



# To Include or Exclude:

**Criteria to look for when looking to code for the  
Scholarship of Engagement**

Price, M.F. & Garcia, S. (2021)

# Table of Contents

<b>COMMUNITY ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP AND ITS RELATION TO THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Terms in this Repository .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>PHASE 1. REVIEW CRITERIA: WHAT WE LOOKED FOR IN THE SCHOLARWORKS SAMPLE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Table 1. Review Criteria .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>PHASE 2. INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Table 2. Phase 2 Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>REFERENCES CITED .....</b>	<b>9</b>



*In the spring of 2021, a pilot was conducted to assess the fidelity of, and degree to which, publications tagged by faculty as civic engagement in Digital Measures met the criteria for community engaged scholarship. A sample of 111 scholarly artifacts were used in this pilot. Records used span 2017-2020. **Based on the criteria used by reviewers, of the 111 artifacts reviewed, only 16 met the criteria for inclusion.***

## **Community Engaged Scholarship and its relation to the Scholarship of Engagement**

---

The Scholarship of Engagement has its roots in the work of Ernest Boyer and national reform efforts to expand what we understand as scholarship and the societal relevance of higher education (Boyer 1996; Blanchard & Furco, 2021). The scholarship of engagement is not the same as service or outreach rather it is integrative. The scope of the scholarship of engagement complements and intersects with the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the scholarship of integration [see figure].

The practices representative of the scholarship of engagement run counter to many institutional and disciplinary norms. The term scholarship of engagement recognizes the importance of scholarly inquiry to advancing theory and methods of community engagement in and across the domains of teaching, research and service. Similarly, the scholarship of engagement can also be produced through efforts to foster, promote and assess individual, project, partnership, unit and institutional change using traditional means.

### **Terms in this Repository**

---

For this repository, we use the term “scholarship on engagement” to refer to products that address topics related to field building and institutionalization of community engagement in higher education, but which use rigorous methods of scholarly inquiry. We reserve “*scholarship as engagement*” (Sandmann, 2008: 97) aka *community engaged scholarship/publicly engaged scholarship* for those products that result from research/creative activities, teaching, and/or service that are undertaken by faculty, staff, graduate students and/or administrators using an *engaged scholarly process*. By engaged scholarly process, we refer to situations in which the scholar/educator/practitioner collaborates with community members, organizations, students and/or scholars from other

fields collaborate through (1) academic-community relationships that embody the characteristics of both rigorous community engagement (i.e., reciprocal partnerships, knowledge exchange, public purposes) **and** (2) scholarship (i.e., demonstrates current knowledge of the field/discipline, invite peer collaboration and review, is open to critique, is presented in a form that others can build on, involves inquiry). (Blanchard & Furco, 2021, Eatman et al. 2018)

There are variants of the term community-engaged scholarship that are more salient in certain fields and disciplines as well as slight variations on how academic roles are positioned in the work:

- *Are they acting as responsive experts providing accurate, unbiased knowledge and skills to address questions of public/community consequence? **[Service Intellectuals, Translational Scholars]***
- *Are they acting as knowledge professionals using their expertise to take stands on issues and advocate for change? **[Public Intellectuals, Policy Advocates/Analysts, Activist Scholars]***
- *Are they tapping into the complementary wisdom and expertise of laypeople and/or other non-academics [practitioners, government representatives, industry, etc.] to solve problems, imagine new possibilities and co-create public goods? **[Public Scholars, Participatory Action Researchers, Civic Scientists, Public Participation in Scientific Research (PPSR), People-Centered Design Researchers, Translational Scholars,]***
- *Are they studying the theories, processes and methods of engagement to help institutions and groups build society's capacity to improve the arts, science and practice of engagement? **[Any of the above, institutional researchers, engaged administrators/staff]***
- *Are they studying the theories, processes and methods of engagement to advance education as a pathway to full participation in society? Are they working to help educate the next generation of civic-minded graduates and professionals? **[Any of the above + Engaged Educators]***

It is important to distinguish how a scholar-practitioner understands themselves, their professional and scholarly identity positions, from the products they produce. As an identity position, individuals can identify and have an affinity for the practices of engagement as scholarship but also produce artifacts that meet the criteria for traditional scholarship. Similarly, they may also conduct activities that are community-engaged but which don't result in scholarly products [aka. Outreach and engagement activities]. The authors also note that individual practitioner-scholars rarely limit their scholarly work to a

single type of scholarship. Similarly, engaged scholars do not tend to integrate outreach and community engagement into their scholarly productivity using a single frame. This is true even for those that have a strong pull toward a particular frame. Engaged work, whether conceptual or applied, is issue/problem focused, emergent from the specific context(s) in which it occurs and directed by the questions and goals under scrutiny (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2016; Stanton et al. 2007; Tufts University & Campus Compact, 2012).

## Phase 1. Review Criteria: What we looked for in the ScholarWorks sample

Products were reviewed using the following criteria. Since the reviewers took a big tent approach to assessing the sample of products beginning with the scholarship of engagement, a product didn't need to include every criterion. The process helped to identify artifacts that responded to the description above.

