Vol. 17 No. 4
2013

Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement

A Publication of The University of Georgia

Published Through

A partnership of the University of Georgia's Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach, Institute of Higher Education, and College of Education

Sponsored By

Campus Compact

Engagement Scholarship consortium

Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement

Volume 17, Number 4, 2013

ISSN 1534-6102

Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement

Volume 17, Number 4, 2013

ISSN 1534-6102

Table of Contents

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement

Programs with Promise

Subsequently, the instructor's perspective is used to describe challenges and offer suggestions for teaching health campaigns applying the scholarship of teaching and learning perspective. The analysis illustrates the benefits gained by incorporating a real-time health campaign into the curriculum, such as accomplishing specific course objectives while working on a bona fide safety campaign, and achieving a high level of student satisfaction. Ultimately, instructors are encouraged to incorporate this engaged approach when designing and teaching health campaign courses.

Book Reviews

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 1, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

From the Editor . . .

Scholarship of Engagement Status Check?

It was in the inaugural issue of this *Journal* (then called the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*) in 1996 that Ernest Boyer wrote, "[T]he academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement" *(p. 11)*. I have always found this now well-known and often quoted observation, and his article as a whole, immensely inspiring . . . and challenging in both theoretical and practical terms. Seventeen years later, with a transition of editorship of the *Journal*, it seems timely to ask, what is the current status of higher education's partnership with society in its "commitment to the common good"? What is the status of scholarship of, about, and on engagement? What have been the impacts of our efforts on those global and local pressing problems as well as the impacts on community partners, students, faculty members, academic disciplines, and institutions?

For perspectives on these questions, we are able to turn to Barry Checkoway's reflective essay in this issue, "Strengthening the Scholarship of Engagement in Higher Education." He defines current terms and provides an overview of people practicing the scholarship of engagement, succinctly stating that "engaged scholarship requires 'engaged scholars' who think and act as members of society" as they "[develop] knowledge with the well-being of society in mind rather than for its own sake," with such "scholarship involving knowledge and action as a single process." Although he considers overall levels of engagement "inconsistent," his provocative yet pragmatic strategies for strengthening student learning, faculty engagement, and institutional change related to engagement provide specific, contemporary responses to Boyer's challenge.

More About This Issue

Since there have been two special issues in this year's *JHEOE* volume, this issue is particularly robust and diverse, with four research articles assessing strategies for the institutionalization of engagement. Whereas Checkoway offers images for new centers for civic and community engagement, Welch and Saltmarsh report on current practices and infrastructures of 100 Carnegie community

engagement classified institutions. How effective are seed grant programs as incentives for faculty? Zuiches reports on the impacts of the engagement seed grant program, particularly the way seed grants stimulate faculty interest in engagement, motivate faculty to develop partnerships, and serve to build larger externally funded programs. Phillips, Bolduc, and Gallo, through a literature review and survey, address the strategic curricular placement of service-learning to promote student learning and developmental outcomes. Elaborating on the value of international service-learning, Nickols, Rothenberg, Moshi, and Tetloff explore the affective domain of their students' international service experiences: their internal challenges, their coping processes, and the competencies they acquire. Of particular interest is the attention paid to the intra-group processes that contributed to the students' maturation and personal growth.

"Engaged scholarship requires 'engaged scholars' who think and act as members of society," comments Checkoway. In four first-person essays, engaged scholars reflect on their journeys performing engaged scholarship. As early career faculty, Gonzales and Satterfield interrogate their work dialogically and reflexively to assess whether they in fact serve the public good. Sherman, another pretenure faculty member, recounts his approach and experiences while surviving a full academic load and campuswide engagement leadership responsibilities. An activist scholar, Apostolidis chronicles his 12 years of using community-based research and documents its impact on both the students of Whitman College and, importantly, on the policy and practice issues of immigrant workers. Also assessing a long-term innovation, colleagues from Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin introduce us to integrated, place-based institutes they call "landlabs" that support coordinated efforts of multisector public engagement that have resulted in a "triple bottom line" of economic, environmental, and social outcomes.

Checkoway reminds us that "the issue is not whether the course originates in natural sciences, social sciences, literature, arts, or humanities, but whether it develops civic competencies, which is possible in all areas." This is exemplified in two featured Programs with Promise, one in which faculty from Colorado State University describe a course-based service-learning program that utilizes college students to mentor at-risk youth within a family systems framework, and another in which Mattson, Haas, and Kosmoski, associated with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Office of Mine Safety and Health Research and Purdue University, show that teaching health campaigns from an

engaged pedagogy perspective is beneficial for students, instructors, and communities.

Outgoing associate editor Theodore Alter slated for this issue six book reviews that involve critiques of the relationships between higher education and democratic citizenship. In one review, Shaffer explores the historical overview provided in Loss's *Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the 20th Century.* Cordes, in his review of the edited volume *Knowledge Matters: The Public Mission of the Research University,* draws out four approaches to the framing of "publicness," which readers will find insightful. Examining *The Short Guide to Community Development*, reviewer Sterner points out that this book involves a thorough and critical examination of both historical and contemporary professional community development practice. Ingram brings us a review of *Teaching Justice: Solving Social Justice Problems Through University Education,* in which Holsinger argues that collegiate-level criminal justice programs need to move beyond preparing students solely for jobs in criminology to include overarching constructs of social justice and activism. Applying this approach to other academic disciplines, Holsinger points out, will motivate students to more actively engage in addressing injustice in our world.

