Creating Engaged Universities: What the Discipline of Rhetoric Teaches Us

Richard A. Cherwitz
The University of Texas at Austin

E. Johanna Hartelius
The University of Pittsburgh

The movement to create engaged public research universities (Boyer, 1990, 1996; Cherwitz, 2005b; Gibbons, 2001; Kellogg Commission, 2001), while laudable for its enthusiasm and passion, seems rooted in ideals and principles with which few would disagree. For example, who would refute the notion that public universities ought to serve the public good? The primary question posed is: What rhetorical strategies are required to mainstream engagement within the academic routines of public research universities? It is our belief that, if such strategies can be devised (i.e., if the rhetorical portion of implementation is sound), then logistical challenges will be far less onerous. Rather than starting and becoming preoccupied with practical ways to solve those problems preventing engagement, administrations should work with and empower faculty to rethink the concept of scholarship and define its many natural venues. As argued here, by devising a thoughtful rhetoric (one with intellectual substance and the requisite academic ethos), public research institutions will inevitably and more effectively serve the public good, thus becoming great sites of engaged learning in the twenty-first century.

The movement to create engaged public research universities (Boyer, 1990, 1996; Cherwitz, 2005b; Gibbons, 2001; Kellogg Commission, 2001), while laudable for its enthusiasm and passion, seems rooted in ideals and principles with which few would disagree. For example, who would refute the notion that public universities ought to serve the public good? Or educate and support rigorous scholars and ethical citizens? And who would argue with the fact that public universities, because they are "public," have a mandate—unlike their private counterparts—to become engaged with society and their communities? While these calls for change are encouraging, inevitably one must wonder how such visionary, inspiring and obvious-sounding principles can be realized. Implementation is the tricky part.

Why hasn't engagement been implemented fully within public research institutions? Perhaps part of the explanation is that, when contemplating "implementation," our initial instinct is to become preoccupied with logistical issues. Among the first questions often asked are: What specific mechanisms and structures should be put into place to achieve engagement? What infrastructure is needed to support these initiatives and from whence will the budget come to underwrite them? How will engagement be incorporated into campus planning? What incentives and rewards should be provided to insure that departments, colleges and their faculty comply with the university charge to be engaged? How will these efforts be measured and evaluated? To be sure, these are vitally important issues. Yet they miss the real challenge: Ascertaining how to implement an idea as complex as engagement, precisely because it is not a

mainstream tradition within the academy, cannot begin with logistics. A logically necessary prior step, we argue, is to develop a rhetorical strategy—a way of thinking and talking about engagement—that creates within the academic culture an acceptance of engagement. This, in turn, enables the logistical dimensions of implementation to be effectively addressed. Without a notion of engagement as essential to the academic enterprise, trying to figure out the logistics of implementation inevitably will prove futile. This, we surmise, is the current and admittedly frustrating state of affairs on most campuses.

Readers should not be surprised, therefore, to learn that this essay offers little in the way of logistical insights into achieving the engaged public research university. We do not make recommendations about budgets and programs; nor do we offer advice about infrastructure, compliance and assessment. Instead, our objective is to analyze the "rhetorical" side of implementation, recommending that public research universities alter their discourses for talking about engagement. The primary question posed is: What rhetorical strategies are required to mainstream engagement within the academic routines of public research universities? It is our belief that, if such strategies can be devised (i.e., if the rhetorical portion of implementation is sound), then logistical challenges will be far less onerous. After all, a major reason why engagement has not been implemented completely is that universities are stymied by logistical questions. We erroneously have assumed that these considerations will solve larger attitudinal problems within the academy.

Logistical solutions rarely have the capacity to change philosophies or worldviews. Equipped with a rhetoric that mainstreams engagement, however, logistical issues would be just that—matters of nuts and bolts rather than efforts in and of themselves to remove the longstanding cultural obstacles preventing engagement.

In a similar vein, we refrain from the temptation to propose a template for creating yet another "program" or "initiative" for engagement. Such separate entities popping up like administrative mushrooms around campus ultimately are counterproductive (Cherwitz, 2005a), contributing to the problems of fragmentation and decentralization universities currently face. Instead, we explore the rhetoric and mindset of engagement. In our view, the engaged university will be a product of reconstituted thinking; this, in turn, will transpire when the language through which we understand the role of the academic is changed. To be a scholar is to "follow the knowledge" and be motivated by questions—to be what later in this article we call "intellectual entrepreneurs," faculty who create and are accountable for their scholarly products (Cherwitz and Sullivan, 2002; Hildebrand, 2005). This process of "following the knowledge" requires risk taking and ownership, and leads to a multitude of products adapted for a variety of venues and audiences. When faculty members' quest to follow the knowledge is viewed as an entrepreneurial pursuit, it is our contention that distinctions among academe's three pillars – research, teaching, service – appear less rigid. This enables universities to become more fully engaged.

To make this case, two arguments are advanced. First, we contend that a scholarly and technical understanding of "rhetoric," one of the most venerable academic disciplines, informs our ability to devise and implement an effective philosophy of university engagement. We claim that current efforts to create an interdisciplinary and engaged public research university have not attained maximum impact, in part, because they have emerged from an institutional rhetoric best described as "separate and inherently unequal." Second, we suggest how the language of "intellectual entrepreneurship" (and the related notion of "citizen-scholars") offers an alternative rhetoric. This has the potential to make engagement and interdisciplinary learning more central to the academic routines of public research universities, thus offering administrators a stable foundation from which to broach logistical questions about implementation. The concept of a faculty "contract" is offered as one illustration of a specific mechanism for implementing engagement emerging from this alternative rhetoric.

WHAT IS AN ENGAGED UNIVERSITY AND WHAT IS REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE IT?

