

The Legacy and Future of a Model for Engaged Scholarship: Supporting a Broader Range of Scholarship

Nancy Franz

Little did I know, when my model for holistic engaged scholarship was published by the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* in 2009, that it would become an important tool for furthering the engaged scholarship movement. I created the model through an iterative process of presentations and conversations at several conferences and other venues over several years. I hadn't planned on publishing the model, but several colleagues encouraged me to do so. I have been amazed at the ways it has been used to further research, personal effectiveness, organizational development, and engagement scholarship practice.

Use of the Model

Personal Use

I've personally used the model since 2006 in a variety of ways. The holistic model of engaged scholarship has been woven into my research and teaching presentations, professional development, and technical assistance across the country over the last decade. I've used the model to help articulate the *Journal of Extension's* niche in the Extension scholarship movement (Franz & Stovall, 2012), to assist others with measuring and articulating engaged scholarship and the value of community engagement (Franz, 2011, 2014, 2015), and to share methods to help graduate students conduct meaningful and successful community-based research (Franz, 2013). The elements and use of the model have also informed my blog postings and social media presence.

The deepest use of the model has been with emerging engagement scholars in their orientation to engaged scholarship and the development of their scholarly agendas and practices. I've served as a guest speaker for the last 6 years for the Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop during the Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference. My presentation on tips for constructing a promotion and tenure engaged dossier (Franz, 2011) includes a discussion of the holistic engaged scholarship model to help the scholars think about how to position their work and their scholarly products.

Mentoring relationships have developed from these conversations, and one relationship resulted in the creation of scholarship from deep exploration of our lived experience as engaged scholars (*Thompson & Franz, 2015*).

Most recently, I've used it while serving as an administrator and engaged scholarship champion at Iowa State University. The model has been a helpful tool to guide conversations and organizational change at Iowa State through learning circles in my college, guiding graduate students, institution-wide new faculty orientation, department and school meetings, department chair and director lunch and learn sessions sponsored by the provost's office, team and individual scholarship, and promotion and tenure conversations. I also shared the model as a foundation for discussion and related action as cochair for Iowa State's Faculty Task Force on Engaged Scholarship and Iowa State's Carnegie Engagement Reclassification Committee. These discussions and actions have helped expand what counts as scholarship at the university, especially scholarship as a public good of a land-grant university.

Use by Others

I have been pleasantly surprised to observe how other scholars have used the holistic model of engaged scholarship. They have chosen the model to help frame their own research, to make the case for improved engagement and engaged research, and to support the need for a broader range of acceptable scholarship in academe. In particular, the model has been used to define engagement (*French & Morse, 2015*); to explore institutional support for community engagement, including expanded faculty professional roles (*French et al., 2013; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers Thompson, 2011; Wittkower, Selinger, & Rush, 2013*); to guide inquiry on faculty productivity (*Watkins, 2015*); and to document changes to engagement approaches at land-grant universities (*Scott, 2012*). Scholars in critical race feminism (*Verjee & Butterwick, 2014*), instructional design (*van Tryon, 2013*), and education (*Nedashkivska & Bilash, 2015; Streat, 2012*) have referred to one or more elements of the holistic engaged scholarship model. Some scholars have used the model to describe particular engaged scholarship case studies (*Bain, 2014; DeZolt, 2014*). Several of the emerging scholars over the years have also indicated that this model helped them expand the points in their work while they develop and articulate engaged scholarship and the creation of a wider range of engaged scholarly products. They have also appreciated the model's integration of teaching,

research, and outreach that aligns with their day-to-day work and ambitions.

Surprisingly, the model has not been deconstructed or added to by other scholars through traditional academic peer-reviewed publications. The most thoughtful nonpublished use of the model has been through an integration of the holistic engaged scholarship model with a broader impacts research framework at one large research university. This framework was developed in response to the National Science Foundation's focus on the need for scientists to articulate the broader impacts of their work for society. The same university is also using the engaged scholarship model to intentionally select scientists to work together on research projects so that all three missions and all six leverage points for engaged scholarship from the model are represented. These actions directly resulted from the National Alliance for Broader Impacts integrating the holistic engaged scholarship model and other engaged scholarship tools and presentations into three national conferences for faculty and administrators over the past 3 years.

Hopes for the Model

I hope the holistic model for engaged scholarship will continue to add to scholarly conversations and actions to broaden the definition, use, and acceptance of engagement scholarship research and teaching practice and products. I had expected more people to study, implement, and evaluate a wider variety of engaged scholarly products as a result of the publication and dissemination of the model. However, this hasn't happened. I hope future research, practice, and policy will lead to advances in these areas.

