# Bye-Bye Teacher-Scholar, Hello Teacher-Scholar?
# Possibilities and Perils of
# Comprehensive Internationalization

Dawn Richards Elliott
*Texas Christian University*

## Abstract

This article develops the claim that the Teacher-Scholar Model (TS), which is used by Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) to evaluate faculty worktime, is ill-suited for the strategy of comprehensive internationalization (CI). CI aims to enhance global learning by offering academic and non-academic opportunities for greater student engagement with international people and organizations. Because of lower transactions and other costs related to non-research academic collaborations with international organizations and people, they have the potential to expose large numbers of undergraduate students to global learning opportunities. Nevertheless, because the TS Model frequently prioritizes research, this type of collaboration is likely to be discouraged. The basis of research prioritization is the contested association of scholarship with better teaching, and more recently evidence-based practice. This article considers some of the consequences of this prioritization for aspirational learning models such as CI. It proposes an update to the TS Model given the conclusion that even in cases where global learning is enhanced, and collaborators' goals are realized, the TS Model is likely to undervalue faculty work, which threatens to undermine the academic component of CI. The proposed update, the Teacher Scholar-Practitioner Model, (TSP) is consistent with evidence of complex knowledge flows between practice, scholarship, and teaching. This evidence confirms that like research, practice activities can lead to original knowledge and can inform scholarship and teaching. Innovative adaptations to the TS model are explored as guides for advocates of CI.

## Keywords

Teacher-scholar model, comprehensive internationalization, globalization, global learning, international research collaborations, higher education

## Introduction

According to Professor David L. Di Maria, 75% of states in the USA either have, or are pursuing resolutions to internationalize education, (2015). These are in response to globalization; the increased mobility, and interconnectivity of people, goods, and resources. Internationalizing education, it is hoped, will prepare students to work and live in this more integrated world. Institutions of higher learning (IHL), the focus of this article, have taken up the mantra with the

_____

**Corresponding Author:**
Dawn Richards Elliott, Texas Christian University, Scharbauer Hall 4110, TCU Box 297200, Fort Worth TX 7619
Email: d.elliott@tcu.edu

strategy of comprehensive internationalization (CI). CI is "a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education," (Hudzick & McCarthy, 2012, p.2). This article does not explore the appropriateness of the CI response to globalization. Instead, it explains why the CI strategy is undermined by the popular TS Model. The TS Model is a merit system which is used to evaluate faculty work along three dimensions; teaching, research, and service. It is widely recognized that in the TS Model research and teaching are weighted more heavily than service, and research is often more heavily weighted than teaching. In recent years, IHL's have turned to international research-collaborations. The hope is that these will identify social policies for global development that are scientifically credible. The underlying assumption that research and publications are a causal source of knowledge poses several challenges for new priorities such as CI. Compared to non-research collaborations, international research collaborations are long-term in focus, expensive, and subject to powerful regulations. They serve few students directly, mostly those in graduate programs at top-tier research institutions. By implication, international research collaborations are less friendly to scaling global learning across IHL's. Non-research international collaborations while simpler to pursue, and potentially more inclusive are demanding of faculty time. Worktime that does not lead to research products and the potential for prestige are less valuable. The undervaluation of faculty worktime can undermine the goals of CI, as it can for other socially-aspirational models of teaching such as service learning, and research such as community based research which can be methodologically distinct. This article which proposes a solution, includes a case study involving: undergraduate students enrolled in an economics class on economic development theories, and another on economic development

polices; a Haitian nonprofit organization; and thirty ultra-poor persons with disabilities. The next section explores why, even in cases where stakeholder outcomes are achieved, the TS model threatens the CI vision. It makes the case for an update to the TS model, and using the case study illustrates how the proposed TSP (Teacher Scholar-Practitioner) Model can be more inclusive in the valuation of faculty worktime. The illustration demonstrates how the TSP Model can also protect traditional ideals of scholarship from the marginalization some fear will accompany the more popular, Boyer-inspired perspectives on scholarship. Conclusions include recognition of challenges and suggested changes.

## Comprehensive Internationalization meets Global Learning: A case study

CI strives to enhance global learning by helping students acquire the "knowledge, skills, and attitudes...to understand world cultures and events, analyze global systems, appreciate cultural differences," and "apply this knowledge and appreciation to their lives as citizens and workers," (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012; AAC&U, 2007; Hadis, 2005; Engberg, 2013). Global learning priorities and activities are nothing new for IHL. On-campus curricular and co-curricular activities, the recruiting of foreign students and employees, study abroad, and international service-learning projects all predate the CI strategy. In global health, global learning is hard to avoid; and in social science specializations such as economics, it is becoming harder to avoid global learning as focus and methodologies evolve, (Cook, 2010). Nevertheless, advocates for CI emphasize the limits of costly programs such as study abroad, and the ad hoc, perhaps untested, efforts by faculty which are also difficult to account for. These efforts, the argument goes, are insufficient for assuring global learning. This is perceived as a problem for students graduating from IHL given recent waves of globalization. The

globalization-induced urgency for CI co-exists with the resurgence of calls for IHL's to make substantive contributions to society; enhance social justice and support community development through collaborative efforts that promotes citizenship, and reduce inequality, (Altbach, 2008; Harkavy, 2006; Hooper, 2016).

From 2013 through 2016 I was part of a team in pursuit of global learning at Texas Christian University (TCU). This five-year "$2.8-million plan was designed to bring the world to TCU and transform learning at TCU by infusing international perspectives throughout the institution," (Kucko, 2005). The plan was linked to quality enhancement accreditation goals (QEP). It anticipated student learning through four pathways: Ethical Interconnected Impact, Informed and Leading Edge Inquiry, Interculturally Competent Impact, and Global Community Engagement, (QEP, 2012; pp. 7). Five new QEP programs were added to the university's long-standing study abroad program; Global Innovator, Virtual Voyage, Visiting Scholar, Local/Global Leaders, and Global Academy. Four learning outcomes for program level assessments were prioritized:

LO1, Students will identify global issues from perspectives of multiple disciplines and cultures

LO2, Students will discuss critical questions about the impact of global issues on domestic and global communities

LO3, Students will develop cultural empathy and intercultural competence

LO4, Students will make responsible decisions about global issues, (QEP, 2013). These learning outcomes were expected to satisfy the University mission to educate individuals to think and act as ethical leaders and responsible citizens to the global community.