What is technology's role in enabling civic engagement through community partnerships? Turgeon reviews Bowdon and Carpenter's edited work rich in case studies, reviews, and critiques of partnerships involving universities and other institutions that were facilitated by information, communication, and digital technologies. Turgeon concludes that "the only real impediment is the limitations of our own creativity in developing and employing the available technologies as we foster partnerships to achieve our goals." The final book review presents an apt conclusion to this *JHEOE* issue. In summarizing Tisch's *Citizen You: How Social Entrepreneurs are Changing the World*, Fortunato lays out seven transformations in the global movement to active citizenship and presents the reader with the exciting prospect of personally playing an integral role in the movement.

About the Journal

This fourth and final issue of Volume 17 (calendar year 2013) represents the wisdom and time of two sets of editorial teams. It is indeed an honor to lead the Journal's current editorial team in continuing the strong tradition of being the premier vehicle for

new knowledge and critical conversations in the field. Two features make the Journal unique. First is its broad conceptualization and coverage of community engagement, and second is its open access status. I think such open status is especially noteworthy since it is consistent with the values and principles of community and civic engagement and provides maximum exposure to our authors' works. One of our goals is to reach an even wider audience around the world and advance the global dialogue about the scholarship of outreach and community engagement.

In addition to the change in editorship of *JHEOE,* several other transitions have taken place. First, we acknowledge with a deep sense of gratitude not only previous editor Trish Kalivoda, but also Drew Pearl, Katie Fite, and Julia Mills, the team that provided strong direction and high content and technical quality to the *Journal* during the past 4 years. In addition, we recognize that the quality of the *Journal* is highly dependent on its editorial board (see listing at the front cover) and reviewers and their feedback to authors. Oversight for the sections of the *Journal* is provided by our associate editors, several of whom have recently completed their terms. We are most thankful for the energetic and diligent assistance of Hiram Fitzgerald, Associate Editor for Reflective Essays; Scott Peters, Associate Editor for Programs with Promise and Practice Stories; and Theodore Alter, Associate Editor for Book Reviews. This issue reflects the work of these long-serving associate editors. However, it is also a bridge to a new cadre of associate editors who have been busy facilitating reviews of the new submissions: Andrew Furco, Associate Editor for Research Studies; Shannon Wilder, Associate Editor for Reflective Essays; Katie Campbell, Associate Editor for Programs with Promise; Burton Bargerstock, Associate Editor for Book Reviews; and continuing Associate Editor for Dissertation Overviews, Elaine Ward. Finally, a new managing editorial team is also in place, consisting of Diann Jones and Denise Collins, with the assistance of Andy Carter, UGA library system.

With this issue, the University of Georgia's underwriting partnership for the *Journal* has broadened. It now includes the Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach, the Institute of Higher Education, and the College of Education. Additionally, we are pleased that the *Journal* is officially sponsored by Campus Compact and the Engagement Scholarship Consortium.

In this issue's opening essay, Checkoway wrote: "It is possible to imagine institutions whose students take courses with a strong civic purpose in a campus culture rich in dialogue about pressing

problems in society." Following the spirit of this observation, I would like to close these introductory comments by borrowing his words as an update to Boyer's challenge. Through the Journal, and the scholarship it represents, we hope to offer a publication with a strong civic purpose; we hope to enrich our culture's dialogue about pressing problems in society.

With best regards,
Lorilee R. Sandmann
Editor

Reference

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

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 7, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

Strengthening the Scholarship of Engagement in Higher Education

Barry Checkoway

Abstract

Should your college or university have a strategy for strengthening the scholarship of engagement? If so, what should it be? This question arises at a time when levels of civic engagement are inconsistent, when higher education and engaged scholarship have potential for addressing the situation, and when new civic engagement and community learning centers are arising on campuses and, in some cases, on a "road half traveled." This essay addresses this question and some of the issues it raises. It assumes that civic engagement is a core purpose of higher education, and that engaged scholarship can contribute to its answer. It places emphasis on student learning, faculty engagement, and institutional change. These are not the only elements of a larger strategy, but they are among the most important ones.

Perspectives on Engaged Scholarship

Civic engagement is a process in which people join together and address issues of public concern. It can take many forms, such as organizing action groups, planning local programs, or developing community-based services. Civically engaged people may become active members of a neighborhood association, contact public officials, speak at public hearings, or participate in a protest demonstration. There is no single form that characterizes all approaches to practice: Whenever people are joining together and addressing issues of public concern, it is civic engagement *(Checkoway, Guarasci, & Levine, 2011; Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002*).