Before launching our argument, we first ask what an engaged university is and what in principle is required to achieve it? Throughout this essay the phrase "engaged university" designates an institution embracing and acting upon the assumption of intellectual capital's enormous value. In this case,

intellectual capital refers to faculty expertise and creativity, which to a large extent stems from a university's capacity to harness, integrate and leverage knowledge for social good. To be engaged means recognizing that a university's collective knowledge is among its most precious assets—anchored to, but not in competition with, basic research and disciplinary knowledge.

Becoming engaged requires that universities address two fundamental challenges. First is the considerable task of making trans-disciplinary (cross-disciplinary) learning and research endemic to the academic culture. Social problems and academic questions in the twenty-first century are increasingly complex, hence defying solution by any one discipline or sector. Working across disciplines requires language and institutional structures that successfully integrate the knowledge housed in separate departments and colleges. An engaged university is one where a specialist's knowledge routinely is complimented by the generalist's perspective, a state of affairs demanding explosion of the academic myth that specialists are to be respected, while generalists are suspected (Gregorian, 2004). Engagement entails production of specialized knowledge, a concurrent encouragement of renaissance thinking (Cherwitz, 2005b) and the dialectical interaction between these two ways of knowing.

A second challenge involves the covenant described by the Kellogg Commission: engaged universities are driven by and accountable for their partnerships with the public. Being an engaged university thus means working with government, businesses and non-profit agencies to respond to community needs. It means faculty members who are not content with being sequestered in or blindly protected by the ivory tower. This dimension of engagement is a two-way street. A genuine collaboration between universities and the public is tantamount to more than increased "access" to a university's intellectual assets. It is more than "knowledge transfer"—the exportation of neatly wrapped solutions rolling off the campus conveyer belt. Collaboration demands mutual humility and respect, joint ownership of learning and co-creation of an unimagined potential for innovation—qualities that move universities well beyond the typical elitist sense of "service" (Cherwitz, 2005a; Cherwitz, Sullivan and Stewart, 2002).

Whether by design or effect, most universities have attempted to meet these challenges by developing an array of programs scattered throughout the institutional landscape. Unfortunately, as long as universities continue to expand and feed a network of separate and disconnected programs that vie for limited resources, the kind of engagement described above will remain unfulfilled. If, on the other hand, engagement becomes viewed as a naturally integral value for both professors and students, these separate initiatives will be superfluous—in effect main streaming engagement. The point we are making is that the language used to describe the place for engagement in public research universities will determine whether engagement becomes part of academic convention. Breaking the binaries that populate academe – teaching/research, research/service, theory/practice, basic/applied research (Stokes, 1997) – is a matter of considerable rhetorical effort. In order to honor the social compact between universities and the public, a language must be devised wherein academic curiosity serves the common good. Curiosity, after all, is the university's raw material and intellectual capital.

Academics' strength is to ask questions and pursue answers with intellectual integrity and methodological rigor. The key to integrating engagement into the academic culture is to draw upon that strength. To be clear, engagement ought not be positioned in opposition to the sort of hardnosed science for which researchers strive. Faculty are already frustrated and overwhelmed by the amount and variety of demands made by universities: to amass a sustained record of publication in refereed journals, to achieve and document excellence in teaching, to procure substantial extramural funding, and to participate in the governance of one's academic unit and university (O'Meara and Rice, 2005). The most sure-fire way of alienating faculty from the idea of engagement is to turn it into another obligation—an additional item on their already full plates. Instead, the language of engagement must establish the natural and inherent synergies among the discovery, propagation, and use of knowledge.

Allowing it to become another separate obligation for faculty, moreover, dooms engagement to a peripheral status. So conceived, engagement will always be viewed as supplementary and additive, competing for time and energy. It thus will be perceived as non-academic, less rigorous, and less valued by peers and academic decision makers who grant tenure and promotion and other university rewards.

However, if engagement is viewed as a natural part and extension of research and teaching, it becomes a matter of ownership and self-efficacy—something chosen and deliberately executed as part of a scholarly agenda. What we are suggesting, then, is that engagement should be driven by faculty functioning as intellectual entrepreneurs, agents empowered to own and be accountable for their enterprise. It should not be superimposed by administrators endeavoring to respond to political concerns.

THE RHETORICAL STATE OF ENGAGEMENT

As rhetoricians, we are sensitive to the role of symbolic influence in cultural, social and political change. We insist that a technical account of rhetoric and rhetorical perspectives is key to understanding why public research universities are not fully engaged. Introducing research pertaining to rhetoric may at first blush seem odd or even tedious to those who are accustomed to the vocabulary of higher education assessment and wish to know more about engagement. Because a scholarly analysis of rhetoric reveals the enormous capacity of discourse to create meaning, shape policy and impact implementation (whether in politics or academe), we spend the next few pages discussing rhetorical theory. We underscore a few of the more important lessons that set up our analysis of the failed discourses of engagement.

Rhetoric: Describing Reality and Creating Possibilities

One of the oldest academic disciplines, dating back to antiquity, rhetoric studies human persuasion. Whether defined as "the rationale of informative and suasory in discourse" (Bryant, 1953), "the art of enchanting the soul with words" (Plato, 1987), "the application of reason to the imagination for the better moving of the will" (Bacon, 1957), "the study of all those arts involving symbolic inducement" (Ehninger, 1968) or "the art of describing reality through language" (Cherwitz and Hikins, 1986), the discipline of rhetoric has as its subject matter the ways in which discourse influences attitudes, beliefs and values, ultimately instigating actions.

