© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 10, Number 1, p. 29, (2004)

Actualizing a Culture of Engaged Scholarship in the College of Education at the University of Florida

Nancy Fichtman Dana and Catherine Emihovich

Abstract

A dean and a faculty member describe three strategies they have incorporated to initiate the building of an engaged scholarship culture: (1) communicating a scholarship of engagement vision; (2) creating new traditions, rituals, and symbols to support and reinforce the vision; and (3) creating new roles and responsibilities to help faculty redefine their individual work as engaged scholarship. Implications for transferring engaged scholarship from theory to practice are discussed.

Introduction

The last decade has been marked by consistent and urgent calls for institutions of higher education to redefine their campus missions and rebuild academic environments for students and faculty by incorporating the notion of engaged scholarship *(Boyer 1995; Glassick 1997; Kellogg Commission 1999; Schon 1995)*. The phrase "scholarship of engagement," coined by Ernest Boyer, is the term being used to redefine the work of the university. Traditionally, scholarship has referred to the generation of original research by faculty at institutions of higher education. When the work of higher education is reconstituted as promoting engaged scholarship, this traditional notion of scholarship is broadened to include not just the generation of new knowledge, but the search for connections between theory and practice *(Boyer 1996)*. Knowledge and expertise flow not just from university to community, but from town to gown as well. The term engagement emphasizes the reciprocity of university-community relationships. "Together, the participants address issues of mutual interest, together they determine questions to be asked, the methodologies to be employed, and the means by which findings will be disseminated" *(Finkelstein 2001, 7)*.

While the term "scholarship of engagement" resonates in campus talk across the country and is the subject of numerous articles and presentations in the field of higher education, many

institutions continue to question, ponder, and struggle with the enormous task of actualizing engaged scholarship within long-standing institutional cultures that are antithetical to the premises underpinning it. Schon noted that higher education cultures are historically steeped in a particular epistemology termed "technical rationality." Technical rationality is a conception of professional knowledge where "practice is instrumental, consisting in adjusting technical means to ends that are clear, fixed, and internally consistent, and that instrumental practice becomes professional when it is based on the science or systematic knowledge produced by the schools of higher learning" *(Schon 1995, 3)*.

Traditional notions of the university mission steeped in an epistemology of technical rationality have led to university cultures that make clear distinctions between research, teaching, and service missions, and whose reward structures favor research above all else. For example, consider the following statement from the ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report titled *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*:

> In 1983, Austin and Gamson conducted a comprehensive review of the current state of the academic workplace. They identified the tensions that existed between teaching and research and identified service as an "afterthought" as reflected in the literature. The service function of faculty has been referred to as the "short leg of the three-legged stool" *(cited in Boyer and Lewis, 1985)*. . . . Faculty members attempting to integrate engagement into their workload face a dilemma, caught between administrative and public calls for engagement and academic reward structures that tend to devalue outreach and engagement efforts. *(Ward 2002, 29)*

Solving this dilemma will require institutions of higher education to pay close attention to the workplace culture and to rework existing cultures to support engaged scholarship.

As a dean and a faculty member joining the University of Florida in 2002 and 2003 respectively, we brought with us to our new institution a commitment to building such a culture. We understood that administration and faculty working in concert was a critical element:

> Faculty and administrators have to work in concert to support engagement. While individual faculty may

> adopt a scholarship of engagement without campus support (indeed many do), large-scale change requires simultaneous effort from the bottom up (faculty and students working for engagement) and the top down (administrators and board supporting engagement) *(Checkoway 2002)*. These groups need to work together to determine how to use engagement to meet institutional mission, while remembering the best way to encourage faculty involvement is with the carrot, not the stick. *(Ward 2002, 137)*

We also understood the scope of the task. Barth states: "One cannot, of course, change a school culture alone. But one can provide forms of leadership that invite others to join as observers of the old and architects of the new" *(2002, 6)*.

