chaves, J. M., Gagger, A., Kapoor, N., LaFrance, M., . . . Zotov, A. (2007). The ups and downs of peer review. *Advances in Physiological Education, 31*, 145–152.

Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 13*(2), 5–18.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1996a). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11–20.

Boyer, E. (1996b). Stated meeting report: The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*(7), 18–33.

Bringle, R., Games, R., & Malloy, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brockliss, L. (2000). Gown and town: The university and the city in Europe, 1200–2000. *Minerva, 32*(2), 147–170.

Cantor, N., & Lavine, S. D. (2007). Taking public scholarship seriously. *The Chronicle Review, 31*, 145–152.

Carnegie Foundation. (2012). *The Carnegie classifications of institutions of higher learning*. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/

Collins, J., & Hussey, R. (2003). *Business research: A practical guide for under-graduate and postgraduate students* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coser, L. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Cruz, L., Ellern, J., Ford, G., Moss, H., & White, B. J. (2010). Recognition and reward: SoTL and the tenure process at a regional comprehensive university. *MountainRise, 7*, 1–27.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to docu-menting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2001). From maverick to mainstream: The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 6*(2), 9–19.

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2004). Roles and responsibilities of academic administrators: Supporting the scholarship of civic engagement. In M. Langseth & W. M. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy* (pp. 51-67). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America. Retrieved from http://imaginingamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/TTI_FINAL.pdf

Fear, F. A., Rosaen, C. L., Foster-Fishman, P., & Bawden, R. J. (2001). Outreach as scholarly expression: A faculty perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(2), 21–34.

Finkelstein, M. A. (2001). Toward a unified view of scholarship: Eliminating tensions between traditional and engaged work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(2), 35–44.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Franklin, N. (2009). The need is now: University engagement in regional economic development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 13*(4), 51–73.

Giles, D.E., Jr., (2008). Understanding an emerging field of scholarship: Toward a research agenda for engaged, public scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(2)2, 97-106.

Glass, C., Doberneck, D., & Schweitzer, J. (2008, October). *Outreach and engagement in promotion and tenure*. Poster session presented at the National Outreach Scholarship Conference, The Pennsylvania State University.

Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2010). *Summary of the 2001 revisions to the reappointment, promotion, and tenure form at Michigan State University: Expanding the definition of scholarship to include engagement*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsue.msu.edu/files/EngagementExchange_No.1_Jan2010.pdf

Glassick, C., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Henderson, B. (2007). *Teaching at the people's university: An introduction to the state comprehensive university*. Bolton, MA: Anker Press.

Horrobin, D. F. (1990). The philosophical basis of peer review and the suppression of innovation. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 263*(10), 1438–1441.

Huber, M.T. & Hutchings, P. (2005). The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Janke, E. M., & Colbeck, C. L. (2008). An exploration of the influence of public scholarship on faculty work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 31–46.

Johnston, R. (1998). The university of the future: Boyer revisited. *Higher Education, 36*, 253-272.

Jordan, C. (2006). *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure*. Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Developing%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf

Kennedy, R. H., Gubbins, P. O., Lauer, M., Reddy, I. K., & Light, K. E. (2003). Developing and sustaining a culture of scholarship. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 67*(3), 1–18.

Martinez-Brawley, E. E. (2003). The scholarship of engagement in a research university: Faculty incentives and disincentives. *Metropolitan Universities Journal: An International Forum, 14*(4), 116–130.

Mayfield, L. (2001). Town and gown issues in America: Some historical and institutional issues of the engaged university. *Education for Health 14*(2), 23–30.

McCook, A. (2006). Is peer review broken? *The Scientist*. Retrieved from http://classic.the-scientist.com/article/display/23061/

McDonald, J. (2005). Universities as sites of citizenship (Victoria): University of Ballarat: Regional engagement at the University of Ballarat. Ballarat: University of Ballarat.

McKinney, K. (2004). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Past lessons, current challenges, and future visions. *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development, 22*, 3–19.

McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McNutt, R. A., Evans, A. T., Fletcher, R. H., & Fletcher, S. W. (1990). The effects of blinding on the quality of peer review: A randomized trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 263*, 1371–1376.

Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 282–310.

O'Meara, K. (2003). Reframing incentives and rewards for community service-learning and academic outreach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 8*(2), 201–220.

O'Meara, K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2006). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: Barriers, facilitators, models, and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 11*(4), 3–26.

O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change, 27*(6), 27–34.

Simpson, R. D. (2000). Toward a scholarship of outreach and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(1), 7–12.

Smith, R. (1997). Reform or revolution: Time to open up the black box of peer review. *British Medical Journal, 315*(7111), 759–760.

Spier, R. (2002). The history of the peer review process. *Trends in Biotechnology, 20*(8), 357–358.

Stanton, T., Giles, D., & Cruz, N. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suls, J., & Martin, R. (2009). The air we breathe: A critical look at practices and alternatives in the peer-review process. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(1), 40–50.

van Rooyen, S., Godlee, F., Evans, S., Black, N., & Smith, R. (1999). Effect of open peer review on quality of reviews and on reviewers' recommendations: A randomised trial. *British Medical Journal, 318*(7175), 23.

Wise, G., Retzleff, D., & Reilly, K. (2002). Adapting Scholarship Reconsidered and Scholarship Assessed to evaluate University of Wisconsin–Extension outreach faculty for tenure and promotion. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 7*(3), 5–18.