Program administrators selected the Caribbean for the launch of the QEP program and awarded the first Global Innovator (GI) title to the Secretary of State for the Integration of Persons with Disability from Haiti. I accepted the accompanying $25,000 GI grant and the associated charge to work to advance the GI's mission in ways that could achieve one or more of the four learning outcomes for student's in a development theory and a development policy class I routinely teach. The grant was used to develop a non-research collaboration with Fonkoze, a Haitian Microfinance and development Non-Government Organization (NGO). Fonkoze agreed to collaborate on a small pilot involving thirty persons with disabilities using a modified version of their adoption of the Graduation Program. The modification involved a blending of core features of the Graduation Program with those of More Than Budgets (MTB). Four core features of the Graduation Program were used: (1) training in two participant selected income-generating activities; (2) transfer of the assets needed to start the two informal income-generating activities; ( 3) weekly case management; and (4) temporary consumption stipend, (Abed, 2015). Typically, the Graduation Program was restricted to able-bodied women who meet the criteria of being ultra-poor and who have dependent children. The untested assumption that disabled persons cannot be successful in the Graduation Program was a primary focus of the pilot which also included men. The selection criteria included the community-based income selection process of the Graduation Program and insights from the GI and the Disability Persons Organizations (DPOs) in the Central Plateau of Haiti.

The pilot also used core features of MTB[1], a financial training program created to help homeless and other low-income persons in the Dallas-Fort Worth community save, (Elliott, 2009). For the pilot, financial lessons were taught by the paid, MTB-trained case manager. Core features of MTB used in the pilot include; (1) saving goals; (2) modest financial awards for saving; and (3) the MTB curricula which was adjusted for context and illiteracy. Each participant received a lockbox in which to save.

Savers kept the lock-box and were responsible for its safety, and the case manager held the keys to dissuade impulsive uses of accumulated savings. Additional funding was secured from a Digicel Foundation Haiti community grant. The, modest, exploratory, pilot was launched in the spring 2015 for twelve months, six months fewer than the Graduation Program.

The asset training for persons with disabilities also extended to the classroom. Involved stakeholders were excited about, and committed to helping students learn about Haiti, their organizations, and their approaches to helping vulnerable groups through efforts such as the pilot. The teaching component of the pilot used two additional QEP Programs (in addition to the GI); Virtual Voyage, and Visiting Scholars. Through Virtual Voyage students engaged with the GI and Fonkoze Staff via virtual classes, and in most cases, they participated in a class screening and discussion of Michele Mitchell's documentary, "Haiti: where did the money go," (2012). Through Visiting Scholars, students engaged with international collaborators and university faculty and staff via in-person classroom and public lectures. In addition to the three QEP Programs, students were required to read a book that exposes them to the reality of living in a developing countries' through the stories of various true-life characters. This non-QEP strategy attempted to humanize many of the development issues discussed in class lectures and it coincided with the ideals of the QEP. To account for global learning I created and used a survey instrument to gauge student perceptions. Two-hundred undergraduate students from spring 2014 through spring 2016 participated in one or more of these three programs, and fifty-seven participated in all three. The perceptions of these fifty-seven students, seventeen from the development theory and twenty-eight from the targeted development policy class are discussed. Although the theory class is less of a match for this type project, because development theory can and sometimes do inform policy I took

advantage of its early scheduling to explore the merits of using the project and the book assignment for global learning.

Anonymously, and with no incentives for participation, twelve of seventeen (71%) theory students voluntarily completed the survey during the last two weeks of the semester at the same time they also completed the standard teaching evaluations. Voluntarily, they responded to several statements using a Likert inspired Scale which was supplemented by visual cues for clarity. The mid-point in this case study, 3, indicated acceptance of the statement. Higher numbers signaled increased certainty about the statement while lower numbers signaled rejection, and strong rejection. On the survey the term QEP was used to describe the activities in class which were supported by Virtual Voyage (virtual classes and virtual office hours) and Visiting Scholars, and the Book refers to behind the beautiful forevers; Life, Death, and Hope in a Mumbai Undercity, (Boo, 2014).

Regarding global development issues (GDI) discussed in class (social exclusion, food insecurity, disabilities, and the roles and limits of NGOs in development), on average, theory students believed that the project exposed them to its human dimensions from multiple perspectives, and that this type of collaboration should continue. The average student was certain that their Virtual Voyage through virtual classes and office hours enhanced their understanding of GDI although less certain responses were more frequent. Students and stakeholders' feedback on the project suggested that virtual office hours were mostly ineffective as conducted, and that three virtual classes might have been too many.

Student responses to the non-fiction book were favorable with respect to improving their understanding of the human dimensions of GDI, and this time stronger acceptances occurred with greater frequency. The book was also perceived favorably for helping to expose the average student to differences in cultural

perceptions of GDI. Most students rejected the claim that the book helped to expose them to the limits of using development models to identify solutions to GDI, and to reduce the abstraction of models. These responses are not difficult to imagine. Fiction is associated with greater empathy, (Pinker, 2016). The assigned book, though a non-fiction told personal stories of people in ways that like fiction can elicit empathy. Outside of the classroom space, students had the opportunity to experience the lives of different characters, navigating their way through many of the barriers to development discussed in class. This probably explains why student responses to using the book to enhance understanding was more symmetrical than responses to the QEP activities. There are many challenges with translating empathy into understanding by reducing the abstraction in models which are often divorced from "real world" experiences. In this case the learning link is indirect and uncertain. In addition, using real-world experiences to explain abstract concepts is not widely used in development theory. Nevertheless it is not unheard of. One example, and the one that inspired my use of this strategy, comes from W. Arthur Lewis' famous article on growth with unlimited supplies of labor. Lewis' 1954 growth model argues that in surplus-labor nations, those where the marginal productivity of labor is low, maybe even zero or negative, investments in the modern or industrialized sector promises a path forward for reducing time spent in low-valued employment and enhancing growth.  Before presenting the model, readers learn about life in the surplus-labor nation, a strategy I believe helps to make the case for the contentious idea that would later follow.