Rhetoricians have long recognized that language serves not only an important "managerial" function but one of "invention" as well. In recent decades, for example, it has been argued that, in addition to being a vehicle by which ideas are transported and propagated, rhetoric simultaneously serves as a method of discovery. Put differently, we now understand that rhetoric is more than embellishment—more than impulse added to truth or an inherently propagandistic device. After a long history of defending rhetoric against the charge that it is mere ornamentation at best and corruptive deception at worst, rhetoricians declare: Language is not just wrapping! Language does not transport meaning from one mind to another. Rather than use language to deploy ready-made mental constructs, humans use language to generate such constructs. Invention, both intra- and intersubjectively, is a linguistic activity. Moving beyond pejorative and pedestrian accounts, theorists have articulated the "epistemic" power of rhetorical discourse; rhetoric is instrumental to the discovery and creation of knowledge and new ways of thinking and acting (Cherwitz, 1980; Cherwitz and Hikins, 1986; Scott, 1967).

Based on these theoretical insights, rhetorical critics have examined individual discourses, discerning how rhetoric both describes and simultaneously imagines or creates reality. We know that the ways in which ideas are rhetorically couched constrain not only what can be thought and done in the present but what might be possible in the future, i.e., what is enabled and prescribed or disenabled and proscribed. For instance, identifying American foreign relations in the Middle East as a "war on terror" rather than an "invasion" or a change of international relations has profound material consequences.

It prescribes that the country responds to an urgent matter with patriotism, fortitude and perseverance. It further aligns the conflict with other historical experiences the United States has had with war. "War" as a rhetorical construct denotes a time of crisis in which citizens must rally behind their leader against an enemy, whether the enemy is a foreign nation or a domestic threat created by problems such as drugs or poverty. The language also powerfully determines who is considered most germane to the conversation and will therefore be at the table; in this case, "war on terror" suggests that it is military experts who will be the major players in shaping United States policy in the Middle East.

Remarkably, rhetorical effects of this sort often are more pronounced because they are insidious, occurring subconsciously. Audience members, frequently without being aware of it, adopt and internalize a speaker's language. And, as noted by rhetoricians and sociologists, the adoption of language carries with it much more than the mimicking of words and phrases; when audiences internalize a speaker's language they implicitly take on a set of values and pre-/proscribed behaviors.

This is why the power of rhetoric supersedes language practices creating particular views of reality. These views continue to reproduce themselves beyond the communicator's original efforts. Consistent with Aristotle's concept of the "enthymeme" (a rhetorical syllogism—a truncated syllogism whose missing premise is supplied by the audience), linguistic internalization may also result in audiences completing a speaker's argument, using their own examples and experiences to bolster, amplify and even go beyond the speaker's thesis. A speaker's language thus has an impressive shelf life, chaining out as the public internalizes it and adopts it as their own. Put bluntly, "language-in-use" (Cherwitz, 1980) may be one of the most significant effects of rhetoric since it is symptomatic of and leads to other substantial affective and behavioral responses.

What research in the discipline of rhetoric reveals, then, is that institutional and cultural changes require deliberate and strategically crafted language. Just as in politics, an academic institution's rhetoric is far more than a vehicle for transmitting and publicizing its core values, policies and day to day operations—what rhetoricians term "disposition." Institutional rhetoric also and perhaps ultimately serves as the engine for discovering, defining and shaping the values of its constituents and determining the manner in which those values are brought to fruition—what rhetoricians call "invention." Additionally, whether intended or not, a university's rhetoric ultimately chooses who will design programs and address the mechanics of implementation. Our success or failure at creating an engaged university, therefore, may be as simple yet challenging as devising and implementing the appropriate rhetorical vocabulary.

From this perspective, faculty and university administrators must begin to recognize that the discourses of "engagement" translate into more than a public relations campaign. There is nothing more pragmatic and concrete than a rhetorical choice. Institutional discourses have enormous policy implications, all of which bear on how engagement is understood, valued and implemented. Rhetoric, after all, is a critical tool by which an institution discovers its brand and the best methods available to maximize fulfillment of its objectives. For example, the creation of a new university culture, which, as we alluded to earlier, may be requisite to engaged universities, will be driven at least partially by our language choices. What is needed, then, are effective rhetorical strategies designed not merely to cater to external constituents (to prove to them that universities are indeed engaged) but those adapted to the academic players who must define, own, deliver and be accountable for the engaged university. An institution's rhetoric directly determines whether the challenge of implementation is met; it impacts how professors understand the role of the engaged university and influences whether they take ownership and responsibility for it.

In the pages that follow, we argue that institutional rhetoric may account for why current efforts to create engaged public research universities have not been as effective as desired and in some cases counterproductive.

The Discourses of Engagement: Separate and Unequal
The call for engaged universities is a movement whose presence is now palpable on nearly every campus across the nation. Phrases like "public scholarship," "applied research," "service learning," "community and civic engagement" and "outreach" are ubiquitous buzzwords. Ubiquity, contrary to popular belief, is not concurrent with general acceptance and integration into the culture. These catchphrases, nevertheless, are symptomatic of the quest to constitute a new language, a way of talking and thinking about the engaged university. Despite the skepticism with which it is occasionally met, the proliferation of such language is one indicator of a genuine desire for engaged universities and for developing mechanisms that bring the vision of engagement to fruition.

Good intentions and a noble cause notwithstanding, most efforts to create engagement have been spawned by an overly-restrictive institutional rhetoric. The result is a wide-array of separate and

disconnected programs that vie for attention and resources. Although sharing basic ideals, these initiatives remain ineffective; they represent tiny points of light, insufficient to generate the sort of heat that the engagement ideal demands for a university-wide reinvisioning.

In part the problem is a lack of systemic support. The inefficiency that plagues many current engagement efforts ought not be attributed to a lack of commitment or sense of what needs doing. Criticizing those who tirelessly devote themselves to the goal of engagement is not our intention. To the contrary, we fully acknowledge that career centers, continuing education and life-long learning programs, community outreach offices and similar units (e.g., the dozens of faculty-run institutes promoting engagement that are tied to academic disciplines) have an extraordinarily lucid understanding of what engagement means. They inform both faculty and students about ways to make intellectual and academic work more socially relevant and how academic and professional commitments might be structured in more mutually reinforcing ways. Unfortunately, as long as these programs operate without a strong network that is supported by the central administration, the challenge to combine efforts and integrate services will be considerable. When one center's version of and formula for engagement competes with another's for attention, funding and institutional priority, the success of each is limited and the collective impact of engagement remains untapped. What we are suggesting is the downside of allowing the engagement wheel to be reinvented by so many offices and academic units.