The purpose of this article is to share our narrative experience of inviting others at our institution to join as observers of the old college culture steeped in technical rationality and the separation of teaching, research, and service, and join with us as architects of a new college culture of engaged scholarship. We do not claim to have created a fully actualized engaged scholarship culture, and we understand we have many hurdles, issues, and complexities facing our future work as we continue promoting engaged scholarship at University of Florida. Yet, we share our "beginning effort" stories to build this culture through our description of three strategies we have incorporated to initiate the building of an engaged scholarship culture: (1) communicating a scholarship of engagement vision; (2) creating new traditions, rituals, and symbols to support and reinforce the vision; and (3) creating new roles and responsibilities to help faculty redefine their individual work as engaged scholarship. By sharing our account, we wish to invite critical dialogue about the specifics of transferring engaged scholarship from theory to practice.

We divide the core of this article into three sections, each articulating one strategy we have utilized to actualize an engaged scholarship culture. The first two strategies are in Catherine's voice, representing administration as the dean of the College of Education. The third strategy is in Nancy's voice, representing a faculty member perspective. We conclude by noting some of the concomitant organizational changes necessary to support a culture of engaged scholarship, and by raising additional questions we continue to face as we emphasize leadership for engaged scholarship.

Strategy One: Communicating a Scholarship of Engagement Vision

When I arrived on campus at the University of Florida as the new dean of the College of Education, as an anthropologist by training, I realized the necessity of learning and understanding the existing culture of my new college. I treated my first year as a grand ethnography, becoming familiar with the people, norms, values, and contextual features of the college. I recall vividly the acronym taught by a wise anthropology professor, Fred Gearing, back when I was in graduate school, where he asked us to focus on every scene in terms of determining the connections among activities, persons, and the environment (SCAPE). Every anthropologist entering a new culture is deeply mindful of the importance of constructing a cultural map that will guide future actions, and establishing rapport with key informants.

At the same time, the college was looking to me as the new dean for vision and direction. I entered a college of education that was founded in 1906 as Florida's first teaching school. The modern college ranks fourteenth among public education schools of the elite AAU institutions, and is the highest-ranked college of any discipline at UF and in Florida. Five graduate education programs claim top-twenty spots in their respective specialties in the *U.S. News & World Report (2005)* rankings. UF enrolls 1,700 education students in more than forty bachelor's and advanced degree programs offered within five academic departments: counselor education; educational leadership and policy; educational psychology; special education; and teaching and learning. Education faculty have pioneered landmark initiatives such as: (1) the community college system, (2) the middle-school movement, (3) school desegregation, (4) Florida's first laboratory school, and (5) school counseling programs. When I arrived, college faculty were exploring ways to adapt cutting-edge technologies to increase student learning and were addressing the needs of high-poverty schools through novel UF-community partnerships. It was an opportune moment to chart the direction for the college and introduce a vision of

"UF enrolls 1,700 education students in more than forty bachelor's and advanced degree programs offered within five academic departments…"

engaged scholarship. In his book *Leading in a Culture of Change*, Fullan notes that a well-articulated vision can "attract the deep energies and commitment of organization members to make desirable things happen" *(2001, 115)*.

In order to seize the moment and capitalize on my "honeymoon" period as dean, I laid out an engaged scholarship vision for the college in both spoken and written words. At every opportunity I had to speak at public engagements (and there were many for a new dean), I carefully crafted my remarks to include reference to Boyer's notions. A prime example was the opening convocation for the college that I organized only a month after I arrived. I invited all my colleague deans, the provost, and the president, along with faculty, staff, students, and key community constituents, to a luncheon where I outlined the core concepts framing the scholarship of engagement for a college of education. More specifically, I also commented that as an anthropologist, I drew a clear distinction between schooling (which referred to formal education primarily in a preK-12 setting) and education, which is the learning that takes place from birth to death in a variety of settings. As a result, I declared that I viewed not just preK-12 schools as our main venue for teaching, research, and service, but the entire university and community landscape as well. Although I could not see his face, friends told me later that the president appeared startled to hear an education dean make such a bold claim. On the other hand, many faculty and students were delighted to hear this perspective, and felt that their status as being isolated and "out of touch" from the main campus (our building is across a busy street and a tunnel connects both sides) was about to change for the better. One faculty member proudly remarked, "We are not just on the other side of the street; we are the light at the end of the tunnel."

