

The Emergence of Engaged Scholarship: Seven Additional Years of Evolution

Dwight E. Giles, Jr.

It is a rare and wonderful opportunity for an author to be invited to revisit, respond to, reframe, or recant ideas expressed in an earlier article. The editors of this issue have done just that. First, the recant. I originally argued that engaged public scholarship (as I called it in the title) should draw from the lessons learned from the emergence of service-learning, both through adopting a unified term for the field and by using research agendas to advance its definition and boundaries. Service-learning has achieved use of a single consistent term (although now often subsumed under community engagement), but legitimate questions remain as to the actual limits of research agendas in advancing the scholarly knowledge of the field (see *Giles & Eyles, 2013*). What should continue to emerge instead is what Sandmann (2008) called “scholarship on the scholarship of engagement” (p. 99) as a way to further coalesce our understanding of the boundaries and contours of this movement or field.

One element that has changed since 2008 is the national context to which the work has had to respond. At the time of that writing, the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification was just beginning, and the 2008 engaged campuses had not been selected. Indeed, the argument could be made that the voluntary classification has acted as an external lever for change on campuses as originally intended (see *Driscoll, 2008* for intentions for the classification.) Thus, *community engagement* is now the common term for the overall work, and I believe the evidence suggests that *community-engaged scholarship* is emerging as the major term in regard to the scholarship dimension of the movement. This is not an uncontested term, however; for example, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argued for shifting the term from community engagement to *civic engagement* to reflect the political and policy nature of engagement in addition to the community-based work, which is often service. The use of this term is under the broader umbrella of democratic engagement in the traditions of Dewey’s concept of democracy and education (*Saltmarsh, Janke, & Clayton, 2015*).

An additional effect of the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement has been a redefining of the nature of

scholarship itself. Specifically, as engagement has emphasized mutuality or reciprocity, scholarship has become more relational (J. Saltmarsh, personal communication, January 8, 2016). In the original article, I (and others) noted the enduring debate on defining scholarship, especially with the rise and stimulus of scholarship of engagement as conceptualized by Boyer (1996). This has engendered a shift in how faculty roles and rewards are operationalized and has challenged the traditional model of scholarship strictly as empirical research. It would take another study to ascertain the extent of resultant change in promotion and tenure guidelines, but there is evidence of the emergence of scholarship linking teaching, service, and a broad range of scholarly studies. For example, the Ernest Lynton Award given by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) has seen a dramatic increase in the quantity and quality of faculty nominated for their engaged scholarship. Indeed, a similar argument could be made by analyzing the 20 years of content of this journal, which published Boyer's call for the scholarship of engagement in its first issue in 1996.

Early analysis of the 2008 Carnegie classification data indicated that the classification was prompting an increase in engaged faculty scholarship (Saltmarsh et al., 2009). That said, entrenched interests of disciplines, academic departments, and traditional epistemology militate against the full emergence of community-engaged scholarship. In the original article, I noted that this debate goes back over 100 years. Even though it is not over, it seems as if we have advanced in our understanding and have achieved more widespread applications of community-engaged scholarship, as I now prefer to call it for the reasons noted above.

I have one additional reaction to points made in the original Volume 12 and in my article. In that article, I valued Sandmann's empirical analysis of the emergence of the terms and "the national scholarship of engagement movement" (Sandmann, 2008, p. 91) over the decade from 1996 to 2006. My call here would be for similar scholarship to be undertaken covering the last 10 years, 2006-2016.

My final revisit is the overarching question that was the focus of my original article, whether we can move toward reducing the "definitional anarchy" that Sandmann identified, whether we can move under a "big tent," if not one umbrella term. My hypothesis now is that the "definitional anarchy" has dissipated quite a bit, and we have much more convergence under the big tent of community engagement with two umbrella terms emerging (and perhaps competing): *community-engaged scholarship* and *civically engaged scholarship* (Saltmarsh et al., 2015).

A final response is to note what a milestone this issue of *JHEOE* is, not only because this journal has chronicled and supported this movement, but also because of the larger forces that have moved higher education to a more responsive engaged human enterprise. As someone who has been part of the service-learning movement for over three decades and a witness to how its pedagogical innovation has stimulated the larger community engagement movement, I find this very exciting and the kind of change that many of us have envisioned for the academy.

References

- Boyer, E. L. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), 38-41.
- Giles, D. E., Jr., & Eyler, J. S. (2013). Review essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. 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.
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press
- Saltmarsh, J., Janke, E. M., & Clayton, P. H. (2015). Transforming higher education through and for democratic civic engagement: A model for change. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 22(1), 122-128.
- Sandmann, L. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 91-104.

About the Author

Dwight E. Giles Jr. is a professor of higher education and a senior associate at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts, Boston. He has coauthored books and articles on service-learning research and community engagement, including *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* (with Janet Eyler; Jossey-Bass, 1999). He can be reached at dwight.giles@umb.edu.