For the remainder of the pilot, global learning outcomes were sought for students enrolled in the development policy class. Based on insights from stakeholders from the theory class, the number of virtual classes was reduced to two, virtual office hours which were intended help support learning outcome four (LO4) where students might contribute to the process of

problem solving were discontinued, and (LO4) was deemphasized.  As in the theory class, student responses were favorable. The average student in a class of twenty-eight with participation rate of seventy-percent felt certain that the QEP humanized the GDI discourse; encouraged consideration of GDI from multiple perspectives; and improved awareness of differences in cultural perceptions about problems related to GDI and solutions to these. Students could choose to read one of two books: Ian Smillie's 2009 *Freedom From Want: The Remarkable Success Story of BRAC, the Global Grassroots Organization That's Winning the Fight Against Poverty* or Nina Munk's 2013 *The Idealist: Jeffrey Sachs and the Quest to End Poverty.* Their responses, like those of students in the theory class, suggested that book readings were warranted and their uses should continue. In the case of in-person classroom visitors, students' response to international guests were stronger than to domestic guests working on similar development issues in terms of their visits enhancing understanding of global development issues.

At a program level, the QEP envision a developmental approach for students from the point they enter the university, most as a fresh person, to the point they graduate, and it aspires to an 80:50:30:20 learning outcome (QEP, 2013). Based on its developmental model, the hope is that 80% of student's will, by the time they have completed their studies, be able to identify global issues from perspectives of multiple disciplines and cultures (LO1). In terms of Learning Outcome 2, it is hoped that 50% of students would have engaged in activities that discuss critical questions about the impact of global issues on domestic and global communities. Learning Outcome 3, developing cultural empathy and intercultural competence, is, it is hoped, to be achieved by 30% of students', and the highest learning bar that aims to help students participate in making responsible decisions about global issues is a dream for 20% of student's.  Faculty recipients

of a QEP grant are obliged, as a part of the application process to specify the targeted learning outcomes they anticipate for students at the class level, and to identify the process for achieving these. Not unlike the case of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) if the aspirations are global (in this case the University) it is not unreasonable to expect that for some countries' (classes in this case) achievements will be lower than the targeted levels (Kenny & Sumner, 2012). When, as in the case of the MDGs, aspirations are used as a benchmark of progress, concerns of fairness might be important to consider (Easterly, 2009). To gain some insights on what might be reasonable to expect at class level from these type of learning activities, student input was sought on the survey. They were asked to map the learning activities of the class to the three targeted learning outcomes (using QEP language), and the mission statement of the university. This mapping can also be interpreted as a crude check on earlier responses which mostly affirmed the learning activities related to the global learning imitative. Student responses to this mapping exercise seem to validate the aspirations of the QEP. For example, in development studies 75% of students' report that virtual classes helped them identify global issues from multiple perspectives (Lo1). Perhaps the most important response relates to the assigned book which in helping students discuss the impact of global issues on communities (LO2) and develop cultural empathy (LO3) fared comparatively well. This is important because of the lower costs faculty are likely to experience by assigning books to help achieve global learning outcomes. The majority of students', 67, 83, and 88% respectively, report that Virtual Classes and Visiting Scholars (Domestic and International) help to meet the mission of the institution compared to 67% and 52% in the case of the assigned book and documentary. Qualitative responses are affirming, (Appendix A).

## Bye, Bye Teacher-Scholar, Hello Teacher-Scholar?

Internationalization is growing on college campuses but for 92% of IHL, international faculty work remains non-tenurable and non-promotional, (CIGE, 2012). It is likely true that faculties, long before the CI movement, have sought global learning outcomes for students' using ad-hoc means. The difficulties, perhaps impossibilities, of trying to account for student global learning in the absence of an organized strategy beyond Study-Abroad, coupled with the opportunities and threats- perceived and real - from economic and other forms of globalization encouraged the shift toward the CI. Investments in the CI strategy likely explain observations of growing internationalization. CI advocates seem surprised that faculty work on CI projects are not meritorious. This surprise, which is unfortunate, suggests that they miss the contradictions between the CI strategy and the Teacher-Scholar Model (TS Model). The TS Model is used on university campuses to evaluate faculty work, and make decisions about tenure and promotion. Faculty work is often described by three areas; teaching, research, and service to the university and one's profession. The contradictions between CI investments and the TS Model can help to explain why at most institutions international faculty work is stubbornly unmeritorious. It can also explain the lure of "international research collaborations" and its use by CI advocates as exemplar, tenurable and promotional CI work, (CIGE, 2012; 15). The surprise and its consequences suggest that advocates, knowingly or otherwise, accept the incentive structure of the TS Model and its narrow, contested ideals about the roles of IHL.