As used in this essay, the term civic engagement refers to collective actions that people take to create changes in a community or society. The issues develop depending on the situation, as do the knowledge and skills needed to address them. Overall, however, civic engagement is public work that contributes to public life, not a narrow professional activity performed for its own sake by an individual who seeks to advance his or her own personal benefit *(Boyte, 2012).*

People are practicing the "scholarship of engagement" when they develop knowledge for a public purpose. The term origi-

nates in the work of Ernest Boyer *(1996, 1997)*, who distinguished among the scholarships of "discovery," pushing back the frontiers of knowledge; "integration" of knowledge across disciplines and fields; "application" of knowledge to address societal issues; and "teaching" to facilitate learning about the other scholarships. He later added the "scholarship of engagement" as "a means of connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems," a revision which itself has engendered substantial discussion *(Barker, 2004; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Fitzgerald, Burack, & Seifer, 2011a; Holland, Powell, Eng, & Drew, 2010)*.

Engaged scholarship is distinct from, but also relates to, positivism, constructivism, empiricism, and other epistemological forms. Each form can relate to engaged scholarship, just as engaged scholarship can influence the others. Understanding the relationships among scholarships requires recognition of multiple approaches, an ability to distinguish among them, and an attitude toward potential productive relationships among them *(Bechara & Van de Ven, 2007; Diener & Liese, 2009)*.

Engaged scholarship requires "engaged scholars" who think and act as members of society. Any scholar, whether a philosopher or a physicist, can be an engaged scholar when he or she develops knowledge with the well-being of society in mind rather than for its own sake. Such scholarship is about knowledge and action as a single process in which one informs the other in all of its stages *(Furco, 2002)*.

Many colleges and universities were established with a civic mission, such as "education for democracy" or "knowledge for society." Over time, however, these institutions have developed multiple purposes and, in so doing, de-emphasized their civic mission. They have not necessarily abandoned their civic purpose, but this purpose has become only one of many *(Axelroth & Dubb, 2010; Ehrlich, 2000; Kerr, 2001; National Task Force, 2012)*.

In recent years, however, a number of colleges and universities have established new centers for civic engagement and community learning. These centers can be found in small and large, private and public institutions, in liberal arts colleges and research universities nationwide—such as Duke, Northwestern, Princeton, Texas, Michigan State, and Tugaloo—and it has become possible to speak of "engaged institutions" as a formal classification *(Bjarnason & Coldstream, 2003; Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Colby, Beaumont,*

Ehrlich, & Corngold, 2007; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Peters, 2010; Sandmann, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009; Van de Ven, 2007).

Each center has its own activities, but most of them focus on distinct practices, such as service-learning, community research, or campus-community partnerships. The pattern is one in which each center provides particular programs for particular constituencies, rather than comprehensive programs designed to engage all members of the institution. Some have grown to a scale that enables them to provide several services, but only a few strive to serve the whole institution *(Axelroth & Dubb, 2010).*

Strengthening Student Learning

How can colleges and universities prepare students for civic engagement in a democratic society? Democracy requires citizens who have competencies conducive to its practice which, in one or another version, include an ability to acquire knowledge of public issues, espouse civic values, think critically, communicate effectively, demonstrate cultural awareness, show responsibility toward society rather than primarily for themselves, and participate in some form of social action *(Musil, 2009)*. Engagement might find its expression through various scholarships or particular activities, but the activities are not the competencies themselves *(Colby et al., 2003; Syvertsen, Flanagan, & Stout, 2007).*

However, too many of today's college students do not develop civic competencies and, as a result, show unprecedented levels of political nonparticipation. They are less likely than earlier generations to vote in elections, contact public officials, work on political campaigns, join civic associations, or attend community meetings *(Bennett, 1997; Keeter et al., 2002; Mindich, 2005; Pryor, Hurtado, Saenz, & Santos, 2011)*. There are exceptional young people whose participation is increasing, such as youth of color, but their activities are unnoticed by social scientists who are not trained to study them *(Ginwright, Noguera, & Cammarota, 2006)*.

What are some strategies for strengthening civic competencies of college or university students? One approach is to involve them in curricula and courses that develop civic competencies. Every college or university course can be designed to incorporate civic engagement, if the instructor views learning and teaching in this way. The issue is not whether the course originates in natural sciences, social sciences, literature, arts, or humanities, but whether it develops civic competencies, which is possible in all areas.

For example, imagine a first-generation Latina student who comes to a college because of its reputation for engaged scholarship. She takes a first-semester course in English composition that enables her to examine educational problems of Latina and Latino children, formulate opinions based on her findings, write a term paper, and make a presentation to public officials. She also takes an introductory physics course that captures her imagination through its emphasis on public policy. She selects physics as a major because of its relevance to environmental justice and technological gaps between rich and poor communities.

Another approach is to involve students in co-curricular activities that develop civic competencies. Co-curricular activities are limitless in number, and all of them have potential for civic development. For example, sororities can incorporate community initiatives in their activities, and soccer teams can involve young people in sports events and neighborhood projects. There is evidence that participation in co-curricular activities is positively related to academic achievement, feelings of efficacy, leadership development, and participation in political activities. If co-curricular activities were constructed in terms of their civic competencies, and more students and faculty members approached them in this way, the effects would be extraordinary *(Eccles & Barber, 1999)*.