Wu, S. (2005). Where do faculty receive their PhDs? *Academe, 91*(4). Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/JA/Feat/wu.htm

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*. Retrieved from http://www.ils.unc.edu/~yanz/Content_analysis.pdf

About the Authors

Laura Cruz is the director of the Coulter Faculty Commons and an associate professor of History at Western Carolina University. Her research interests include the Boyer model of scholarship, graduate student development, and organizational models in higher education. Cruz earned her Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley.

Gillian D. Ellern is the systems librarian at Western Carolina University. Her research interests include the Boyer model of scholarship, authentication and library systems, jail libraries, and interlibrary partnerships. Ellern earned her bachelor's degree from Western Virginia Wesleyan and her MLIS from Louisiana State University.

George Ford is an assistant professor in the Department of Construction Management at Western Carolina University. His research interests are based on his background in plant and environmental engineering including warehouses, manufacturing buildings, and utilities infrastructures. Ford earned his bachelor's degree and M.B.A. from Clemson University, a master's degree from the University of South Carolina, and his Ed.D. from Western Carolina University.

Hollye Moss is an associate professor of Management at Western Carolina University. Her research interests include service operations management and the Boyer model of scholarship. Moss earned her bachelor's degree from Converse College, her M.B.A. from Wake Forest University, and her master's degree and Ph.D. from Clemson University.

Barbara Jo White is an associate professor of Computer Information Systems in Western Carolina University's College of Business. A returned Peace Corps Volunteer, she founded The World Map Project. Her research interests include Information Systems and law, visual search using product images, and the Boyer model of scholarship. White earned her bachelor's degree fron the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, her M.B.A. from Eastern Carolina University, and her Ph.D. from the University of Mississippi.

Appendix 1: Academic Departments

At Western Carolina University there are 32 academic departments within six colleges or schools, plus the library, for thirty-three total departments. The academic departments, organized by college, are:

College of Arts and Sciences: Anthropology and Sociology, Biology, Chemistry and Physics, Communication, English, Geoscience and Natural Resources, History, Mathematics and Computer Science, Modern Foreign Languages, Philosophy and Religion, Political Science and Public Affairs

College of Business: Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics; Business Administration and Law and Sport Management; Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation; Global Management and Strategy; Sales, Marketing, and Hospitality and Tourism

College of Education and Allied Professions: Educational Leadership and Foundations; Elementary and Middle Grades Education; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; Human Services; Psychology

College of Fine and Performing Arts: Stage and Screen, Art and Design, Music

College of Health and Human Sciences: Criminology and Criminal Justice; Communication Sciences and Disorders; Health Sciences; Nursing; Physical Therapy; Social Work

Kimmel School of Construction Management and Technology: Construction Management, Engineering and Technology

Appendix 2: Template

Western Carolina University Faculty Handbook Section 4.04: Standards for Collegial Review

C. University Standards for Collegial Review

Faculty members at WCU are expected to be effective teachers, to be practicing scholars in their disciplines, and to provide meaningful service to the University and the community. The particular mix of these expected activities will vary as a function of departmental missions and the role of the faculty member in the department. Tenure-track or tenured faculty members should be active in all three areas. The following minimum university standards provide the groundwork for departments to establish specific criteria for collegial review.

1. Teaching

Faculty members at WCU are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective, i.e. their students learn. Effective teaching will be documented through the use of student, peer, and self-evaluations. Students provide reports that teachers are organized, clear, and enthusiastic, provide frequent and fair evaluations, and maintain an appropriate level of communication. Peers provide reports that faculty members design their courses in ways that help students learn, are knowledgeable and reflective about both their subject matter and their teaching, and challenge their students intellectually. Faculty members will also self-report and evaluate their teaching.

2. Scholarship

Faculty members should demonstrate that they are current and scholarly in their disciplines as reflected in the ways they teach and serve. They are also expected to demonstrate regular activity in one or more types of scholarship outlined below. The relative emphasis on each type of scholarship will be determined in the context of departmental and university mission and needs. Expectations of scholarly activity should be consistent with peer institutions. Departments will provide guidelines in AFE/TPR [Annual Faculty Evaluation/Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment] documents for dissemination and evaluation of scholarship. The four types of scholarship from Ernest Boyer's model include:

- **Scholarship of discovery.** Scholarship of this type includes original research that advances knowl-

edge and may involve publishing journal articles, authoring/editing books, or presenting at conferences. This type of scholarship also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.

- **Scholarship of integration.** Scholarship of this type involves synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time. Textbooks, bibliographies, and book reviews are examples of this type of scholarship.

- **Scholarship of application.** Sometimes called engagement, the scholarship of application goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the University. To be considered scholarship, there must be an application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers such as technical reports, policy statements, guidebooks, economic impact statements, and/or pamphlets.

- **Scholarship of teaching and learning.** Scholarship of this type is the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

Departments should recognize and evaluate a wide variety of scholarly activities consistent with the department's and the University's mission. Scholarly activities should not be rigidly categorized. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship.

3. Service

Faculty members are expected to participate in service. Service is expected to increase over a faculty member's employment. Primarily, service requires general expertise and is done as an act of good citizenship. Service at the department, college/school and university levels, includes serving on committees (e.g., search committees, curriculum committees, and collegial review committees), recruiting students, mentoring new faculty members, and advising administrators.

Service may also require special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership. Examples of such service include exercise of special technological, research or pedagogical skills, involvement with students in extracurricular activities, leadership in university governance, or taking on special administrative assignments (e.g., being department head, directing a graduate program, administering a grant obtained by the University).

Service includes community engagement (e.g., providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level).

Advising students is a significant form of service. Advisers are expected to be informed about curriculum and related processes, to be available to those they advise, and to help students in their academic and career planning.