Those who openly support the TS Model claim that scholarly work, which is the basis of research, causes better teaching. This underscores the vision of IHL as centers of knowledge creation and sharing, and as a result scholarship, from which knowledge emanates, is a priority for all IHL: not only research-intensive

institutions, but also those that prioritize teaching (Ruscio, 2013).  Under the popular TS Model, even institutions that prioritize vocational learning expect successful faculty to engage in traditional research for peer-reviewed publications in field journals, (Henderson, 2007).  Prestige, which matters for a variety of reasons not explored here,  is bestowed on those institutions and its researchers that create greater knowledge which presumably advantages them, in sharing with students. Despite the popularity of this claim, literature reviews exploring the empirical evidence regarding this causal claim from scholarship to better teaching reveals that it is contested, (Prince, Felder, & Brent, 2007). Perhaps worse, the claim is not easily tested and believers are obliged to accept it as an existential truth. Because the claim is codified in university policy through the TS Model, international research collaborations are an easy but misguided exemplar for CI advocates. The contested claim that research makes faculty more effective teachers,  does not  extend to practice; the disciplined, exploratory use of existing, and or prospective knowledge in pursuit of solutions to social problems. Research, the logic goes, produces evidence-based knowledge which leads to evidence-based practice and more effective practitioners. This propensity for yielding better practice is expected to close stubborn scholar-practitioner gaps which, it is argued, are the fault of practitioners' who distrust science and scientists and are guilty of engaging in practice with no scientific credibility, (CIGE, 2012; Aniekwe et al., 2012; Bertucci, Borges-Herrero, and Fuentes-Julio, 2014; Giluk and Rynes, 2012). This logic necessarily prioritizes international research collaborations and discourages consideration of the limits to achieving CI.  Indubitably, this self-serving argument marginalizes faculty who specialize in practice, community-based research, or even commercial innovations, (Henderson, 2007; Viswanathan et al., 2004; NONPF, 2000;

NONPF, 2015; Pohl et al., 2012; Sanberg et al., 2014).

Beyond the questionable logic that prioritizes research and international research collaborations as the only source of new and sharable knowledge, the exclusivity of the latter is cause for concern.  These collaborations are uniquely exclusive because of cost, time, and their concentration at wealthy research-intensive institutions. They offer few opportunities for undergraduate student involvement and as a result global learning for most students at IHL. By contrast are non-research collaborations. Because they are often small-scale, non-research collaborations are more likely to be flexible and easily used at a wide variety of IHL while also serving the needs of multiple stakeholders. These attributes make them more accessible to undergraduate students and increases the likelihood of realizing the CI vision. Nevertheless, despite this possibility and the expressed commitments to and investments in CI, non-research collaborations are undervalued at IHL because of the underlying incentive structure of the TS Model which rewards research work and penalizes practice work. These practice-intensive collaborations use methods that do not meet the standards of scientific research, and do not permit generalizations about causal relationships that research work strives to achieve. And yet, as will be discussed more carefully, practice work can yield new, even original knowledge, and its insights can influence the work activities of scholars and community organizations. This makes it increasingly difficult to uphold the myth of the omniscient scholar from whom knowledge flows originate. This is true in business specialties, (McNatt, Glassmann, & Glasmann, 2010; Schulz & Nicolai, 2015). It is also true in poverty-related specialties such as those related to human and country development programs and policies. The possibility that practitioners who are often engaged in aspirations that have important social implications can shape original knowledge

and direct scholars, also challenge narrow perspectives of the roles of IHL One example is the Graduation Program whose origin dates to Bangladesh in 2002. The successfully scaled program began with one man and a vision and used decades of exploratory, problem-solving practice work outside the walls of research and IHL, (Abed, 2015; Smillie, 2009). The results and impact on people's lives were too good to ignore, and within a few years the insights from practitioners caught the attention of scholars from elite research IHL and wealthy donors. Several costly research collaborations followed. These sought to explore the merits of this field-level source of new knowledge mostly using randomized or quasi-randomized experiments. These credibility-seeking experiments also suffer from generalizability and they share with practice work important limits regarding practical uses, (Deaton, 2010). In an era that has fallen in-love with the idea of knowing what works before investing time and resources, the unequivocal support of the Graduation program by esteemed scholars must be comforting for practitioners especially given implications for program funding in recent times, (Hashemi & de Montesquiou, 2011; Banerjee et al., 2015; Smillie, 2009; Banerjee, Karlan, & Zimmerman, 2015). And yet, like practitioners because scholars cannot explain why the program works, knowledge gaps have not been filled: is it, as many practitioners believe, the support from case management, or is it the access to resources as economic theory suggest? Perhaps training?

The real issue isn't whether practitioners can benefit from scientific knowledge. They can, and not only for validating innovative and novel practice work. It is perhaps not a coincidence that the popular microcredit program of the 1990s originated with an academic economist, and more recently scholars have tamed overzealous claims of microcredit's ability to reduce poverty and shifting global poverty focus to microfinance and more holistic practice, (Banerjee, Duflo, Glennerster, & Kinnan, 2015; Banerjee, A., Karlan, D., & Zinman, J. 2015).

Research work is and will always be critical, and essential for interrogating the fallacies scholars, practitioners, and others are guilty of starting and or perpetuating. For example, it was contemporary tales of cruel, high-cost moneylenders as the only source of informal microfinancing that helped fuel the race to formalize no-collateral small-valued financial access. These tales are challenged by decades old anthropological research describing 19th century innovations in developing countries which are culturally-embedded, efficient sources of financing, (Ardener, 1964). Contemporary research and empirical assessments affirm these insights that informal financing is not only varied, and contextual, but also robust, and widely used: by the poor who do not own financial accounts at regulated institutions, the less poor who do, and even immigrants to new, far-away new lands, (Ardener, 1964; Ardener, 2010; Basu, 2011).

Ultimately, the problem for faculty who choose to engage in practice work is not research, or the lack of it. The problem is the incentive structure of the TS Model that suggests, wrongly, that research is the only credible means of knowing. The message from this article is simple and twofold; (1) practice can yield original knowledge and direct research, and (2) practice, like research can be meritorious and promotional because of (1). Like engineers, practitioners who can and do benefit from science "needn't wait for scientists to give them the go-ahead" to invest in the process of identifying solutions to pressing social problems, (Petroski, 2010). This investment is a valuable component of knowledge creating and sharing, even in cases that do not yield measurable transformational outcomes and impact. In cases of the academic-turned-practitioner that innovated a successful program such as the Conditional Cash Transfer Program that originated in Mexico, it might be tempting to conclude that scientists make the best practitioners and faculty-led international-research collaborations are the Holy Grail. This

should be avoided given the large numbers scholars who've led practitioners astray, (Lustig, 2011). And when they do, with impunity the TS Model protects faculty by rewarding counts of research publication with no consideration for their social costs or uses outside of the narrow halls of IHL.