For example, our physics major participates in co-curricular activities that complement her social commitments. She writes for the school newspaper and creates a Spanish-language column for students. She joins a student association that enables Latina and Latino students to advocate for educational programs and organize community campaigns. She reaches out to students in secondary schools, recruiting them to the institution because of its opportunities for civic leadership.

Despite its advantages, there are obstacles to strengthening student learning for civic engagement. Many students believe that college will benefit them chiefly by providing a job, increasing their earnings, and enhancing their personal prestige. They view college as preparation for entering a line of work rather than for gaining civic competencies. When students attend college for personal gain rather than public good, this weakens any expectations of "education for democracy."

Once on campus, students find few courses with "civic" in the title, faculty members do not view civic competencies as part of their professional roles, class discussions do not address public issues, and assignments do not challenge civic imaginations. There

are exceptional institutions that promote civic engagement, but they are not typical *(Harward, 2011; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011)*.

Studies show that unprecedented numbers of students are entering college with community service experience that they expect to continue, and enrolling in service-learning courses that involve them in direct service, such as helping the homeless. In contrast, fewer students come with an orientation toward civic engagement, such as organizing the homeless or joining an advocacy group for affordable housing. Indeed, student interest in public participation or political leadership is at an all-time low, and actually decreases during the college years *(Pryor et al., 2011)*.

Involving the Faculty

How can colleges and universities involve faculty members in the scholarship of engagement? Faculty members are ideally positioned for engaged scholarship. They have expertise in academic disciplines and professional fields, conduct research projects that address pressing issues, and teach students whose potential for civic engagement is limitless. They operate in anchor institutions whose decisions affect society, with access to resources that are the envy of the world.

However, today's faculty members are lacking in civic orientation. Although some of them might comment on civic disengagement as a subject of study, they seldom suggest that they themselves have a role in creating the problem or finding its solution. They might be productive researchers and master teachers, but they do not necessarily view their work as civic, although on a deeper level they might be yearning for civic expression that has been frustrated by their conditioning *(Macfarlane, 2005)*.

What are some strategies for involving faculty members in engaged scholarship? One strategy is to sensitize faculty members to teaching that develops civic competencies. For example, imagine a physics professor who teaches about the laws of physics. He lectures on velocity, and relates velocity to the dangers of automobile accidents. He explores theories through a mock crash, summarizes what is known about impacts at varying speeds, and facilitates sessions on why velocity is an important issue. He prepares the students to contact safety officials, make public presentations, design a community campaign, and, as a final assignment, write a paper on "physics for change." He and his colleagues believe that all physics courses have civic potential and that they, as scholars, should develop civic competencies.

Most faculty members want to engage their students, and if they were aware of pedagogies that combine substantive content and civic development, they might employ them. Currently, however, many institutions identify service-learning as a primary pedagogy for civic development and, in so doing, limit the involvement of faculty for whom this particular pedagogy is inappropriate. Each discipline has its own pedagogical culture, and overemphasis on service-learning—narrowly defined as a method of learning and teaching that combines classroom discussion with service in the neighboring community—runs the risk of disassociating faculty from teaching that is civic.

Furthermore, faculty members who select service-learning do not necessarily contribute to civic development. This pedagogy has benefits, but there is little evidence that it contributes to civic engagement, and reason to believe that service-learning might even dissuade students from civic engagement *(Perry & Katula, 2001)*.

A second strategy is to reconceive research as engaged scholarship. Boyer *(1996, 1997)* called for scholarship that recognizes the full range of scholarly activities rather than a narrow emphasis on scientific positivism. He argued that each stage of research—from defining the problem, to gathering information, to using the findings—can have civic potential, which also sparked substantial discussion *(Keshen, Moely, & Holly, 2010; Rice, 1996; Schweitzer, 2010a; Seifer, 2003; Simpson, 2000)*.

For example, another physics professor formulates a general theory of relativity, conducts research on particles and the properties of light, and applies the theory of relativity to the universe as a whole. He publishes scientific papers, teaches advanced students, and lectures to scientists who specialize in the topic. He also informs public officials about the dangers of atomic weapons, recommends that the nation begin uranium procurement, and signs a manifesto on the dangers of military involvement. He organizes workshops for laypersons on how to form policy groups and make persuasive presentations to public officials. He receives recognition for his scientific work and for his civic contributions as well.