But the problem runs much deeper than university geography and administrative infrastructure. It resides with the discourses through which engagement is presented and invented. The language choices that create opportunities can just as easily limit them: "Every way of seeing is a way of not seeing" (Burke, 1965). Institutional rhetoric, we contend, reflects and perpetuates a view of engagement best described as "separate and inherently unequal." Drawing upon the earlier discussion of rhetoric, consider the significance of the current language of engagement and how it potentially stymies implementation:

- Regardless of intent, *"community and civic engagement"* suggest an activity that is not distinctively academic and one without a unique scholarly component. As modifiers of "engagement" the words "civic" and "community" evoke a notion of "service" in the traditional sense of volunteerism, where to be engaged means to do something beyond and apart from one's primary professional responsibilities. This language offers a clear enthymematic invitation to view engagement as "benevolent"—what human beings, regardless of career or expertise, do out of a moral sense of obligation and duty (and in the case of academics, perhaps to balance and justify the resources that we consume and are privileged to receive from society). The rhetorical effect of this is to render difficult if not impossible an understanding of engagement as an organic part of scholarship and thus a professional obligation of academics.

- *"Interdisciplinary"* entails that which is not the same as or equal to disciplinary knowledge—the academic gold standard of educational institutions and learned societies. Instead, the term conjures up a kind of knowledge or expertise that sits outside of disciplines. Because it is on the edges or margins, interdisciplinary scholarship is less rigorous, "soft" and perhaps even anti-disciplinary. One is either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, and to engage in the latter is to appear "off-mission" within a research institution.

- *"Service learning"* denotes a separate and distinctive kind of learning that therefore is segregated from and viewed as less valuable than the academic and intellectual kind. It also implies that learning takes place in the context of engagement only when it is classified as "service learning" – learning, it is assumed, does not happen from "service" alone.

- *"Outreach"* sets up a dichotomy between insiders and outsiders—an "us" and a "them." The insiders are the intellectuals, the researchers who "reach out" into the community and "transfer" their expertise. The outsiders are those with insufficient expertise who rely upon and need the knowledge produced by academics. The term "outreach," moreover, implies a unidirectional line of influence, inhibiting the sort of two-way interaction and collaboration that is characteristic of effective engagement.

- *"Applied research"* reveals that there is another option for researchers, namely to be "not applied." It implies a false dichotomy between kinds of research that perhaps are better represented on a continuum. This dichotomy rhetorically sets up a value judgment: since applied research is less scholarly and less rigorous than basic research and theory, it is a less valuable commodity of the academy. Furthermore, while the counterpart to "applied research" is not explicitly labeled "non-applied," this is a logical and rhetorically appropriate inference. Hence, consistent with this language is the risk of viewing basic research as necessarily and inherently an end rather than a means—a prospect allowing scholarship to be an exclusively self-serving enterprise. To be clear: We are not arguing that all scholarship must be applied or have an applied dimension. If an application is yet unknown, the work still may be vitally important and academically significant. Nevertheless, the "ivory tower" criticism against academe is warranted when research lacks a sense of self-reflexivity. As the Kellogg Commission notes, the covenant between the public and the public university demands a contribution from researchers. There is a multitude of ways, however, in which such contributions can be viewed and different timelines for evaluating the extent to which they have been made. Our point is simply that the language of "applied research" is limiting and prejudices the case, making realization of an engaged university more onerous.
- The same interpretation holds for phrases like *"public scholarship"* and *"public intellectual."* The underlying assumptions of this language must be exposed: By what standards is scholarship deemed to be "public" rather than "academic"? Is the implication that a public intellectual is distinguishable from an intellectual proper only by employment and title? The language here is highly normative, suggesting that public intellectuals—because they write for a larger and more general audience rather than for specialized readers of peer-reviewed academic journals—are not intellectuals proper. As with prior examples, the public intellectual and public scholarship language, though not intended that way, prejudices the case for university engagement.

In addition to language, the absence of academic ethos provides another rhetorical explanation accounting for our inability to fully achieve engaged public research universities. At research universities, for better or worse, some have it and some don't. Administrative offices and non-academic units are commonly considered by faculty to be external to the intellectual life of the university. Because they operate outside of the institution's academic departments (where the real work supposedly gets done), these offices and their staff are not in a position to advise faculty on matters related to original research. And yet it is from these offices that the call for engagement is heard. Not surprisingly, many scholars dismiss these pronouncements precisely because they come from those without the appropriate scholarly ethos and intellectual motivation. For some faculty, engagement is the rallying cry or diatribe of failed scholars.

This dismissal of engagement is reminiscent of the movement in prior decades to improve university teaching and give it greater institutional priority. As important as teaching is, it frequently is not elevated to a high priority at research institutions. Why? Perhaps it is because teaching and its advocates (who often are not publishing scholars) seem disconnected from the more primary research mission of universities. What we have is an extension of the mentality that "those who can't, teach!" The same pattern now may be repeating itself with the movement toward engagement. As long as it is heralded by those who are not viewed as the university's best, or at least archetypal, scholars, why would we expect faculty commitment to and university-wide implementation of engagement?