Because there is no scientific reason to believe that scholarship has a monopoly on knowledge creation and teaching, this article contends that it is time to either say Bye-Bye to the TS Model and the roles of IHL it suggests, or update it.  This article calls for updating the TS Model. It proposes to leave research and scholarship as they have long been perceived and widely understood at IHL; faculty work time that leads to publishable, peer-reviewed, products using discipline-specific, albeit ever-evolving, norms of scientific inquiry. This update calls for the addition of practitioner work and work products to join scholarship as a means of creating sharable and reproducible knowledge. The Teacher Scholar-Practitioner Model (TSP) aligns with more narrow calls from business faculty for "pracademician" job-types, (McNatt, Glassmann, & Glasmann, 2010; pp. 15). Although it also overlaps with the broader focus of Boyer-inspired efforts, the TSP is an alternative to the vision of a more inclusive view of scholarship, (Boyer, 1990). Boyer expressed concern, among other things, about the marginalization of faculty who no longer specialize in research over the course of their employment. To capture the value of diverse faculty worktime, he suggested a rebranding of scholarship to include time spent on traditional research, integrating and interpreting knowledge across disciplines, applying and teaching knowledge, as well as the work products from each of these scholarship activities.

There is much written about these ideas, too much to be summarized here other than to note the voluminous and mostly positive responses. Though few, there are dissenters. Perhaps one of the most impassioned warns of a day when Boyer's vision transforms all faculties

into scholars. In this new academic world order, Scholardom, being a faculty inevitably makes one a scholar. This results in mass marginalization of scholarship, scholarly-talented faculty, and students, (Ziolowski, 1996). The only winners in Scholardom are faculty who no longer or never did publish original and traditional research products. A second source of concern relates to operationalizing the Boyer vision. Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff propose using six common attributes of scholarship to delineate scholarship from non-scholarship, (1997). Scholarship is no longer a catch-all for faculty work as concerns about Scholardom suggest, but those works which can be identified by: (1) clarity of goals; (2) preparation consistent with meeting goals; (3) best use of appropriate methodology; (4) activities that generate significant, or important results; (5) the means for effective sharing; and (6) opportunities for reflection, and evaluation (pp. 25). Relatedly, but more narrowly focused on helping community based scholars meet meritorious standards of original scholarship, scholarship can include worktime devoted to building processes involving "co-learning and reciprocal transfer of expertise by all research partners" using models of "shared decision-making and mutual ownership of the processes and products of the research enterprise, (Viswanathan et al., 2004, Pg 3).

These efforts to account for the diversity of faculty work are producing change that might benefit those seeking innovative learning models that change faculty worktime in ways that cannot be accounted for under the TS Model. This is especially true among community and public health professionals. Some are innovating models rooted in Boyer's ideas and others unique alternatives, (Jordan, 2006).  Jordan describes the University of Colorado Health Science Center's use of Boyer's vision to include traditional work products from peer-reviewed publications as well as patents, presentations, and external funding in written, video, or computer formats, (Jordan, 2006; pp. 6). This

contrasts with The University of Arkansas Medical School College of Public Health. At this IHL worktime related to scholarship is distinguished from practice. In this example of a TSP Model, there are different meritorious and promotional specialization tracks: faculty who specialize in scholarship, those who specialize in practice, and those who strive for a scholarship-practice balance, (Jordan, 2006; pp.4). Nine different criteria determines the products from practice work including publication, and evidence that practice work "has resulted in contributions in policy or program design, lead to new developments in the field or been incorporated to address a problem and will influence (solutions) in the community, has stimulated the work of other researchers or practitioners, has influenced teaching activities, has influenced activities in the community, in other communities or with other agencies or organizations or has resulted in the creation of a new, ongoing partnership to address public health issues in a community (local, state or national)," (Jordan, 2006, pp4). Progress toward tenure and or promotion can also be documented by reports, presentations, training or seminars, and the multimedia sharing of information from practice work. These examples demonstrate the different pathways to crafting alternatives to the TS Model which can evaluate diverse, faculty work that contributes to knowledge growth without undermining the traditional norms of scholarship. They are examples of how to protect the traditional roles of IHLs while retaining the ability to consider and adjust to shifting priorities and investments in these. They are reminder that merit models that are rigid and insensitive to shifting priorities can marginalize faculty and programs that are expressed institutional priority.

In the rest of this section, the Haiti Pilot is used in a simple illustration (Table 1.) The illustration strives to demonstrate how merit models can undervalue faculty worktime by discounting non-research work products and compromise investments universities make in new priorities such as CI. This illustration adapts Nibert, M. (nd) and Petersssen & Stevens (2013) achievement wok products from faculty worktime which are based on Boyer's four domains of scholarship. In this illustration, only those products that are relevant for the Pilot are included. To delineate these work products into faculty work activities, teaching, and scholarship or practice, Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff's six attributes of scholarship are considered along with traditional boundaries of scholarship and the guidelines from the University of Arkansas Medical School. In this delineation faculty worktime related to initiating, developing, monitoring, and evaluating the non-research project that displays the six attributes of scholarship, but will not yield peer-reviewed publications can be considered as scholarship-equivalent work, or practice. In contrast to both the TS and TSP Models, when using the Boyer-inspired model work products from the pilot are valued as scholarship under three of the four domains if a peer-reviewed publication never occurs. Unlike the TS Model, under the TSP Model work products that fall outside of teaching activities and traditional or original scholarship, are neither ignored nor undervalued by their inclusion in the low-valued service category. This is because while the TSP Model protects traditional ideals of scholarship and teaching, it does so without marginalizing knowledge-creating practice work which in some cases is also life transforming work oftentimes for a few, and sometimes for many.