A third strategy is to broaden the civic roles of faculty members. In these roles, which are potentially limitless, faculty members can create knowledge that contributes to civic development; teach and train people in areas of civic expertise; aggregate knowledge to make it more useful to civic agencies; disseminate knowledge to broad public and professional audiences; advocate on issues; and

become change agents in society. All of these roles are consistent with engaged scholarship *(Bringle, Hatcher, & Clayton, 2006).*

However, faculty members are shaped by an academic culture that runs contrary to engaged scholarship. They are trained in graduate schools whose courses ignore civic content, and enter careers whose gatekeepers dissuade them from public work. They are socialized into a culture whose institutional structures shape their beliefs and cause behaviors that are consistent with their conditioning. They are led to believe that engaged scholarship is not central to their roles, that there are few rewards for this work, and that it might even jeopardize their careers in the university *(Bringle et al., 2006; Dienert & Liese, 2009; Driscoll & Sandmann, 1999; O'Meara, 2010, 2011a, 2011b).*

The fourth strategy is to modify the reward structure. Faculty members should be rewarded for their work, including drawing upon their expertise for the benefit of society as an integral part of their role. Thus, any strategy of involving the faculty should have an appropriate reward structure, including promotion and tenure, time for professional priorities, salary increases, and other rewards. To do otherwise is dysfunctional for the individual and for the institution.

The present reward structure, however, places emphasis on research for its own sake and for its publication in scholarly journals, but not for its civic outcomes. Faculty members are expected to focus on problems defined by their departments and disciplines, and they perceive that engaged scholarship has few rewards. These perceptions are reinforced by promotion and tenure committees, professional peers, disciplinary associations, and editors of journals. Faculty members respond to the rewards they receive, and these rewards do not normally recognize civic performance *(Bringle et al., 2006; Lynton, 1995a, 1995b; O'Meara, 2010)*.

Researchers are now calling for new approaches to promotion and tenure, including rewarding multiple forms of scholarship *(Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O'Meara, 2010; O'Meara and Rice, 2005)*; reframing incentives and rewards *(O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Martinez-Brawley, 2003)*; preparing future faculty; reconsidering the roles of academic administrators *(Langseth, Plater, & Dillon, 2004)*; making the case for engaged scholarship *(Foster, 2010; Lynton, 1995a, 1995b)*; moving faculty culture from private to public *(Kecskes, 2006)*; and creating institutional change *(Fitzgerald, Burack, & Seifer, 2011a, 2011b)*.

The present reward structure is based on a belief that faculty members will be more productive when they focus on research and teaching that are "normal" rather than "civic." However, there is no empirical evidence to substantiate this belief. On the contrary, studies show that faculty members who consult with community agencies have more funded research projects, more publications in peer-reviewed journals, and higher ratings in student evaluations of their teaching than those who do not *(Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Patton & Marver, 1979).*

Modifying the reward structure would require a systematic strategy for reintegration of research and teaching for a larger civic purpose. It would provide guidelines for preparation of promotion packages, documentation and assessment of activities, and broadening the criteria for evaluation of excellence in scholarship *(Ahmed & Palermo, 2010; Bringle et al., 2006; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Lynton 1995a; Moore & Ward, 2008)*.

The reward structure needs modification, but the limitations of the present structure should not keep faculty from practicing engaged scholarship. Faculty members do many things for which there are few rewards, and there are substantial rewards for work that lies outside present structures. The reward structure is an important instrument, but faculty should be expected to play civic roles with or without its support.

Building Institutional Capacity

How can colleges and universities build institutional capacity for the scholarship of engagement? Engaged scholarship is not a one-time event but an ongoing process that requires institutional capacity, including individual leaders, leadership cadres, and an institutional unit that enables people to exchange information, learn from one another, and build mutual support. There is no single organizational location for engaged scholarship that fits all institutions; the key is to fit its location to the particular situation. This is especially important in institutions that operate as a loose confederation of distinct villages rather than a comprehensive whole, and whose members are sensitive to the power or prestige of the unit with which they identify *(Alpert, 1985; Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007; Fitzgerald, Burack, & Seifer, 2011a; Harkavy, Benson, & Puckett, 2007).*

Engaged scholarship requires mechanisms that facilitate collaboration across academic units, and between campus and community partners. These might include contact and entry points for

potential users and procedures to refer users to resources; interdisciplinary arrangements that increase interaction among knowledge producers in order to foster interdisciplinarity on issues transcending the expertise of each one; brokering mechanisms that handle administrative arrangements and contractual details; and dissemination programs that reach potential audiences in language understandable to them *(Walshok, 1995, 1999).*

Leadership is a core component for building capacity, but who are the leaders? For example, the university president has a formal position with a platform on which to campaign and an appearance of greater power than is usually available in a decentralized institution. Vice presidents can formulate policies and provide funding support; however, they also depend on deans and department heads who implement initiatives but who also are more absorbed in boosting their own academic units rather than the entire institution.

Faculty leaders can strengthen support for initiatives, but because they often derive their influence from outside the institution, they might or might not have time for this work. Student leaders have been responsible for many changes in higher education, but today's students often are unaware of their potential power.

Imagine a new center for engaged scholarship with responsibility for involving students in curricular and co-curricular activities, faculty in research and teaching, and institutional structures that reach the whole campus. It offers a vibrant center for discussion of epistemological, methodological, pedagogical, and institutional issues that arise in scholarship of this type.