Our claim about the rhetoric of engagement cannot be overstated: when it is presented to faculty members as an activity external to and separate from their research, and when it is couched as an administratively imposed obligation, engagement inherently remains a second-class, auxiliary assignment. Confining engagement to the traditional language of "service" or other peripheral duties is severely limiting. Nothing could be less appealing to faculty—or graduate students—than another obligation that detracts from time and energy spent on "the real stuff" – rigorous research and publication in prestigious journals. Faculty occupy themselves with activities that are rewarded—activities judged consistent with

the primary mission of the university as it is rhetorically captured and disseminated by the institution's administration. In view of the current rhetoric of engagement, therefore, it is hardly shocking that stepping outside of the laboratory and archives or away from the quiet contemplation associated with research and scholarship are by definition "detours." In addition to being "off mission" these detours often seem pointless and unattractive to faculty since they come as requests from "outsiders"— administrators and external constituents who are not active researchers and who appear motivated more by a political than scholarly agenda.

Engagement terminology and the accompanying administrative discourse by which it is disseminated create for faculty a mixed message at best, viz., along with building a successful record of scholarship, engagement is a desirable practice. It is not hard for faculty to read between the lines: participating in engagement is laudable but, at the end of the day, it is research that counts and for which one will be rewarded. Faculty learn quickly that engagement is not the principal currency of research institutions, no matter how much supplemental rhetoric is generated by administrators calling for universities to contribute to society. They understand full well that, although commended for their engagement activities, in the end such work and the accolades handed out for it pale compared to the punishment (e.g., denial of promotion, less merit salary increases, being tagged as a "second-class" faculty member, etc.) received for not keeping one's head down and producing the coin of the realm.

What we are suggesting is that to be realized engagement must become a mindset to which faculty ascribe rather than merely an administrative imposition. Moreover, as revealed by the above rhetorical analysis, engagement must be a way of thinking and speaking that dissolves rather than invites and reinforces the traditional binaries of research/engagement or research/teaching. In order to establish this mindset, universities should allow faculty to be faculty, asking what lines of inquiry truly inspire academics and then encouraging faculty to pursue and own those questions.

In the final section of this essay we argue that genuine engagement will be achieved when there are discourses allowing it to be seamlessly integrated into universities' academic and scholarly routines. We do not claim to have a detailed map of the ways by which this will occur since, as noted earlier, the logistics of implementation are beyond the scope of our argument. Nevertheless, the following examples from the University of Texas' Intellectual Entrepreneurship "Consortium" illustrate what is possible if the discourse of engagement is substantially altered.

INTELLECTUAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: A NEW DISCOURSE OF ENGAGEMENT

"Intellectual Entrepreneurship" (IE) is premised on the belief that intellect is not limited to the academy and entrepreneurship is not restricted to business. IE began in 1996 as a program in the Office of Graduate Studies at the University of Texas at Austin. The program enrolled in classes, workshops, internships and other activities more than 5,000 students in over 90 academic disciplines involving every college and school on UT's campus. Since 2003, IE has been transformed from a program to an "inter-collegial consortium." This shift was driven by the fundamental philosophy of its participants: that university engagement must be integral rather than peripheral, that engagement is a mindset and not a program.

IE informs the thesis of this article. It offers academic institutions one—and certainly not the only— example of a rhetoric extricating us from the less than successful approach to engagement detailed earlier. Drawing on IE as a philosophy of education, we now provide a glimpse into how academic engagement might rhetorically become a part of the culture of public research universities and what specific mechanisms for implementation emerge as a result.

The Intellectual Entrepreneurship Philosophy

The language and philosophy of IE fundamentally alters the "separate and unequal" status under which the quest for engagement has languished. That is its strength: IE is a way of changing academe's rhetorical practices. The mission of IE is to educate "citizen-scholars." These scholars are living proof of what it means to take ownership of one's work and intellectual capital—personally, professionally and

academically. Citizen-scholars use their capital as a lever for social good through meaningful contributions to disciplinary knowledge. They realize that, when the personal/professional dichotomy is erased, we spawn change from the ground up. Like Demosthenes, citizen-scholars understand that speech (scholarship) without action is empty and idle.

It is a common academic misconception that all entrepreneurs are necessarily business persons. To the contrary: the language of intellectual entrepreneurship is not a covert move to import carte blanche the corporate model into universities. We believe that public universities are and indeed should be subject to different rules and expectations than businesses in the private sector. In order to retain their unique identity as places to discover and disseminate knowledge, "return on investment" must remain a distinctive concept for universities. Yet, as the Kellogg Commission reports, times are changing. If anything, the push to adopt a corporate model of intellectual capital in universities will come in a much more subtle package than one that is labeled "intellectual entrepreneurship." Though it may sound like a cliché, academics must now become the agents of change lest they become its casualties. Being the vanguards of institutional and social change, we argue, is a task well suited for the "citizen-scholar."

Engagement and ownership go hand in hand for citizen-scholars. More specifically, they function as mutual prerequisites. To assume ownership of one's work is to assume accountability for all phases of the process – questions, methods (invention), implications, audience adaptation (disposition) and implement-ation. Ownership entails more than accountability to an "other"; it also means accountability to one's self. Researchers who own their work are able to view themselves as distinct from more conventional faculty members. Citizen-scholars are not cogs in the university machinery. Because these researchers are creative agents of their own practices and products, engagement becomes one of the most natural extensions imaginable of academic scholarship.

Citizen-scholars require certain basic conditions to thrive. Most important is the kind of institutional support that can come only from rhetorical strategies departing from current ones. With the language of IE, we suggest, engagement is a natural part and extension of one's scholarly agenda, rather than a separate and inherently unequal venture. Moreover, the language of IE empowers faculty to own and be accountable for their scholarship, thus rendering them more in control of their professional futures and that of their institutions. In other words, the language of IE liberates us from starting with and incessantly talking about "products" (e.g., publications, grants, awards, etc.). Instead, the language of IE allows faculty to direct attention to the scholarly enterprise itself—an enterprise and way of thinking potentially generating many products, all of which are a fundamental part of scholarship. By focusing on and starting with "process" (how we configure and deploy intellectual resources), rather than "products" (the desired goals and outcomes), IE language fosters "ownership," "integration" and "collaboration"—three necessary ingredients of an engaged university.