Table 1

*Valuing Faculty Work Time: An Illustration from the Haiti Case Study*

| Work Time Achievement | Boyer Model | TSP Model | TS Model |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Peer-review publication | 1 Scholarship | 1 Scholarship | 1 Scholarship |
| 1. Intra-academy course  report and or presentation | 1 Scholarship of Integration | 1 Teaching/Practice | 1 Teaching |
| 1. Community Project<br>2. Project Grant<br>3. Ongoing collaboration community organizations<br>4. Mentor students<br>5. Project report/ presentation | 1-6 Scholarship of Application | 1, 2, 3,5 Practice<br>4 Service | 1-4 Service<br>5 Service/ignored |
| 1. Insights on learning<br>2. Assess teaching/ materials<br>3. Peer assessment teaching<br>4. Presentations/report | 1-5 Scholarship of Teaching | 1-3 Teaching<br>4 Practice/Teaching | Teaching<br>4 Service/Teaching/ignored |

## Conclusion

Aspirational teaching models that strive to enhance student learning while doing good for others increase faculty worktime. The TS model makes it difficult to value some aspects of this worktime and this can lead to the marginalization and or outsourcing of aspirational learning strategies from academic units. One example is service learning (SL). Today, most SL programs are non-academic and the few academic SL programs that exist are associated with a check-list type approach. This approach encourages shallow learning – learning which fails to interrogate the assumption that SL necessarily promotes both learning and the social good - (Butin, 2010).  In the 1990s when SL was popular, the burdens it imposes on faculty was widely recognized and different solutions were proposed to offset these. These solutions emphasize reducing individual faculty cost but ignored or side-stepped big concerns related to the incentive structure of the TS Model. For example, some called for "disciplining" SL,  making it subject to the traditions of an academic unit, while others by exploring the advantages of SL, cautioned young faculty and or those who teach classes that are not overtly applied to stay away, (Butin 2006; Elliott, 2009). The more challenging alternative, to revisit the incentivize structure of IHL, is important if aspirational teaching models continue to be a priority for student learning. Incentive structures reveal underlying belief systems. In the case of the TS Model, this belief relates to the narrow perspective of IHL as knowledge creators through research, and sharers of knowledge through teaching and presentations of original research works. By contrast, a community-based perspective on the roles of IHL envision organizations that serve local, national, and global communities through teaching and research. This so-called progressive view of IHL is reminiscent of 19th century America when institutions were expected to prioritize nation-building in work activities, (Leeds, 1999; Boyer, 1990). A return to this view is perhaps essential for designing merit models such as the TSP Model.

And yet, it is not a simple task to change perspectives and a result such change will not come easily or quickly. Like most if not all things, the community or nation-needs perspective of IHL is fraught with challenges such as tradeoffs related to specifying and prioritizing needs, (Leeds, 1999). The TSP Model provides a practical place to start. It can serve as a guide for institutions that believe that its contributions to society are important. Examples from community health schools are instructive and the old adage useful to remember: it's not possible to have one's cake and eat it. If IHL's hope to help students learn through engagement with local and international communities while involving faculty, the practice-work that is important for engaging large numbers of students must offer a pathway for faculty success. This pathway will only occur if IHL's say Bye-Bye to the TS Model and begin the process of updating it based on their evolving roles and responsibilities.

## Author Note

1. The title of this article is adapted from Dani Rodrik's (2006) Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? A Review of the World Bank's Economic Growth in the 1990s Learning from a Decade of Reform.

2. The non-research collaboration with Fonkoze which constituted the case study described in this article was funded from a Global Innovator Grant awarded by Texas Christian University and a Development Grant from Digicel Foundation Haiti.

## Notes

1. MTB collaborates with private NGOs and public agencies to offer six-week seminars on financial topics that are amenable to behavior changes. Classes are taught by trained MTB volunteers who also work within the financial services community and or who have been trained as financial

educators. MTB has been the beneficiary of Community Development Grants awarded by Comerica Bank and Wells Fargo Bank.

## References

AAC&U (2007). *College learning for the new global century: A report from the national leadership council for liberal education and America's promise.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/GlobalCentury_final.pdf.

Abed, S. (2015). *Ultra-poor graduation: The strongest case so far for why financial services must be a part of the solution to extreme poverty.* Retrieved from https://cfi-blog.org.

Altbach, P. G. (2008). *The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization.* Retrieved from http://upcommons.upc.edu/handle/2099/8111.

Aniekwe, C., Hayman, R., Mdee, A., Job, A., Lall, P., & Stevens, D. (2012). *Academic-NGO collaboration in international development research: a reflection on the issues.* Working Paper, Retrieved from http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/750/Academic-NGO-Collaboration-in-International-Development_September-2012.pdf.

Ardener, S. (1964). The comparative study of rotating credit associations. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 94 (2), 201-229.* doi:10.2307/2844382.

Ardener, S. (2010). Microcredit, money transfers, women and the Cameroon diaspora. *Afrika Focus, 23(2),11-24.* Retrieved from www.gap.ugent.be/africafocus/pdf/2010vol23nr2a_ardener.pdf.

Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kinnan, C. (2015). The Miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 7(1): 22–53,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/app.20130533.

Banerjee, A., Karlan, D., & Zinman, J. (2015). Six randomized evaluations of microcredit: Introduction and further steps. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 7,1, 1–21,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/app.20140287.

Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Goldberg, N., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Parienté, W., Shapiro, J., Thuysbaert, B., & Udry, C. (2015). A multifaceted program causes lasting progress for the very poor: Evidence from six countries. *Science, 348, Issue 6236,* DOI: 10.1126/science.1260799.