Imagine the benefits of this center for a physics scholar who wants to strengthen her scholarship. It provides opportunities to exchange information and ideas, learn from others, and build mutual support for her work. Through the center, she learns about best practices in physics and other fields, especially those with which she is unfamiliar. Here she attends a series of distinguished lectures that raise questions at the highest level of discourse; seminars on how to publish papers on subjects outside her normal areas of expertise; workshops on research and teaching methods that integrate civic content into class discussions. She learns about Scientists for Social Responsibility, an association that supports scholars like her, and Physics Teachers for Social Justice, which provides information about the work of her peers.

Toward a Strategy?

Should your college or university have a strategy for strengthening the scholarship of engagement? If so, what should it be? Civic engagement is a process in which people participate in public work; engaged scholarship is an approach to knowledge development that has a public purpose. Colleges and universities are positioned for work of this type, and the new centers for civic engagement and community learning might play a role as part of an overall institutional strategy.

Such a strategy would include efforts to strengthen student learning, involve faculty members, build institutional capacity, and face institutional obstacles. Indeed, civic renewal is especially difficult when students enroll with uneven levels of interest in public participation caused by forces in society, when faculty members are conditioned to perceive that engaged scholarship is not central to their work, or when institutions have developed so that civic purposes compete with other powerful purposes. However, obstacles to change are a normal part of the change process, and the issue is not that there are obstacles to change, but rather that there are efforts to address them.

It is possible to imagine institutions whose students take courses with a strong civic purpose in a campus culture rich in dialogue about pressing problems in society. It is possible for faculty members to employ engaged scholarship in accordance with the highest standards of their disciplines. It also is possible to imagine a unit with central responsibility for civic renewal of the whole institution.

New centers for civic engagement and community learning are arising on campus, and might or might not take up this torch. Currently, however, most of them are absorbed with "service-learning," "community research," "campus-community partnerships," or other particular programs that reflect their stage of development but also limit their potential, in the absence of overall institutional strategy to the contrary.

Acknowledgments

An earlier version of this essay was presented as part of the Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award from Campus Compact at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges & Universities, San Francisco. This is one of a series of papers (Checkoway, 1991, 1996, 1997, 1998, 2001a, 2001b, 2008) on which I draw in the present work. I am indebted to

Thomas Ehrlich, Donald Harward, Lester Monts, and many other colleagues for their contributions to my thinking.

References

Ahmed, S. M., & Palermo, A. S. (2010). Community engagement in research: Frameworks for education and peer review. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(8), 1380–1387.

Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 56*, 241–281.

Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2011). *The drama of diversity and democracy: Higher education and American commitments.* Washington, DC: Author.

Axelroth, R., & Dubb, S. (2010). T*he road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads.* College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative, University of Maryland.

Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 123–137.

Bechara, J. P., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). Philosophy of science underlying engaged scholarship. In A. H. Van de Ven, *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research* (pp. 36–70). New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Bennett, S. (1997). Why young Americans hate politics and what we should do about it. *Political Science & Politics, 4,* 19–23.

Bjarnason, S., & Coldstream, P. (Eds.). (2003). *The idea of engagement: Universities in society.* London, England: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 1*(1), 11–20.

Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyte, H. C. (2012). *Reinventing citizenship: The practice of public work.* St. Paul, MN: Center for Democracy and Citizenship.

Bringle, R., Games, R., & Malloy, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Clayton, P. H. (2006). The scholarship of civic engagement: Defining, documenting, and evaluating faculty work. *Metropolitan Universities, 25*, 257–279.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Holland, B. (2007). Conceptualizing civic engagement: Orchestrating change at a metropolitan university. *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(3), 57–74.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., Jones, S., & Plater, W. M. (2006). Sustaining civic engagement: Faculty development, roles, and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities, 17*(1), 62–74.

Checkoway, B. (1991). Unanswered questions about public service in the public research university. *Journal of Planning Literature, 5,* 219–225.

Checkoway, B. (1996). Combining service and learning on campus and in the community. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77,* 602–606.

Checkoway, B. (1997). Reinventing the research university for public service. *Journal of Planning Literature, 11*, 308–319.

Checkoway, B. (1998). Professionally related public service as applied scholarship. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17,* 358–360.

Checkoway, B. (2001a). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*, 125–147.

Checkoway, B. (2001b). Strategies for involving the faculty in civic renewal. *Journal of College & Character, 2*, 1–14.

Checkoway, B. (2008). Involving urban planning, social work, and public health faculty in the civic renewal of the research university. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 27,* 507–511.

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Diener, M. L., & Liese, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Engaged scholarship: Personal journeys, professional experiences.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publically engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(4), 5–35.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. (2004). Roles and responsibilities of academic administrators: Supporting the scholarship of civic engagement. In M. Langseth & W. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy* (pp. 51-68). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Eccles, J., & Barber, B. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14,* 10–21.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Higher education and civic responsibility.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university.* Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.

Fitzgerald, H., Burack, C., & Seifer, S. (2011a). H*andbook of engaged scholarship: Vol. 1. Institutional change.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Fitzgerald, H., Burack, C., & Seifer, S. (2011b). *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Vol. 2. Community-campus partnerships*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Foster, K. M. (2010). Taking a stand: Community-engaged scholarship on the tenure track. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 3*, 20–30.

