An Integrated Model Recontextualized

KerryAnn O'Meara and John Saltmarsh

*A*s we revisited this article, we were pleased to see that much of the model we set forth with our colleague Lorilee Sandmann remains relevant today. For example, clearly the four topics we identified as second-order issues for support of faculty community engagement (i.e., doctoral socialization, faculty cultures and mentoring, academic reward systems, and disciplinary association recognition) remain critical. We still see the four quadrants of graduate education, departments, disciplinary associations, and institutions as major sites where faculty are socialized, recognized, supported, and advanced. This observation is reinforced by comparing efforts to support faculty community engagement with federal efforts to support the pipeline of women and underrepresented minority faculty in STEM. Key initiatives and directorates from NSF have similarly focused support on graduate education (e.g., Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate [AGEP], Integrative Graduate Education and Research [IGERT], NSF Research Traineeship program [NRT]), department and institutional transformation (e.g., ADVANCE) and through working with disciplinary associations and groups (Association for Women in Science [AWIS], American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS], and the National Academies). Such comparison reinforces the primacy of these four quadrants as foci of change efforts.

At the same time, the context for thinking about community-engaged scholarship and institutional change has been influenced by greater awareness of demographic shifts and their implications, as an increasing number of graduate students and early career faculty are more racially and ethnically diverse and have developed scholarly identities as engaged scholars pursuing emerging forms of scholarship, in particular interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship, digital scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship *(Post, Ward, Longo, & Saltmarsh, 2016; Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, & Bush, 2011)*.

The context has also been shaped by greater awareness of the implications of the rise of the neoliberal, market-driven, highly privatized university at a time when there is great demand for universities to more effectively address critical social issues, many

of which are impervious to market solutions. Since the central goal of the political economy of neoliberalism is to transfer numerous public functions, assets, and roles to the private sector, neoliberalism "seeks to eliminate any notion of the broader public good, including institutions such as schools and public universities" *(Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011, p. 13)*. "All too often," explains Burawoy *(2005)*, the "market and state have collaborated against humanity in what has commonly come to be known as neoliberalism" *(p. 7)*. "For critics of the neoliberal model… universities became places of civic engagement," with the result that "one answer to the abuses of neoliberalism became the engaged university" *(Jones & Shefner, 2014, p. 11)*.

What this larger context has clarified for us, and for other scholars, is the importance of accounting for power, privilege, and politics as we think about academic homes in which engaged scholars can thrive. At a recent conference on community-engaged scholarship, a senior scholar commented that she continues to advise younger scholars doing community engagement to restrict their activity until after getting tenure. In many ways, this response was representative of the older context, accounting for the systems and structures of academia and trying to best navigate them so that young scholars could survive. A younger scholar at the meeting asked that we, collectively, think about the implications of such an approach and consider that what we are saying is pretenure community-engaged scholars should deny their identity for 6 years. This, it was pointed out, is a form of structural violence, fostering oppression and marginalization, and should not be acceptable. What needs to be infused into the organizational analysis is the context of power, privilege, and politics as they play out in the academy and their implications for democratic values, social justice, and the public good *(see Simpson, 2014)*. This, we believe, is what needs to be accounted for in rethinking an integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement.

With this in mind, we return to our *JHEOE* article. Reflecting on our work over the last 8 years since the article was published, we would suggest a revision to the model, shifting from an emphasis on creating better "homes" for engaged scholars to creating stronger "networks." Homes perhaps allowed for reinforcing the metaphor that homes, although places where power, politics, and privilege certainly exist, are not made explicitly for the sake of harmony (or collegiality). Thinking about networks offers a different metaphor, one in which power, privilege, politics, and their interactions can

be made more visible. Thinking of networks allows us to look at the model through different lenses.

We initially were attracted to the language of "homes" because this image brings to mind a place where people are nurtured and grow, that they identify with, are loyal to, and have as a foundation for their subsequent work and engagement in the world. However, as we have both interacted with engaged scholars—some doing very well within existing reward systems, some struggling—we have come to understand the need for stronger networks among engaged scholars and prefer the language of networks.

Networks are a significant source of social capital and power *(Niehaus & O'Meara, 2014)*. Often invisible to those outside them *(O'Reilly, 1991)*, networks are critically important to social change efforts in higher education *(Kezar, 2014)*. They help transfer knowledge and information, provide resources, influence, and allies, and can enhance individual and group sense of agency in achieving certain goals *(Kezar, 2014; Niehaus & O'Meara, 2014; O'Reilly, 1991)*.

For this reason, we think one way of assessing the strength of the community engagement movement is to assess the strength of national and international networks of engaged scholars within the four quadrants, as well as across overlapping goals with other movements—such as the diversity and inclusion movement, the movement to improve student learning, and movements to make college more accessible and affordable *(Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, & Bush, 2011)*.