After using the model for almost a decade, I have come to realize that the term *field* in the definition is confusing for some people. I have begun to drop that term and simply state that engaged scholarship is a mutual relationship between academia and the community that leaves a positive legacy for all partners. This simplified definition appears to resonate better than the original definition with a wider variety of people in a wide variety of contexts.

I hope scholars and academics will use the model to plan more intentionally for engaged scholarship products before engagement begins. I often create a table of potential products with academic and community partners upfront and update the table as the project progresses (see *Franz, 2011, p. 23*). A purposeful and coordinated plan for developing and disseminating engagement scholarship products tends to increase quantity and quality.

Summary

The holistic model for engaged scholarship published in the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* in 2009 has helped shape the way scholars and administrators think about and practice engaged scholarship and judgments about that scholarship. The model has been used by individuals, teams, and organizations to enhance engaged teaching and research. However, there are more opportunities to use the model to contribute to development of further frameworks for engaged scholarship in a variety of disciplines and projects. I welcome deconstruction of and additions to the model for more effective support that will enable engaged scholarship to better meet the needs of communities and the academics and students who partner with them.

References

- Bain, M. (2014). *Community–university engagement: Case study of a partnership on Coast Salish territory in British Columbia* (Master's thesis). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.ubc.ca/>
- DeZolt, D. (2014). How do faculty in for-profit institutions serve the public good? In G. G. Shaker (Ed.), *Faculty work and the public good: Philanthropy, engagement, and academic professionalism* (pp. 169–181). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Franz, N. (2011). Tips for constructing a promotion and tenure dossier that documents engaged scholarship endeavors. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(3), 15–29.
- Franz, N. (2013). Preventing graduate student heroic suicide in community-based research: A tale of two committees. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, 3, 111–127.
- Franz, N. (2014). Measuring and articulating the value of community engagement: Lessons learned from 100 years of Cooperative Extension work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(2), 5–15.
- Franz, N. (2015). Programming for the public good: Ensuring public value through the Cooperative Extension program development model. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, 3(2), 13–25.
- Franz, N., & Stovall, C. (2012). *JOE's niche in the Extension scholarship movement*. *Journal of Extension*, 50(5). Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2012october/comm2.php>
- French, C., & Morse, G. (2015). Extension stakeholder engagement: An exploration of two cases exemplifying 21st century adaptations. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, 3(2), 108–131.
- French, C., Williams, J., Tang, J., Abrams, E., Townson, L., Sabin, M., ... & Wake, C. (2013). The University of New Hampshire Engaged Scholars Academy: Instilling in faculty principles of effective partnership. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, 3, 19–42.

- Nedashkivska, A., & Bilash, O. (2015). Ukrainian language education network: A case of engaged scholarship. *Engaged Scholar Journal*, 1(1), 107–131.
- Nicotera, N., Cutforth, N., Fretz, E., & Summers Thompson, S. (2011). Dedication to community engagement: A higher education conundrum? *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 4(1), 37–49.
- Scott, L. (2012). *Engaged-learning: Community engagement classifications at U.S. land-grant institutions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ERIC Institute of Education Sciences. (ED533609)
- Strean, W. (2012). Exhilarated learning and the scholarship of engagement: From here (the university) to the horizon (the community). *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 5, 179–183 [Article 31].
- Thompson, N., & Franz, N. (2015). *Decision points in academic leadership development as an engaged scholar: To lead or not to lead*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- van Tryon, S. (2013). The instructional designers' role in forming university–community partnerships in digital literacy. *Tech Trends*, 57(1), 52–58.
- Verjee, B., & Butterwick, S. (2014). Conversations from within: Critical race feminism and the roots/routes of change. In S. V. Iverson & J. H. James (Eds.), *Feminist community engagement: Achieving praxis* (pp. 31–52). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Watkins, M. (2015). *Engaged scholarship activities among tenure-track and tenured faculty members* (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University. Retrieved from <http://www.scholarworks.waldenu.edu>
- Wittkower, D., Selinger, E., & Rush, L. (2013). Public philosophy of technology. *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology*, 17(2), 179–200.

About the Author

Nancy Franz, an emeritus professor in the School of Education at Iowa State University, consults on organizational development and evaluation. Her research interests include measuring and articulating the value of community–university engagement and conditions that promote transformative learning in non-formal educational environments. Her Ph.D. is in Extension and adult education from Cornell University. Her e-mail address is nfranz@iastate.edu.