While the spoken word can be charismatic, I also recognized the strategic need for some written documentation of an engaged scholarship vision. The talk I gave at the convocation appeared in an article in our alumni magazine, *EducationTimes*, titled "Imagining Education." In this article, I described five core concepts critical to an engaged scholarship culture:

> Public research institutions have an historic commitment not just to create knowledge, but to actively engage in efforts to disseminate knowledge in mutually beneficial partnerships. There are five core concepts that will frame our work in the coming years:

> **Connections** with programs and units both within and outside the College that share a related concern with the needs of children and families in all sectors,
>
> **Collaboration and collaborative** partnerships that are reciprocal in nature,
>
> **Communication** about the results of our work and providing the documentation for cases where we have made a difference,
>
> **Culture** and the recognition and acknowledgement of those cultural differences that constitute the democratic core of this nation,
>
> **Community** which entails establishing new connections, forming collaborative partnerships, communicating more effectively the results of our work, and embracing cultural differences in meaningful ways. *(Emihovich 2003, 5–6)*

Communicating an engaged scholarship vision was the first step. My efforts to introduce this vision through spoken and written work spurred dialogue among faculty. Conversations arose throughout my college questioning the exact meaning of engaged scholarship and what it would mean for the future of our college. It was time to begin capitalizing on those conversations by introducing actions to support my words.

Strategy Two: Creating New Traditions, Rituals, and Symbols to Support and Reinforce the Vision

Groups use rituals to create and preserve collective identities *(Hermanowicz and Morgan 1999)*. In order to help build a collective identity for the College of Education at the University of Florida based on engaged scholarship, developing actions to support the words articulated in my public pronouncements meant creating new rituals. While the creation and reexamination of existing rituals is never an easy task, ritual activity is readily apparent in higher education. According to Manning:

> The academic year is book-ended with convocation and commencement. In between is a long line of building dedications, class galas, tree-planting ceremonies, alumni merry making, and founder's commemorations. Clearly, rituals and ceremonies are cultural markers of college campuses. *(2000, 1)*

One way to signify the importance of a new cultural marker is to create a signature event that underscores the key concepts associated with the marker and celebrates the work of those who participate in shaping it. At the end of my first year as dean, I introduced the Scholarship of Engagement dinner. The purposes of this dinner were twofold: (1) to honor all our student scholarship recipients and the donors whose generosity made these scholarships possible (fund-raising is never far from the mind of any dean today) and (2) to recognize the contributions of faculty (including our lab school teachers), students, and school district and community members who either based their research on the scholarship of engagement or who supported it through collaborative partnerships. As with the convocation, we sent out invitations to college and university faculty, staff, students, and community members, and my event coordinator nervously awaited responses to ensure we would have a strong turnout. Much to our surprise and delight, over 140 people came. The dinner included five awards: a university-wide award, a college faculty award, a lab school faculty award, a school district award, and a community award. Each recipient was given a beautiful plaque and was introduced by the person who had nominated him or her. In our second year, even more people attended (175), and we added a student award. The highlight of the 2004 dinner was our student speaker, one of the scholarship recipients, who brought down the house when she described how much the scholarship meant to her for continuing her education after her mother died of cancer. Each year we will continue to refine this ceremony. For example, our new president, who also is strongly committed to community outreach, attended and spoke at the 2005 dinner.

The importance of holding ceremonies like this cannot be overstated. Young defines rituals as follows:

> Rituals are behavioral patterns that are repeatable, have purpose, and have acquired a sense of rightness among the people who participate in them. Rituals reflect basic human needs and desires. They all convey values, and most of them affect behavior, for better or for worse. Reexamining and redesigning our rituals will help us improve our institutions, especially those that intend to be learning communities. A ritual is a learning activity that is grounded in the spirit of community. It helps individuals connect their life experiences, questions, and answers to those of other people. *(1999, 11)*

By creating a shared public event that highlighted the multifaceted nature of scholarship, the dinner helped faculty, graduate students, administrators, community members, and alumni connect life experiences, and continued a community dialogue about the meaning of engaged scholarship. It has become an important cultural marker in our college, one that I hope will become one of the defining memories of their university experience for people who participated in it, and for those whose contributions are acknowledged and valued.