Basu, K. (2011). Hyperbolic discount and the sustainability of rotational savings arrangements. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics 3 (November), 143-171.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/mic.3.4.143

Bertucci, M., Borges-Herrero, F., & Fuentes-Julio, C. (2014). Toward "best practices" in scholar–practitioner relations: Insights from the field of inter-American affairs. *International Studies Perspectives, 15, 54–72.*

Boo, K. (2014). *Behind the beautiful forevers: Life, death, and hope in a Mumbai undercity.* New York: Random House.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* A Special report, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from http://www.csusm.edu/community/facultyengagem ent/scholarshipreconsidered.pdf.

Butin, D. (2006). Disciplining service learning: Institutionalization and the case for community studies. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 18, l, 57-64.*

Butin, D. (2010). Can I major in service-learning? An empirical analysis, of certificates, minors, and majors. *Journal of College & Character, 11, 2,* doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1035.

CIGE (2012). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses, 2012 edition.* Retrieved from https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalizationon-US-Campuses-2012-full.pdf.

Cook, T. D. (2010). An alien parachutes into economic research on low-income populations. *Focus, 27,2, 27-32.*

Deaton, A. (2010). Instruments, randomization, and learning about development. *Journal of Economic Literature, 48 (June 2010): 424–455*

Di Maria, D. L. (2015). *Globalization and internationalizing of higher education: Trends, challenges, and opportunities.* Convocation Colloquium Montana State University, Retrieved from http://www.montana.edu/facultyexcellence/teaching -learning-events/DiMaria_Presentation.pdf.

Doyle, M. P. (nd). *Scholarship reconsidered -inherent dangers in its applications.* Retrieved from http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Topic/Chemistr y/ChemConference/FacultyRewards/Doyle.txt.

Easterly, W. (2009). How the millennium development goals are unfair to Africa. *World Development 37, 1, 26–35.*

Elliott, D. (2009). What is the comparative advantage of the service learning? Insights from development economics. *Forum of Social Economics, 38, Iss. 2-3.*

Engberg, M. E. (2013). The influence of study away experiences on global perspective-taking. *Journal of College Student Development, 54,5, 466-480.*

Glassick, C., Huber, M. T., and Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Standards of scholarship. In Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate chapter two, 22-36. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco CA

Giluk, T. L., and Rynes, S. L. (2012). *Research findings practitioners resist: Lessons for management academics.* Research Gate, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199763986.013.0008.

Hadis, B. F. (2005). Gauging the impact of study abroad: how to overcome the limitations of a single-cell design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30,1, 3-19.*

Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st Century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 1,1, 5–37,* DOI: 10.1177/1746197906060711.

Hashemi, S. M., and de Montesquiou, A. (2011). *Reaching the poorest: Lessons from the graduation model.* CGAP Focus Note # 69.

Henderson, B.B. (2009). The work of the people's university. *Teacher-scholar; The journal of the state comprehensive university, 1, 1, 5-29.*

Hooper, D. (2016). *Supporting thriving communities: The role of universities in reducing inequality.* University Alliance Regional Leadership Series, Retrieved from http://www.unialliance.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Supporting-thriving-communities-UA_WEB.pdf.

Hudzik, J. K. & McCarthy, J. S. (2012). *Leading comprehensive internationalization: Strategy and tactics for action.* NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Retrieved from www.nafsa.org/epubs.

Jordan, C. (2006). *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure.* Background Information Compiled by Cathy Jordan, Chair, Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative. Retrieved from https://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Devel oping%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%2OCES. pdf.

Kipesha1, E. & Zhang, X (2013). Sustainability, profitability and outreach tradeoffs: Evidences from microfinance institutions in east Africa. *European Journal of Business and Management, 5, 8.*

Kenny, C. & Sumner, A. (2011). *More money or more development: What have the MDGs achieved?* Center for Global Development Working Paper, 278.

Kucko, J. (2015). *Three challenges to consider when internationalizing your campus.* Retrieved from http://evolllution.com/revenue-streams/global_learning/three-challenges-to-consider-when-internationalizing-your-campus/.

Leeds, J. (1999). Rationales for service-learning: A critical examination. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 6, 1.*

Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. *The Manchester School, 22, 139–191.* doi:10.1111/j.1467-9957.1954.tb00021.x.

Lustig, N. (2011). *Scholars who became practitioners: The influence of research on the design, evaluation and political survival of Mexico's anti-poverty program progresa/oportunidades*, Tulane Economics Working Paper Series, Retrieved from http://econ.tulane.edu/RePEc/pdf/tul1123.pdf.

McNatt, D. B., Glassman, M., & Glassman, A. (2010). The great academic-practitioner divide: A tale of two paradigms. *Global Education Journal, 23, 3, 6-22.*

Mitchell, M. (2012). *Haiti: Where did the money go?* Eleven Media Production.

Munk, N. (2013). *The idealist: Jeffrey Sachs and the quest to end poverty.* Anchor Books, NY, USA.

Nibert, M. (nd) *Boyer's model of scholarship.* Retrieved from http://www.facultyguidebook.com/test/2_5_1.htm

NONPF (2000) *Faculty practice and promotion and tenure report.* Prepared by a sub-committee of the Faculty Practice Committee for NONPF, August 21, 2000, Available from http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nonpf.org/resource/resmgr/imported/FPguide1100.pdf.

NONPF (2015). *Nurse practitioner faculty practice 2015.* Retrieved from http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/nonpf.site-ym.com/resource/resmgr/Docs/FacultyPracticePaper Final201.pdf.

Petroski, H. (2010). *Engineering is not science: And confusing the two keeps us from solving problems of the world.* Retrieved from http://spectrum.ieee.org/at-work/tech-careers/engineering-is-not-science.

Peterson, K. & Stevens, J. (2013). Integrating the scholarship of practice into the nurse academician portfolio. *Nursing Faculty Publications,1,* Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/nursing_facpub/1.