Furco, A. (2002). Traditional views on scholarship versus the scholarship of engagement. In J. Anderson & J. A. Douglas, with A. Agogino & K. L. Komar, *Promoting civic engagement at the University of California* (p. 10). Berkeley, CA: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California.

Ginwright, S., Noguera, P., & Cammarota, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Beyond resistance: Youth activism and community change.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Harkavy, I., Benson, L., & Puckett, J. L. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Harward, D. (2011). *Transforming undergraduate education: Theory that compels and practices that succeed*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Holland, D., Powell, D., Eng, E., & Drew, G. (2010). Models of engaged scholarship: An interdisciplinary discussion. *Collaborative Anthropologies, 3*, 1–36.

Kecskes, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002). *The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait.* College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Keshen, J., Moely, B. E., & Holland, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Research for what? Making engaged scholarship matter.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Langseth, M., Plater, W. M., & Dillon, S. (2004). *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service learning*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Lynton, E. A. (1995a). *Making the case for professional service.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Lynton, E. A. (1995b). *Professional service: Why it is needed, and what it is, and how it can be documented and evaluated.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Macfarlane, B. (2005). The disengaged academic: The retreat from citizenship. *Higher Education Quarterly, 59*, 296–312.

Martinez-Brawley, E. E. (2003). The scholarship of engagement in a research university: Faculty incentives and disincentives. *Metropolitan Universities Journal: An International Forum, 14,* 116–130.

Mindich, D. T. Z. (2005). *Tuned out: Why Americans under 40 don't follow the news*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2008). Documenting engagement: Faculty perspectives on self-representation for promotion and tenure. J*ournal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(4), 5–27.

Musil, C. M. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning & democracy's future.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

O'Meara, K. (2010). Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship: Promotion and tenure. In H. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Vol. 1. Institutional change* (pp. 271–294). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

O'Meara, K. (2011a). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177-198). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

O'Meara, K. (2011b). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 26* (pp. 161–220). New York, NY: Springer.

O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, C. V., & Marver, J. D. (1979). Paid consulting by American academics. *Educational Record, 60*, 175–184.

Perry, J. L., & Katula, M.C. (2001). Does service affect citizenship? *Administration & Society, 33*, 330-365.

Peters, S. J. (2010). *Democracy and higher education: Traditions and stories of civic engagement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Korn, W. S. (2006). *The American freshman: Forty year trends.* Los Angeles, CA: Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Higher Education Research Institute.

Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47–64.

Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seifer, S. (2003). Documenting and assessing community-based scholarship. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health* (pp. 429-435). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simpson, R. D. (2000). Toward a scholarship of outreach and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(1), 7–12.

Syvertsen, A. K., Flanagan, C. A., & Stout, M. D. (2007). *Best practices in civic education: Changes in students' civic outcomes.* College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Walshok, M. L. (1995). *Knowledge without boundaries*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Walshok, M. L. (1999). Strategies for building the infrastructure that supports profession-related public service. *Educational Record, 65,* 18–21.

About the Author

Barry Checkoway is professor of social work and urban planning at the University of Michigan and recipient of the 2010 Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award.

Research Articles

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 25, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

Current Practice and Infrastructures for Campus Centers of Community Engagement

Marshall Welch and John Saltmarsh

Abstract

This article provides an overview of current practice and essential infrastructure of campus community engagement centers in their efforts to establish and advance community engagement as part of the college experience. The authors identified key characteristics and the prevalence of activities of community engagement centers at engaged campuses by reviewing the professional literature and analyzing over 100 successful applications for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching elective Community Engagement Classification. These data can be used as a baseline for centers and institutions of higher education to assess their current structures and programs and to assist in strategic planning for the future.

Introduction

The civic mission of higher education has a long history *(Harkavy, 2004)*. That mission has included an emphasis on cocurricular volunteering as one way to promote students' civic role. This emphasis began in the 1980s, and shifted in the 1990s to an academic focus through service-learning *(Jacoby, 2009; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).* As a result, the field of service-learning has existed for nearly a generation, during which it has experienced significant growth and evolution. A variety of initiatives, reports, and practices have helped shape the field and the administrative centers that advance and coordinate this form of experiential education. Early on, campuses created centers to coordinate programming, although such centers often were organized as ad hoc offices within student affairs. Many of these offices had to "make it up as they went" due to the limited empirical best practice and evidence on impact available in an emerging field. Later, through the 1990s, many campuses created centers or offices associated with academic affairs to link community-based teaching, learning, and research to core faculty work. Substantial infrastructure in the form of a community engagement unit (office, center, division) is a key organizational feature of a highly engaged campus *(Etienne, 2012; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2002; Walshok, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1998)*.