From a dean's perspective, key components of building an engaged scholarship culture clearly include communicating a vision of what engaged scholarship can be, and enacting new rituals as cultural markers of that vision. Another key component is recruiting new faculty members who are committed to an engaged scholarship vision and enlisting their support to further building a culture of engagement. During my first year as dean, I strategically hired Nancy to do just that, and she began her efforts by helping faculty redefine their individual work as engaged scholarship.

Strategy Three: Creating New Roles and Responsibilities to Help Faculty Redefine Their Individual Work as Engaged Scholarship

I had spent the first decade of my career in higher education living engaged scholarship as I worked to form meaningful partnerships with schools. In order to survive and thrive in higher education, my own work and my passion for school-university partnership work and teacher inquiry naturally wove my teaching, research, and service together in intricate ways *(Dana and Yendol-Silva 2003)*. When Catherine extended an invitation to join the faculty at University of Florida, her passion for engaged scholarship and her vision for my role presented an opportunity and challenge too enticing to resist. My role was to revitalize a center that had existed within the college for years, the Center for School Improvement. One of the core components of revitalizing that center was to focus on school-university partnerships, helping faculty to heighten the visibility of their work, begin new initiatives, and connect new and existing endeavors to the engaged scholarship vision. An overarching challenge of this new position included creating the conditions that would enable faculty to blur the boundaries between their teaching, research, and service in partnership work, and to find success as engaged scholars.

When I arrived at University of Florida in August of 2003, I began, as Catherine had the previous year, by trying to understand the existing culture of my new workplace. Perhaps the most natural place to see engaged scholarship in action in a college of education is in school-university partnership work. As my own research had focused in this area as well, partnership work is where I began my quest to understand the current state of engaged scholarship at UF.

Catherine and our associate dean provided me with a list of people engaged in partnership work. I spent two months meeting individually with these faculty and with each department head to learn more about their work, and seeking out other faculty not on the original list who were also doing partnership work. I left each meeting inspired by the work that was already under way. Although inspired, I also became perplexed as I came to realize that all of the individual efforts by faculty were not connected to one another or to a larger vision. Most individuals knew little about other similar work that was being done across the college.

"Another key component is recruiting new faculty members who are committed to an engaged scholarship vision and enlisting their support to further building a culture of engagement."

My next step was to bring together these junior and senior faculty who represented four different departments, our Lab School, and two centers, into one room to begin a dialogue with each other. In October, the first partnership meeting took place. Our agenda was shaped by three questions for discussion: (1) Why is it important to connect our work? (2) What do we mean by partnership work? and (3) What are our next steps? To inform each faculty member of the breadth of current partnership work in the college, I had prepared a brief description of each partnership endeavor I had learned about. These were referred to when faculty introduced themselves, as well as during meeting discussion. More than fifteen faculty attended this meeting, and together, through discussion, we made explicit powerful reasons for connecting our work (see table 1).

In dealing with a group of very diverse individuals who had historically engaged in partnership work independently, I hoped to communicate, through this articulation of reasons to connect

Table 1: Meeting Document
Importance of Connecting UF College of Education Partnership Work