The citizen-scholar is not a product of IE imagination; she exists. Dr. Martha Norkunas taught at the University of Texas at Austin for over ten years. She is the founder of the Project in Interpreting the Texas Past (ITP). Norkunas, a public historian, grounds her research in local sites, employing a variety of methodological approaches in both teaching and research. The ITP project, which was developed in 1999 in collaboration with the IE Program, is based on the IE philosophy of interdisciplinary and community-based education. By organizing graduate training around a particular historical site of public interest, Norkunas integrates theoretical and applied knowledge, offering graduate students a genuine experience in engaged scholarship. This experience affords a unique opportunity to reflect on the potential outcome of dissolving traditional distinctions among teaching, research, and service – precisely the sort of mechanical distinctions that make engagement less likely.

Admittedly, history is one of the most traditional disciplines in the academy. In recent times, it has been criticized for harboring many of the qualities that render academic knowledge troubling. Conventional historical scholarship is interested in the story of the past as written by the victors. The losers, those who have been left at the margins of society, are rarely invited to tell their story. Over the past few decades, oral historians like Norkunas and other scholars of collective memory have partially changed this state of affairs. Norkunas' research is an attempt to enrich the public record with the greatest possible diversity of voices.

Norkunas and her students are beginning to reinvent what it means to do history. They are restoring it to its local communities. Rather than imposing their expertise on audiences (what we earlier described as the "knowledge transfer" model of engagement), they are listening and collaborating with local communities to jointly tell important, often untold stories in new ways. The resulting "citizen scholarship" not only brings scholars and communities together, but it produces new and more vibrant local histories.

Each year, Norkunas' classes focused on a different historical site or museum. Students surveyed the site in the fall, asking critical questions about the discipline of history and its methodologies. Because sites often lack resources, their interpretations can be outdated. Students analyzed the site's historic presentation in interdisciplinary teams and then develop project proposals to improve it. One of these proposals is then funded. During the spring, students learned interviewing, fieldwork and documentation skills. In the end, what is produced are local histories—stories contributing importantly to academic knowledge of history and to the needs of communities endeavoring to preserve and bring alive the past.

The success of the ITP project lies in its groundbreaking approach: connecting with society, putting research to work and making education more responsive and accountable. As universities and communities struggle to better collaborate, initiatives like ITP are blueprints for a new academic model and language of engagement. These citizen-scholars are part of a growing body of intellectuals whose research adds both to academic disciplines and to society. While perhaps differing from traditional conceptions of scholarship, these undertakings hold real and substantive value; they provide a useful way of thinking about engagement and entrepreneurship as part of the scholarly enterprise.

For example, the intellectual curiosity upon which Norkunas' research is premised supersedes and thereby "smudges" conventional categories. As a citizen-scholar, Norkunas' curiosity moves her seamlessly between different disciplines; in addition her work simultaneously speaks to different audiences inside and outside of academe. By adopting a different rhetorical approach, Norkunas endeavors to circumvent the university's institutional obstacles preventing engagement.

Norkunas' project, however, exposes an irony: while public research universities are searching for ways to implement engagement, they may be failing to recognize a powerful rhetorical model for obtaining it in their very midst. As previously noted, citizen-scholars do currently exist. Their research is forming a new way of being in the academy. In various departments across campuses, engaged scholars are finding ways to be intellectual entrepreneurs, to make disciplinary contributions that simultaneously speak to community needs. ITP, in particular, is a successful instance of engaged scholarship precisely because it is sustained by a unique discourse. ITP doesn't invoke a language that perpetuates the usual distinctions between theory and application (service). The ITP project operates on the assumption that historians are intellectual entrepreneurs and hence theoretical and applied knowledge are not at opposite ends of a continuum; they are necessarily concurrent.

Professors are not the only ones who thirst for a sense of ownership and personal/professional coherence. This is true for graduate and undergraduate students as well. They too feel torn between a multitude of different and often conflicting demands. It is not uncommon for undergraduates, in addition to their coursework, to be involved in several extra-curricular activities, to work at least part-time, and to be enrolled in professional internships during their college tenure. Increasingly, students search for ways to integrate these different experiences, using them in pursuit of a more focused goal. For example, one student might seek a way to bring together her major in political communication, her internship at the state capital, her volunteer work in a local nonprofit organization and her office in a student organization. Where, she wonders, is the language and subsequent structure to express and validate the natural connections that exist between these endeavors?

One aspect of the IE consortium that addresses this concern (both in language and philosophy) is the "Pre-Graduate School Internship." It connects talented undergraduate students with a graduate student mentor and faculty supervisor in their proposed field of graduate study. The goal of the internship is to offer undergraduate students the opportunity to explore and reflect upon those aspects of graduate education that make it different from the undergraduate experience (conducting research, writing for scholarly audiences, participating in seminars, serving as teaching and research assistants, becoming members of scholarly organizations and learned societies, etc.). Logistically, the internship takes a variety

of different forms; each undergraduate intern registers to receive course credit but the "contract" that s/he and the mentor/supervisor formulate together is almost entirely a result of collaboration. Some interns conduct research, writing essays similar to those published in scholarly journals or presented at academic conferences. Other interns are exposed more generally to the culture of graduate education, being encouraged to interrogate (much as an anthropologist would) the academic community they are observing. In other words, these internships are an exercise in entrepreneurship, operating with a high degree of flexibility and deliberately avoiding centralized control. The best way to serve the intern's interest has been and continues to be letting each own the experience, a hallmark of the IE philosophy of education.