**Table 1. Review Criteria**

Criterion	Description	Examples
<b>Title</b>	Did the title convey information indicating an engagement focused topic or method was the focus of the piece?	"Avoiding a Tyranny of the Majority: Public Deliberation as Citizen Science, Sensitive Issues, and Vulnerable Populations" (Ott, M. A., & Knopf, A. S. (2019). Avoiding a Tyranny of the Majority: Public Deliberation as Citizen Science, Sensitive Issues, and Vulnerable Populations. <i>The American journal of bioethics: AJOB</i> , 19(8), 28–31. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2019.1619870">https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2019.1619870</a> )
<b>Purpose*</b>	Does the piece address a community issue/problem with the community of interest?	"...this study identified locations within properties and cities that exhibited the highest exposure risk to children, and also exhibited the power of citizen science to produce data at a spatial scale (i.e., within a property boundary), which is usually impossible to feasibly collect in a typical research study." (Filippelli GM, Adamic J, Nichols D, Shukle J, Frix E. Mapping the Urban Lead Exposome: A Detailed Analysis of Soil Metal Concentrations at the Household Scale Using Citizen Science. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> . 2018 Jul 19;15(7):1531. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15071531)
<b>Conceptual grounding*</b>	Builds on prior work and/or breaks new ground; draws on community engagement theories, concepts, models, strategies, etc.	"We Are All Teachers: Modeling Democratic Engagement in Faculty Development" (Studer, M., Benton, M., Rogers, C., & Quirke, M. (2017). We are all teachers: Modeling democratic engagement in faculty development. <i>Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning</i> , 23(2). doi: <a href="https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0023.213">https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0023.213</a> )

<b>Authorship</b>	Were non academics listed as co-authors or only authors? If co-authorship, were they given attribution in the acknowledgements or in the body of the product?	<p>LYNNE MCMAHAN Associate Faculty member and Specialty Certification Coordinator, Prescott College</p> <p>TIFFANY TALBERT Director of Operations, Peace Learning Center</p> <p>(McMahan, L., &amp; Talbert, T. (2020). Creating a Complete Learning Community: A New Chapter for Peace Learning Center and the Tribes Learning Community. <i>ENGAGE! Co-created Knowledge Serving the City</i>, 1(3). doi: <a href="https://doi.org/10.18060/24454">https://doi.org/10.18060/24454</a></p>
<b>Methods</b>	Did the product use a method that involves the community of interest in one or more phases or the work? If the piece was more conceptual, did the product discuss, analyze contribute to theory building related to engagement as method?	<p>"...we developed the study collaboratively after discussing the challenges that Indiana Latinos face. Once the study was developed, the entire team built upon the strengths of the community partner in terms of knowledge about the community and their existing cadre of community contacts for recruitment purposes. Throughout the duration of the study, both the community partner and the academic partners were actively engaged and included in all phases of research. Both the community partner and academic partners conceptualized and wrote this manuscript" (p.87).</p> <p>(Bigatti, S. M., Diaz, V., Conrad, K. K., Ramirez, M., &amp; Weathers, T. D. (2019). A Mixed-Methods, Community-Based Study To Identify Predictors Of Depression In Latino Adolescents By Gender. <i>ENGAGE! Co-Created Knowledge Serving the City</i>, 1(1), 78–97. doi:10.18060/22817.</p>
<b>Advocacy</b>	Did the piece take a stand on a local/global issue and/or advance policy work?	<p><b>“Taking a stand” example:</b></p> <p>“Understanding the value of heritage sites for diverse stakeholders requires both paying attention to the fields of power in which the sites operate and applying methodologies that are open to user-defined paradigms of value“...”</p> <p>Throughout the study, it was evident that people in all of the stakeholder groups care deeply about these sites. Most also expressed an openness to learning about the sites and about other stakeholders’ perspectives. Perhaps the most striking observation we can take away from this study is the contrast between the complex but largely rigid frames of value evident in the survey results and the much more dynamic, generous, and fluid discussions about meaning and value in the focus group conversations. While such conversations are time consuming and can be uncomfortable, <b>the study affirmed the power of dialogue to provoke thoughtful questions, expand understanding, and create empathy”</b></p> <p>(Kryder-Reid, E., Foutz, J. W., Wood, E., &amp; Zimmerman, L. J. (2017). “‘I just don’t ever use that word’: investigating stakeholders’ understanding of heritage.” <i>International Journal of Heritage Studies</i>, 24(7), 743–763. doi:10.1080/13527258.2017.1339110)</p> <p><b>Advance policy work example:</b></p>

“Due to the growing racial, ethnic, religious and Non-binary diversity of student bodies across the nation, consideration and familiarity of non-Eurocentric, non-Christian, and non-binary cultural values and norms are necessary to construct spaces where students feel comfortable existing wholly. This comfort will provide a level of freedom to focus on learning versus being distracted by unnecessarily prescriptive, greatly oppressive, and inherently racist policies which have the propensity to traumatize those most impacted by the language and enforcement of said policies.”