1. Developing a Collective Identity. By connecting our work, we can heighten the visibility of partnership work within the College itself, as well as across the University, and the State. With a collective identity, we can foster better communication about the nature and impact of the work we do . . . this, in turn, can lead to generation of additional resources to support the work.
2. Recruiting Doctoral Students. By publicizing and offering graduate students the opportunity to work in schools on problems of practice, we may recruit more and better students to our graduate programs.
3. Strengthening Individual Efforts. With an understanding and information of different partnership work across the college, each individual effort is strengthened. We can come together to define and discuss various dilemmas and tensions of partnership work that emerge in different categories including: knowledge, power, role, research, and publics.
4. Improving the Quality of Research. There is potential to produce more powerful studies by working together. We can serve as critical friends for each other. Together, we can seek and develop external strategies to document and evaluate our partnership efforts.
5. Modeling for Students. Through connecting our efforts, we can begin to help students see relationships between different components of education that they traditionally and historically have viewed as discrete entities. (i.e., Special education and classroom management).
6. Creating Opportunities for Practitioner Voices to be Heard. We can connect practitioners and build capacity for them to talk about and share what they've learned in different partnership work with each other.
7. Building Strength in Numbers. We are creating spaces for a number of people with different experiences, expertises and knowledge bases to work towards solutions to pressing problems of practice. This can lead to the garnering of political power.
8. Tackling the Problem of Partnership Work Sustainability. We accept that engagement in partnership work is draining, time and labor intensive, and difficult work. We can support each other as we collectively contemplate how to sustain our individual efforts.
9. Helping the College Understand Scholarship of Engagement. Together we can work to develop common language and shared understandings of the engaged scholarship that happens in partnership work.
10. Harnessing and Sharing the Knowledge We've Constructed About How To Work with Schools. We can coach others about how to work with schools.
11. Helping Us Integrate the Many Layers of Our Work. Through connecting our work we may see ideas and seek support for connecting our major responsibilities—teaching, research, and service.

our work, that we had more in common than in conflict. According to Kouzes and Posner, developing a shared sense of destiny is a critical component of any leadership effort. To achieve this, leaders must "enroll others so that they can see how their own interests and aspirations are aligned with the vision and can thereby become mobilized to commit their individual energies to its realization" *(Kouzes and Posner 2002, 143)*. This collaboratively created list of reasons for connecting our work served to mobilize participants' commitment as Kouzes and Posner describe.

We decided our next step was to work toward the development of a collective identity. A smaller group volunteered to develop categories or themes for the partnership work currently in place at UF. This group met in November and developed five categories to share with the larger group.

The December meeting of the whole partnership group was quite lively, as the categories that were constructed by the smaller group were broken down and rebuilt once again into five focus areas. Once everyone in the room felt comfortable with the emerging description of partnership work at UF, the meeting ended and I was assigned the task of representing the work of this group in written form. Dialogue about the scholarship of engagement and how partnership work connects to engaged scholarship notions grew naturally from the conversation that took place at the meeting. In the written representation of partnerships at UF, I was asked by faculty in attendance at this meeting to frame the focus areas within engaged scholarship (table 2).

Once this was accomplished, we met as a group to edit the document and discuss next steps. As the academic year was quickly coming to a close, the group decided it was a good time to share our work with department heads and deans. Another faculty member and I asked to be on the agenda for the monthly department head meeting.

In May, we shared our work with this group. It was received with some healthy skepticism and generated a great deal of discussion among department heads and deans. Some trepidation was expressed that the exclusive focus on partnership work left many other faculty members and their work out of the loop. There was agreement that partnership work was just one aspect of engaged scholarship and that use of a process similar to that employed with school-university partnership work was needed to continue a dialogue across the college about the meaning of engaged scholarship and to broaden descriptions of the work to include other components.

There are two significant aspects to the process that was employed to initiate dialogue on the scholarship of engagement and the ways individual faculty work might be recast as engaged scholarship. First, for the first time, a space was created to bring together faculty from different departments and areas of the college to dialogue specifically about the nature of their individual work and how it may connect to a collective identity for the college. Second, it was the faculty who were discussing, debating, expressing opinions, and generating the ways a collective identity of engaged scholarship would be defined at University of Florida. This process mitigated a shift in the way faculty framed the grand engaged scholarship picture at UF, from "What does our new dean mean by engaged scholarship?" to "What do we, the faculty, mean by engaged scholarship?" We believe this is a healthy shift and that it laid the foundation for us to continue building an engaged scholarship vision in our college.