Pinker, S. (2016). Empathy by the book: How fiction affects behavior, *Wall Street Journal,* http://www.wsj.com/articles/empathy-by-the-book-how-fiction-affects-behavior-1478804590.

Prince, M., Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2007). Does faculty research improve undergraduate teaching? An analysis of existing and potential synergies. *Journal of Engineering Education, 96,4, 283-294.*

Pohl, J., Duderstadt, K., Tolve-Schoeneberger, C., Uphold, C., & Hartig, M. T. (2012). Faculty practice: What do the data show? Findings from the NONPF faculty practice survey. *Nursing Outlook, 6,0, 250- 258.*

Ruscio, K. P. (2013). What does it mean to be a teacher-scholar? *Peer Review, 15,3.*

QEP (2012). *Global 2020 plan for comprehensive internationalization.* Retrieved from http://www.sacs.tcu.edu/documents/GLOBALCITIZ ENSHIPQEP.pdf.

QEP (2013). *Discovering global citizenship: Building the foundation for comprehensive internationalization.* Retrieved from www.neeley.tcu.edu/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx ?id.

Rodrik, D. (2006). Goodbye Washington consensus, hello Washington confusion? A review of the world bank's economic growth in the 1990s: Learning from a decade of reform. *Journal of Economic Literature, XLIV,  973–987.*

Sanberg, P. R., Gharib, M., Harker, P. T., Kaler, E. W., Marchase, R. B., Sands, T. D.Arshadi, N., & Sarka, S., (2014). Changing the academic culture: Valuing patents and commercialization toward tenure and career advancement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A., 111,18, 6542–6547,* doi:  10.1073/pnas.1404094111.

Schulz, A.  & Nicolai, A. T. (2015). The intellectual link between management research and popularization media: A bibliometric analysis of the Harvard business review. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 14, 1, 31-49.*

Smillie, I. (2009). *Freedom from want: The remarkable success story of BRAC, the global grassroots organization that's winning the fight against poverty.* VA, USA: Kumarian Press.

Smith, A. (1790). *The theory of moral sentiments, Part I, I.I.2.* Retrieved from http://www.econlib.org/library/Smith/smMS1.html #firstpage-bar.

Viswanathan M., Ammerman A., Eng E., Gartlehner G., Lohr K.N., Griffith D., Rhodes S., Samuel-Hodge C., Maty S., Lux, L., Webb L., Sutton S.F., Swinson T., Jackman, A., and Whitener, L. (2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence.* AHRQ Publication No. 04–E022-2, Retrieved from http://archive.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/p df/cbpr/cbpr.pdf.

Ziolkowski, E. J. (1996). Slouching toward scholardom: The endangered American college. *College English 58, 5, 585.*

**About the Author**

**Dawn Richards Elliott, Phd,** is associate professor in the department of economics at Texas Christian University.  Her current research interests include development economics, in particular, issues related to the role of the non-profit sector in development and issues related to Caribbean Development.

Appendix A: Qualitative Perceptions of Students

| |
|---|
| The QEP was good and the pilot was very interesting. It was good to be involved in something that I could relate what was going on in the classroom. My only thing would be if the pilot was, or could have been further along so that we could really see the progress. |
| I'm not sure calling Boo's book fun is accurate, but I found working with (international NGO partner), hearing speakers, etc. very interesting because it put a face to the importance or relevance to the theories in class. |
| The QEP is helpful cause it engages, Boo's book is an awesome read and offers intellectual reflection on global issues, and the speakers/videos help to change up the class pace a bit. |
| I believe both the QEP and Boo's book are great tools to understand global issues and why human development is so important. |
| QEP was good. Enjoyed learning about (international NGO partner) and Haiti.  Really enjoyed hearing ____(QEP Staff) |
| The QEP made me better informed by learning of development. However SKYPE outside of class was not too useful. |
| Movie eye opening |
| Virtual classes and Visiting Scholars are really helpful. They enhance our understanding of global issues |
| Class gives students a general understanding of how economic development works. More importantly, I now pay more attention to these countries |
| Exposure to conditions and economic challenges that other students around the country might not hear about |
| I really learned a lot this semester and thoroughly enjoyed the material |
| Really enjoyed Virtual Sessions and when people visited. I thought it enhance the class. I also think the papers do a good job of keeping you involved in class and broadening horizons on the subjects |
| I think this method of learning is a great idea in the fact that the interactive components of the class help bring light to many questions I had about some of the proposed theories and methods of development that could have otherwise been confusing. The reading and writing assignments ae a great way to make students really make up their own opinions after researching the topics. |
| Virtual classes and collaboration makes me want to get involved |
| Books give us deeper understanding. Movies are the only ones I could see getting rid of. Speakers offer outside perspectives, different from professors |
| Need to figure out ways students could directly get involved. Some of the development stuff is extremely interesting, and a way for students to get directly involved or some other development programs in order to get some experience. I want to help...but how?? |
| QEP enhances course content. Books, Visiting Scholars movies all informative. Virtual classes good |
| QEP meets TCU Mission and enhances course content. It provides a different perspective. The Books, I learned a lot . Movies, a fun learning experience, Visiting Scholars, enhanced learning |
| QEP enhances course content and was fun. Books help meet TCU mission, movie screening meets mission, enhance course content, and was fun same for CS |
| Enjoyed how you forced us to think critically and to understand the different components |

| |
|---|
| I thoroughly enjoyed the Virtual sessions and movies. Visiting Scholars were also engaging. The book, I simply did not devote sufficient time in order to really benefit from it. This is one of, if not, my favorite class I have taken at TCU |
| The movie screenings and Virtual Classes really helped open my yes to the issues with NGOs and other cultural development issues/progress. |
| I don't like the book assignment. The Virtual Classes and Visitors and movies are educational and entertaining |
| The book and movies were very helpful. Helped me learn many different perspectives and gained sympathy for how others live. |
| Really enjoyed having the speaker on Haiti who visit class at the beginning of the year |