This IE Pre-Graduate School Internship constitutes a major rhetorical and structural deviation from the typical academic experiences of undergraduate students attending large public research universities. Students at these institutions are intimately familiar with the process of meeting degree requirements. Successfully completing a major can be a matter of mindlessly checking items off a list of predetermined requirements. This illustrates "product" rather than "process" oriented system of public higher education and its assumption that a certain number of semester credit hours translates into and entitles students to a baccalaureate degree.

By contrast, the IE Pre-Graduate School Internship is a practice in "invitational rhetoric." The tables are turned for students participating in this initiative. Accustomed to coming to their instructor for advice on how to complete an assignment, pre-grad interns must function as entrepreneurs. Instead of receiving explicit and ready-to-follow guidelines from their mentors/supervisors, interns are challenged to answer many of their own questions: To what purposes do *you* personally and professionally aspire? What *questions* must be answered to attain your objectives and what are the best strategies for seeking answers? As an entrepreneur, what is your personal, professional and academic identity? The invitational rhetoric of this approach provides students with a sense of agency that most never before have had. The entrepreneurial language in which the internship is couched is an invitation for one to own their education. When ownership is a deliberate choice, undergraduate education becomes less of a product and more of a process. Putting all of the pieces together – coursework, activities, memberships, and jobs – is a way of getting beyond a mechanistic view of education.

The IE Pre-Graduate School Internship is a powerful illustration of the new way of thinking and talking about engagement. Just as different rhetorical practices make it natural and possible for faculty to work as citizen-scholars, contributing to both their social and intellectual communities, so too it is for interns. Once interns escape the language of division and start to think more dynamically about what they want to achieve, transitions between different kinds of work, distinct audiences, and different forms of collaboration become much more natural. Interns are asked: What do you want to know and who will you work with to find out? Who will benefit from your expertise and whose will inform your own work? Wrestling with these issues moves education beyond the transfer model of service learning, setting the tone for the sort of two-way interaction that characterizes genuine engagement.

One of the most exciting outcomes of the entrepreneurial way of thinking associated with the Pre-Graduate School Internship is achievement of an "unintended consequence," viz., greater diversity (Cherwitz 2004, 2005c; Raspberry, 2005). As noted by the Kellogg Commission, the under-representation of minorities in graduate education is troubling. Why do minority students choose not to pursue graduate studies? Might it be because academic disciplines are perceived to be insular and out of touch with the real world? For those minority students who feel strongly compelled to "give back to their community," to be engaged, graduate education in fields other than law, medicine and business simply may not be attractive. The current model of education is thus likely to remain unappealing, despite the valiant efforts by public research universities to actively recruit minorities. Supplanting the "apprenticeship-certification-entitlement" metaphor and method of education with one that encourages "discovery-ownership-accountability" necessitates, as we have documented throughout this chapter, rethinking the university's rhetorical habits.

The language sustaining the IE internship offers some hope. When minority students are invited to view themselves as citizen-scholars, they no longer are "just students" working to complete degree

requirements. Moreover, they are not the helpless outsiders in need of paternalistic guidance, as is sometimes the rhetorical implication of recruitment and outreach policies which focus almost exclusively on statistical outcomes. When the language bifurcating research and theoretical inquiry from "the applied" is expunged, students become intellectual entrepreneurs, creating and owning their scholarly identities. The result is that they may begin to view their research as simultaneously contributing to disciplinary knowledge and serving the larger community to which they belong. It is not hard to envision how in this way of thinking engagement is integral rather than supplemental to students' educational choices and areas of expertise.

Intellectual Entrepreneurship: Implementing Engagement

These examples from Texas' "Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium" illustrate the possibility for change emerging from a shift in language. Faculty and students alike can be "citizen-scholars" whose work both relies on and validates a new discourse of engagement. So how, one might ask, does this rhetoric make a difference when it comes to the logistics of implementation? Recalling our earlier claim that logistical considerations cannot change philosophy and thus may be doomed to failure without a transformation of the academic culture of research universities, the answer should be apparent. No longer trapped in the binary of research versus engagement, or disciplinary versus interdisciplinary knowledge, or applied versus basic research, faculty and administrators will be in a stronger position to discuss issues of academic geography, reward systems and budgets.

The logic of our argument here is based on a seemingly self-evident fact: the most difficult logistical challenges confronted by universities (and for that matter all organizations) are those where implementation and compliance involve practices that are seen as less than endemic to the organization. Where there is not a natural and inherent tendency to behave in certain desired ways, administrators often struggle to come up with detailed plans to artificially induce such behavior. In the end such plans may fail if the desire is disingenuous (sometimes, it must be admitted, a university's talk of engagement is just that) and/or there isn't a natural proclivity for the behavior in the first place. As we have argued, this is the current plight of efforts to achieve engaged public research universities.

If our contention is correct, viz., that the introduction of a new language (like IE) can re-envision academe, providing new ways of thinking about teaching, research and service, then the logistics of implementation will emerge more readily. While it may be premature if not presumptuous to prescribe how each individual institution will/should implement engagement, we confidently assert that, with a solid foundation in place, logistical issues will take care of themselves.

Consider the following example. Assuming a public research university begins to internalize the language of IE, one possible mechanism for implementing engagement that might materialize is a faculty "contract." By contract, we do not mean the sort of "legal" document used by unionized institutions. Instead, we are referring to a "process" by which faculty, in consultation with their departments and colleges, negotiate and then over the course of time renegotiate their work product.

In view of the IE philosophy, which involves vision, ownership and accountability, the "contract" would not begin with a discussion of product. It would commence with professors articulating a scholarly vision and agenda, explaining how that agenda comports with their larger personal and professional commitments. In addition, the burden would be on faculty to document how their scholarship aligns with the mission of the institution and academic unit to whom they report. The next step would be negotiation (or renegotiation) between faculty members and the relevant administration (e.g., department chair, departmental personnel committee, college dean, etc.) regarding the products and outcomes naturally occasioned by the stated scholarly vision and agenda. These work products, once agreed upon, would serve as the metrics for evaluating faculty performance. Thus, faculty would be treated consistently and, at the same time, differently.