Table 2: UF Partnership Document **Draft * Draft**
UF School – University – Community Partnership
Areas of Focus

A defining feature of the College of Education at the University of Florida is our commitment to the scholarship of engagement. Originating with Ernest Boyer, the term scholarship of engagement has been coined to redefine the work of the university. Traditionally, scholarship has referred to the generation of original research by faculty at institutions of higher education. When the work of higher education is reconstituted as engaged scholarship however, this traditional notion of scholarship is broadened to include not just the generation of new knowledge, but searching for connections between theory and practice *(Boyer, 1995; 1996)*. Knowledge and expertise flow not just from university to community, but from town to gown as well. The term engagement emphasizes the reciprocity of university-community relationships. "Together, the participants address issues of mutual interest, together they determine questions to be asked, the methodologies to be employed, and the means by which findings will be disseminated" *(Finkelstein, 2004, p. 7)*.

One aspect of the scholarship of engagement at the University of Florida is the development of strong school – university – community partnerships. The College of Education at UF currently has in place and continues to develop long term relationships with schools that are characterized by reciprocity – everyone in the partnership learns, everyone benefits, and together, school and university partners negotiate goals for their work. Needs and scholarship emerge collectively and are focused on the reality of school-based problems. Partners develop a shared, mutual respect for different bodies of knowledge – both practical and theoretical. School-University Partnership work at UF is dynamic and brings Boyer's notion of engaged scholarship to life.

Conclusions

While we are just beginning to build an engaged scholarship culture in the College of Education at the University of Florida, we have learned a great deal from the first steps in our journey described in this article: communicating a scholarship of engagement vision; creating new traditions, rituals, and symbols to support and reinforce the vision; and creating new roles and responsibilities to help faculty redefine their individual work as engaged scholarship. But we are deeply aware that these first steps constitute only the beginning, and that no culture can be sustained in the absence of key organizational and disciplinary changes that must accompany the creation of new rituals and traditions. We close this article by

Table 2 (cont.)

UF school-university-community partnerships have five focus areas that interconnect and weave throughout various partnership initiatives:

Focus Area 1: Developing Family, School, & Community Linkages To Foster Learning and Development of Children and Youth

Practitioners and UF faculty and staff partner to create purposeful connections between families, schools and/or community agencies. The structures created to connect these entities work towards both understanding and improving the conditions that are necessary for the growth and development of all children and youth.

Focus Area 2: Supporting High Need/High Poverty Schools

Practitioners and UF faculty and staff partner to collaboratively define, understand, and articulate the unique needs of the high poverty school site, and work together in a collaborative effort to meet those unique needs.

Focus Area 3: Supporting/Developing and Implementing Whole School Reform

Practitioners and UF faculty and staff work together to study the problems, tensions, dilemmas and issues inherent in teaching and learning at a particular school site, and subsequently develop and implement action plans for school improvement and organizational change.

Focus Area 4: Targeting Specific School Needs (i.e., Technology, Behavior Management, Literacy, etc.)

Practitioners and UF faculty and staff work together to implement a specific innovation or best practice into the school site.

Focus Area 5: Creating powerful Contexts for Initial Preparation of Prospective Educators and Continuing Professional Development of Practicing Educators

Practitioners join with UF faculty and staff to collaboratively develop and share best practice in relationship to the professional growth and development of beginning and/or veteran educators.

briefly describing four critical structural components that need to be in place, and our current efforts to establish them in our college and on our campus. These components are: (1) identifying linkages between this new model of engaged scholarship and the strategic plans outlined by the Florida Board of Governors, the University of Florida, and the College of Education; (2) re-allocating and/or leveraging resources across entities (centers, institutes, programs, school districts, etc.) that share similar goals and purposes in accord with the tenets of engaged scholarship; (3) providing incentives for faculty in the form of stipends, small seed grants, and release time to construct their research, teaching, and service agendas around this model; and (4) refocusing tenure and promotion criteria to ensure that faculty will receive appropriate professional recognition and career advancement for engaged scholarship.

"Intensive discussions have also been held among directors of centers and institutes that share common goals to encourage them to seek innovative ways of pooling and leveraging their resources for greater effect."