In reflecting on how community engagement has and has not been adopted and institutionalized on college and university campuses since we developed this model, we also believe we have underemphasized the role of power and politics in the support of community engagement *(O'Meara, 2011a, 2011b; O'Meara, Lounder, & Hodges, 2013)*. For example, we discussed in several places in the article a need for a fundamental shift away from recognition of only traditional scholarship and toward recognition of engaged scholarship. In many institutions, there was significant reform of reward systems to support newer forms of scholarship such as engagement *(O'Meara, 2011 a, 2011b; O'Meara, Eatman, & Peterson, 2015; Saltmarsh et al., 2009)*. However, the fact that this happened does not mean that traditional scholarship does not also still have powerful advocates, interest groups, and funding sources that maintain its primacy in the reward system. Nor do we advocate that traditional scholarship be disenfranchised within reward systems. In many

ways, the story of community engagement has been similar to one of communities with many subgroups of neighbors. Community engagement faculty often form an enclave within an institution, but there are other enclaves as well, and institutional transformation requires making allies across subgroups and interests and finding ways to make compromises that do not assume a zero-sum game between more traditional and engaged scholarship and scholars. A natural pair of allies are faculty working to increase support for diverse faculty (e.g., by gender, race, sexual orientation) and diverse forms of scholarship *(O'Meara, 2015; Sturm et al., 2011)*. However, sometimes these groups do not see common ground or are not in conversation with each other—a missed opportunity to create important alliances.

Such alliances are important within the quadrants we mentioned—of institutions, disciplinary associations, graduate education, and faculty reward system reform—because faculty involved in community engagement, interdisciplinary, and public scholarship still face a number of cumulative disadvantages in their careers *(O'Meara, 2011a; 2011b; 2014, 2015)*. Engaged scholars operate within higher education systems where other forms of faculty work are privileged, and their work is inherently considered of less value or merit. Such "inequality regimes" have real consequences for engaged scholars in terms of career advancement, having a place in positions of power and decision-making in institutions, and access to resources that can support higher education missions of social justice and the public good *(O'Meara, 2014, 2015, in press)*.

If we were to write this article again, we would encourage engaged scholars and those within the movement to pay special attention to the development of strategic networks, alliances, and community organizing to advance this work. We would encourage them to approach their work as political work aimed at dismantling privilege and exposing the power exerted by hegemonic epistemic paradigms and the inequalities that are created. Attending to power and privilege constructs an understanding of knowledge generation and of teaching and learning that is inherently political—with consequences for equity and justice in a democracy. Attending to power, privilege, and politics is critical in rethinking an integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement.

References

Burawoy, M. *(2005)*. 2004 American Sociological Association presidential address: For public sociology. *American Sociological Review, 70*(1), 4-28.

Jones, E. J., & Shefner, J. (2014). Introduction: Globalization and the university—a path to social justice. In J. Shefner, H. F. Dahms, R. E. Jones, & A. Jalata (Eds.), *Social justice and the university: Globalization, human rights and the future of democracy* (pp. 11-17). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kezar, A. (2014). Higher education change and social networks: A review of research. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(1), 91-125.

Niehaus, E., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Invisible but essential: The role of professional networks in promoting faculty agency in career advancement. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(2), 1-13.

O'Meara, K. (2011a). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 26, pp. 161-220). New York, NY: Springer.

O'Meara, K. (2011b). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177-198). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

O'Meara, K. (2014). Dismantling inequality regarding scholarship. In H. V. Boyte (Ed.), *Democracy's education* (pp. 126-130). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

O'Meara, K. (2015, April 10). *Equity-minded reform in academic reward systems: Supporting diverse faculty and diverse forms of scholarship*. Keynote address at workshop presented under the auspices of UC Davis ADVANCE, University of California, Davis.

O'Meara, K. (in press). Legitimacy, agency, and inequality: Organizational practices for full participation of community-engaged faculty. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

O'Meara, K., Eatman, T., & Peterson, S. (2015). Advancing engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure: A roadmap and call for reform. *Liberal Education, 101*(3). Retrieved at https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2015/summer/o%27meara

O'Meara, K., Lounder, A., & Hodges, A. (2013). University leaders' use of episodic power to support faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(2), 5-20.

O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1991). Organizational behavior: Where we've been, where we're going. *Annual Review of Psychology, 42*, 427-458.

Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N., & Saltmarsh, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Rhoads, R. A., & Szelényi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged

campuses. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (Advances in Service-Learning Research; pp. 3-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Simpson, J. S. (2014). *Longing for justice: Higher education and democracy's agenda*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). *Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education* (White paper). New York, NY: Columbia University Law School, Center for Institutional and Social Change.

About the Authors

KerryAnn O'Meara is professor of higher education, affiliate faculty in Women's Studies, and director of the University of Maryland ADVANCE Program. KerryAnn's research examines organizational practices that support or limit the full participation of diverse faculty and the legitimacy of diverse scholarship in the academy. Dr. O'Meara is P.I. of the new NSF funded Faculty Workload and Rewards Project. She can be reached at komeara@umd.edu.

John Saltmarsh is the director of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts Boston as well as a faculty member in the Higher Education Doctoral Program in the Department of Leadership in Education in the College of Education and Human Development. He is the author, most recently, of the coedited *Publicly Engaged Scholars: Next Generation Engagement and the Future of Higher Education (2016)*. He can be reached at john.saltmarsh@umb.edu.