What this approach suggests is that, while all professors at public research universities are expected to be scholars, each has a different scholarly program and therefore should be evaluated uniquely depending on the work products most befitting their chosen pursuits. The contract mechanism and the IE philosophy spawning it also emphasize that the professional vision and scholarship of professors constantly evolve,

change and mature over the course of an academic career. Flexibility in defining outcomes is necessary to insure that faculty members are energized and innovative, and that they remain resilient and productive. From an IE perspective, the key is creating regular and formalized opportunities for faculty to reflect upon their professional vision, subsequently articulating it to their academic units and incorporating it into negotiations of acceptable performance.

The contract method of implementing engagement will not create two classes of faculty citizens. Flexibility does not provide a license for faculty to deviate from the mission of the university and academic unit, to decide arbitrarily and unilaterally about what counts as work product, or to become lazy. Rather, it adds reflection followed by open deliberation to the process, allowing faculty greater ownership of their scholarship and an ability to participate in the definition of appropriate work products. In short, the IE rhetoric and philosophy enable the construction of innovative logistical methods—such as the contract—as a means for implementing the engaged university.

A related implication of our argument is that perhaps the time has come for public research universities to rethink their philosophy for hiring academic administrators. This applies particularly to those whose portfolios contain issues—such as engagement and interdisciplinary learning—demanding thoughtful consideration of whether and how to change the academy's long-standing practices. In view of our claim that to implement a concept like engagement requires it to be seen as the academic coin of the realm and defined and disseminated by those with appropriate academic ethos, perhaps universities should select leaders based more on their academic credentials, intellectual creativity and entrepreneurial skills than their penchant for being good day to day administrators. Such a personnel-based approach to change (which, of course, is a major IE theme) provides a better guarantee that concepts like engagement will be effectively implemented, instead of being seen as administrative efforts to impose that which is not a natural part of the enterprise.

What we are recommending is that public research universities should jettison the current philosophy of "if you (administrators) build it we (faculty and students) will come." In its place should be put the philosophy "if we (faculty and students) are committed to and own engagement as a part of scholarship, we will be motivated to partner with you (administrators) to make it happen." This is precisely what was meant earlier when we suggested that, equipped with a rhetoric that mainstreams engagement, logistical issues will take care of themselves—that they will be just that, matters of nuts and bolts rather than attempts to remove longstanding cultural and philosophical obstacles preventing engagement.

CONCLUSION

To trustees, central administrations, and university governance leaders we make the following recommendation: Rather that starting and becoming preoccupied with practical ways to solve those problems preventing engagement, work with and empower faculty to rethink the concept of scholarship and define its many natural venues. As argued here, by devising a thoughtful rhetoric (one with intellectual substance and the requisite academic ethos), public research institutions will inevitably and more effectively serve the public good, thus becoming great sites of engaged learning in the twenty-first century. While IE is but one example, it underscores our larger claim regarding the centrality of rhetoric to cultural change within academic institutions. In particular, it illustrates how, armed with a concrete and effective rhetorical strategy for seamlessly integrating interdisciplinary research and engagement into the established practices of the academic enterprise, administrators will be able to tackle the logistical issues (e.g., academic geography, rewards and incentives, evaluation and assessment, campus planning, budgeting, etc.) necessary for implementing an engaged public research university.

REFERENCES

Bacon, Francis. (1957). *Of the advancement and proficiencie of learning* (5th ed.) William Aldis Wright (Ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1990.

---. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20

Bryant, Donald. (1953, December). Rhetoric: Its functions and its scope. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 39*, 401-424.

Burke, Kenneth. (1965). *Permanence and change* (2nd rev. ed.). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Cherwitz, Richard. (1980). The contributory effect of rhetorical discourse: A study of language in use. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66*, 33-50.

---. (2005a, July/August). Creating a culture of Intellectual Entrepreneurship. *Academe, 91*(5), 69.

---. (2005b, November/December). A new social compact demands real change: Connecting the university to the community. *Change, 37*(5).

---. (2005c). Diversifying graduate education: The promise of Intellectual Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(1), 19-33.

Cherwitz, Richard and Hikins, James. (1986). *Communication and knowledge: An investigation in rhetorical epistemology*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Cherwitz, Richard and Sullivan, Charlotte. (2002, November/December). Intellectual Entrepreneurship: A vision for graduate education. *Change*, 22-27.

Cherwitz, Richard, Sullivan, Charlotte and Stewart, Theresa. (2002, spring/summer). Intellectual Entrepreneurship and outreach: Uniting expertise and passion. *The Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 7*, 123-33.

Ehninger, Douglas. (1968, summer). On systems of rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1*, 131-144.

Gibbons, Michael. (2001). *Engagement as a core value for the university*. The Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Gregorian, Vartan. (2004). Colleges must reconstruct the unity of knowledge. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(39).

Hildebrand, David. (2005, spring). Academics are intellectual entrepreneurs. *Peer Review*, 30-31.

Intellectual Entrepreneurship: A cross-disciplinary consortium. (n.d.). Retrieved September 25, 2005, from https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/index.html.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2001). *Returning to our roots: Executive summaries of the reports of the Kellogg Commission on the future of state and land-grant universities*. New York: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

O'Meara, Kerry Ann and Rice, Eugene. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Jossey-Bass.

Plato. (1987). *Gorgias*. (Donald J. Zeyl, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett.

Raspberry, William. (2005, May 31). Filling the racial gap in academia. *Washington Post,* A17.

Scott, Robert. (1967, February). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal, 18*, 9-17.

Stokes, Donald E. (1997). *Pasteur's quadrant: Basic science and technological innovation*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.