In terms of the first component, we were fortunate to have a new president selected in January 2004, J. Bernard Machen, who was himself deeply committed to the concepts of service-learning and community outreach. His new administrative appointments, especially his new vice president of student affairs, indicated that these concepts would receive prominent attention in the implementation of the university's strategic plan. The Florida Board of Governors has also sent strong signals that their funding priorities would be closely tied to areas that either addressed critical state needs or were targeted toward solving long-standing, complex community problems. To give one example, universities interested in submitting legislative budget request proposals for the 2005–2006 funding cycle had to document their ability to meet one of four criteria, one of which was explicitly tied to meeting community needs (Strategic Planning Goal/Objective: Meeting Community Needs and Fulfilling Unique Institutional Responsibilities). To ensure that the principles of engaged scholarship would become embedded in the college strategic plan, in the spring of 2005 four strategic task forces were created, with outreach scholarship

identified as one of the key groups. The fortuitous convergence of action at these three levels of academic governance greatly simplified the task of persuading faculty to consider this new model seriously, although the remaining components were equally essential.

The second component involves the reallocation of resources to support faculty and student work in engaged scholarship. When communicating to faculty what activities are valued, nothing sends a clearer message than providing discretionary funds, and in the past two years, several projects that reflect the principles of engaged scholarship have been conspicuous among the budget priorities submitted to the provost's office by the dean. As an example, one priority requested for the 2005–2006 budget cycle was funding to create a community outreach clinic where children and families could receive counseling and mental health services, and where faculty could conduct research on the most effective models for working with high-poverty, diverse communities with multiple social and psychological problems. Intensive discussions have also been held among directors of centers and institutes that share common goals to encourage them to seek innovative ways of pooling and leveraging their resources for greater effect. For example, the Center for School Improvement, which is headed by the first author, often partners with another center at UF, the Lastinger Center for Learning, on projects that are conceptually linked, although the actual activities may be very different. In fact, both centers are collaborating to present a single featured session at the 2005 National Outreach Scholarship Conference in Georgia. This session will highlight work done through each center as well as throughout the entire college that is conceptually linked through outreach scholarship. The new buzzword heard frequently around the college is "synergy," and the positive momentum and energy experienced by faculty and students who collaborate across centers and departments continues to build support for future projects. Collins *(2001)* noted that when people engage in small changes that lead to tangible results, their enthusiasm for continuing and expanding these changes increases exponentially each time. He dubbed this phenomenon the "flywheel effect," and this effect is clearly evident as examples of engaged scholarship multiply across the college.

The third component is providing faculty with incentives that indicate these activities are valued. These incentives can be modest in scope, and include such factors as supporting travel to present papers on engaged scholarship, establishing seed grants for innovative ideas, and supporting course release time for faculty to

work in schools for an extended period of time. As one example of how effective release time can be, one senior faculty member made national news when the low-income, 100 percent African American elementary school in which she had been embedded for four years moved from a grade of "F" to "A" in one year, and then sustained that ranking for the next two years. She had worked intensively with the teachers to help them utilize research-based practices to improve their teaching, and she is currently working on a book (coauthored with the principal) that will describe her experiences in greater detail. These incentives, along with the award program noted earlier, encourage faculty to experiment with new ideas, and provide critical support for helping them develop a program of engaged scholarship that can lead to greater national visibility. Without these kinds of incentives, faculty are less likely to adopt a model of engaged scholarship unless they can see how this work will be supported, and that it can be linked to a scholarly agenda appropriate for promotion and tenure.

The last component, revising the tenure and promotion criteria to incorporate the tenets of engaged scholarship, is the most problematic one to tackle, and it is one that we expect to begin addressing in the next few years. Faculty understand the need for publishing this kind of outreach work; the challenge is cultivating an appreciation of the amount of time required to do it well and the amount of work that can be produced within a given time frame. The time commitment is radically different from that involved in conducting and publishing more traditional kinds of research. The educational research community has never seriously grappled with the concept of "impact" within the practitioner community as a measure of achievement comparable to the sheer volume of output in the form of articles, monographs, and books that few practitioners may ever read. A focus on impact, however, should not presume the absence of new theoretical constructs emerging from engaged scholarship. Peter Levine *(2003)*, a research scholar at the University of Maryland's Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy, noted that engaged scholarship can be at the cutting edge of a discipline's progress while also involving innovative, interesting, and mutually respectful collaboration with communities. He cited Elinor Ostrom's work in political theory centered on the management of "common-pool resources" as an example of scholarship that links academic rigor with civic engagement.