Anderson, J. (2020). Hair Discrimination is Racist. ENGAGE! Co-Created Knowledge Serving the City, 1(3). doi:10.18060/24813

<b>Implications and Actions*</b>	Does the piece include actionable recommendations by the community(ies) of interest?	“To mitigate the potential pitfalls of public deliberation on stigmatizing health issues with marginalized populations, we propose several strategies.” (Ott, M. A., & Knopf, A. S. (2019). Avoiding a Tyranny of the Majority: Public Deliberation as Citizen Science, Sensitive Issues, and Vulnerable Populations. <i>The American journal of bioethics: AJOB</i> , 19(8), 28–31. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2019.1619870">https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2019.1619870</a> )
<b>Readability : Limit jargon and use accessible language</b>	Is the piece clearly written? Does it use accessible language that the communities of interest understand?	Piece published in an outlet that includes governing standards for readability and access by non-academic and/general audiences. “ <i>Readability: Accepted manuscripts will be edited to journal/magazine style. As a community-university journal with a broad, multilingual readership, clear, accessible language is strongly encouraged. Thus, avoid as possible using technical and scientific terms that only academic readers are likely to understand. If you need to use these terms, include definitions.</i> ” ENGAGE. <a href="https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/ENGAGE/about/submissions">https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/ENGAGE/about/submissions</a>

## Phase 2. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

The second phase of analysis was used to determine inclusion/exclusion criteria to be used in the selection of future artifacts. For this sort, we derived three factors (see table 2). Works were marked for exclusion if the product [or work referenced therein] did not:

- a)** addressed one or more of the following: concepts, theories, dimensions, processes, or outcomes of engagement in teaching, research or service
- b)** explicitly addressed, documented, and/or analyzed an explicit community process, issue, or priority, and

**c)** created, described or documented actionable outcomes for the communities of interest resulting from the partnership or collaboration.

Products were marked for inclusion and further analysis if the product:

**a)** addressed one or more of the following: concepts, theories, dimensions, processes or outcomes of engagement in teaching, research or service,

**b)** involved engagement of the community(ies) of interest in phases of production of the work, or addressed, documented, and/or analyzed an explicit community process, issue or priority, and

**c)** created, described or documented actionable outcomes for the communities of interest resulting from the partnership or collaboration.

**Table 2. Phase 2 Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria**

Category	Action	Description
<b>Scholarship of/on engagement</b>	<i>Include if</i>	Scholarly products that address one or more of the following: concepts, theories, dimensions, processes or outcomes of engagement in teaching, research or service
	<i>Exclude if</i>	Scholarly products that do not address one or more of the following: concepts, theories, dimensions, processes or outcomes of engagement in teaching, research or service
<b>Scholarship as engagement [Community-Engaged Scholarship + Outreach Scholarship]</b>	<i>Include if</i>	<p><b>Community Participation:</b> Scholarly product involves engagement of the community(ies) of interest in phases of production of the work.</p> <p><b>and/or</b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The product addresses, documents, and/or analyzes an explicit community process, issue or priority.</p> <p><b>and</b></p> <p><b>Outcome(s):</b> The product creates, describes or documents actionable outcomes for the communities of interest resulting from the partnership or collaboration.</p>
	<i>Exclude if</i>	<p><b>Purpose:</b> The product does not explicitly address, document, and/or analyze an explicit community process, issue or priority.</p> <p><b>and</b></p> <p><b>Outcome(s):</b> The product does not create, describe or document actionable outcomes for the communities of interest resulting from the partnership or collaboration.</p>



The inclusion/exclusion criteria used in this review builds on prior work and helps to locate a range of primary and secondary scholarly artifacts. Looking ahead we expect that additional reviews of artifacts will help us to refine the criteria as well as assist in clarifying the relationship between other emerging forms of scholarship that frequently intersect with the scholarship of engagement such as transdisciplinary and digital scholarship.

## References Cited

- Blanchard, L. & Furco, A. (2021). *Faculty engaged scholarship: Setting standards and building conceptual clarity*. East Lansing, MI: Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.17615/0xj1-c495>
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11–20.
- Eatman, T.K., Ivory, G., Saltmarsh, J., Middleton, M., Wittman, A., & Dolgon, C. (2018). Co-constructing knowledge spheres in the academy: Developing frameworks and tools for advancing publicly engaged scholarship. *Urban Education* 53(4), 532–561. doi.org/10.1177/0042085918762590
- Sandmann, L. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education & Outreach*, 12(1): 91-104.
- Stanton, T (2007). *New times demand new scholarship: Research universities & civic engagement II: Opportunities and challenges*. Los Angeles, CA: The University of California, Los Angeles and California Campus Compact.
- Tufts University & Campus Compact (2012). New times demand new scholarship I: Research universities and civic engagement: a leadership agenda. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement*, 16(4): 236-269