There remains only one obstacle to wide dissemination of this model: the realization of engaged scholarship as an activity acknowledged and valued within the academy. We strongly believe

that the changing demographics of the professoriate are working in our favor. More often than not, young scholars, especially faculty of color, prefer this model over the practices that keep them enshrined in the "ivory tower," and they want to engage directly with the world to help make a difference, or as Boyer put it, to affect the "public good." As universities strive to attract and keep their best talent, they may find that supporting engaged scholarship is one way to ensure that these new scholars remain committed to their discipline while they begin redefining it in exciting new ways.

As part of our continued learning process, we find that new questions constantly emerge about actualizing engaged scholarship on university campuses. These questions include: (1) In what ways might an engagement culture be a tool for fund-raising? (2) How do we honor the individual autonomy of faculty members who practice a different model of scholarship as an engagement culture is built? and (3) How might the tenets of the scholarship of engagement be incorporated into a faculty professional development plan that revitalizes faculty's commitment to their institution and their field?

We will continue to grapple with these and other questions as we realize the possibilities, problems, and pitfalls associated with developing an engaged scholarship culture for our college. Yet all journeys must begin with the first step, and although we face a difficult road ahead, we are glad to have begun. We call for others across the nation to share the stories of their journeys toward engaged scholarship. In the sharing of our stories, institutions can generate new knowledge about actualizing an engaged scholarship culture, and one day, Boyer's vision will become a reality. Engaged scholarship will redefine the way business is done at universities across the nation.

References

Barth, R. S. 2002. The culture builder. *Educational Leadership 59*(8): 6–11.

Bondy, E., with teachers. 2002. Warming up to classroom research in a professional development school. *Contemporary Education 72*: 8–13.

Boyer, E. 1995. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

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

Collins, J. 2001. *Good to great*. New York: HarperCollins Books.

Dana, N. F., and D. Yendol-Silva. 2003. *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.

Emihovich, C. 2003. Imagining education. *Education Times* (University of Florida College of Education), spring/summer, 5–6.

Finkelstein, M. A. 2001. The scholarship of engagement: Enriching university and community. *Metropolitan Universities Journal 12*(2): 7–9.

Fullan, M. 2001. *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glassick, C. E., M. T. Humber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hermanowicz, J. C., and H. P. Morgan. 1999. Ritualizing the routine: Collective identity affirmation. *Sociological Forum 14*(2): 197–214.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kouzes, J. M., and B. Z. Posner. 2002. *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, P. 2003. The engaged university. *Higher education exchange*. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation.

Manning, K. 2000. *Rituals, ceremonies, and cultural meaning in higher education*. Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey.

Schon, D. 1995. The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change 27*: 27–34.

U.S. News and World Report. 2005. America's best graduate schools 2006. Washington, D.C.: *U.S. News and World Report*.

Ward, K. 2002. *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. ASHE-ERIC higher education report, vol. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. See especially "Moving toward engagement: Policy questions and their responses."

Williamson, P., E. Bondy, L. Langley, and D. Mayne. 2005. Meeting the challenge of high-stakes testing and maintaining child-centered pedagogy: The representations of two urban teachers. *Childhood Education 81*(4): 190–95.

Young, R. B. 1999. Reexamining ritual. *About Campus*, September, 10–16.

About the Authors

• Nancy Fichtman Dana is professor of education and director of the Center for School Improvement at the University of Florida. She has published numerous articles in professional journals on teacher inquiry, professional development schools, and school-university collaboration, and is author of *The Reflective Educator's Guide to Classroom Research* from Corwin Press.

• Catherine Emihovich is dean of the College of Education at the University of Florida. She has published three books and numerous articles in refereed journals focused on children's language use in classrooms and community settings; cognition, language, and literacy issues; race, class, and gender equity issues; and teacher education.