The early professional literature in this burgeoning field gradually suggested practices and structures to support this work. Over 20 years ago, the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education *(Kendall, 1990)* published a two-volume resource book that included examples and recommendations for establishing campus community engagement centers. Bucco and Busch *(1996)* were also among the first scholars to recommend specific programmatic frameworks designed to create service-learning programs on college campuses. About that same time, Hatcher and Bringle *(1996)* also enumerated specific infrastructure for service-learning centers. Soon, a small collection of innovative programs coordinated by dedicated offices specifically designed to promote service-learning emerged on college campuses. Zlotkowski *(1998)* provided a collection of program descriptions that included an appendix containing actual organizational flowcharts, administrative forms, syllabi, and policy documents that could be easily adopted by other institutions. Over time, other scholars have contributed to this literature in various publications and reports.

Since these early days, there has been an expansive shift to include and incorporate a broader umbrella of community or civic engagement under which cocurricular volunteer programs and service-learning fall. The Carnegie Foundation defined community engagement as "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation, 2012). We acknowledge that the term "civic engagement" is often synonymously incorporated in the literature and conversation. Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton *(2009)* noted in their white paper that civic engagement is a commonly used term that is loosely defined and serves as an "umbrella term" *(p. 5)* characterized by activity and place: that is, it refers to a campus-based activity that relates to an off-campus issue, problem, or organization. We, however, have chosen to use "community engagement" in this discussion since this term is used by the Carnegie Foundation for the elective classification and is the basis of this study.

In 2006, the Corporation for National and Community Service inaugurated the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, which annually recognizes colleges and universities that promote civic engagement by involving students and faculty in solving community problems using meaningful, measureable outcomes in the communities they serve. Similarly, in 2006 the Carnegie Foundation established the elective classification

Community Engagement by creating and incorporating a set of benchmarks to assist in designating institutions for this classification. To apply for classification, campuses must provide evidence of campus practices, structures, and policies designed to deepen community engagement and make it more pervasive across the institution. To deepen community engagement across the campus, a growing number of institutions endeavor to expand and coordinate cocurricular service and curricular service-learning programs through a campus center in ways that promote broader civic community engagement.

More recently, the report by the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement titled A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future *(2010)* proposed a comprehensive framework consisting of a knowledge base coupled with skill sets, values, and collective action designed to prepare college students to be engaged citizens in the 21st century. The report presented six best practices proven effective to promote civic learning, which includes service-learning and extracurricular activities. Thus, the expectation remains that institutions of higher education will infuse civic and community engagement throughout students' curricular and cocurricular experience. The question and challenge associated with this expectation is, how will this be organizationally facilitated and by whom?

An entire generation of students, faculty, staff, and community partners has thus created a new area of study, professional literature, and set of practices while shaping the design and architecture of community engagement structures on campus. Many campus centers originally designed to coordinate cocurricular volunteer service evolved into facilitating service-learning and are now expected to continue expanding in ways that also include new programming to promote community engagement. However, many institutions of higher education continue to encounter challenges within and outside the academy. Internally, centers may lack the infrastructure or resources necessary to maintain quality programs and partnerships. Defining features such as organizational structure, reporting lines, funding, student programming, faculty professional development, community partnership development, and policies and procedures are critical elements for a successful center.

Entering a second generation of development in the field provides a unique twofold opportunity to revisit the structures of campus community centers initially created and designed for cocurricular service and service-learning that are now expected

to promote community engagement. First, there is the opportunity for existing centers and programs to assess how well their currrent structure and programming aligns with recommended practice found in the literature. Second, for institutions creating new centers, this retrospective review provides an empirically-based starting point by articulating essential, key components as identified and enumerated by experienced directors at established centers. This is timely, as institutions of higher education and the field as a whole may implicitly assume that campus centers originally designed for cocurricular volunteering and later service-learning have the necessary structure and resources to also coordinate newer community engagement efforts. Therefore, this study was designed to answer the following questions:

- What are the defining features of the organizational structures created by campuses for the purpose of facilitating connections to communities at the local, regional, national, and global levels?
- To what extent are the activities undertaken through these institutional structures connected to institutional or community change initiatives?

This investigation was designed to provide an overview of critical components and essential infrastructure to guide campus administrators and center directors as they establish and continue to advance community engagement as part of the college experience. These data can then be used as a baseline for centers and institutions of higher education to assess their current structures and programs as well as assist in strategic planning for the future.

A Review of Center Components and Infrastructure

A review of the literature was conducted to identify the components and infrastructure enumerated in the earlier phases of the field. The review also analyzed over 100 successful applications from the 2010 cycle for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching elective Community Engagement Classification *(Carnegie Foundation, 2012)*. The review revealed a total of 66 key characteristics at community engagement centers on college campuses, as identified in Table 1. Therefore the list is inclusive rather than incorporating any type of criteria to select specific features found in the literature. Those examples of practice that were derived anecdotally from personal conversations are attributed to "other." These characteristics were categorized into

six sections to assist in the organizational structure and format of a survey instrument: (a) institutional architecture/policy, (b) center infrastructure, (c) center operations, (d) center programs for faculty, (e) center programs for students, and (f) center programs for community partners. Institutional architecture/policy is described as systemic structures such as organizational flowcharts, strategic plans, policy and procedures manuals/handbooks, and governance. Conversely, center infrastructure consists of administration, personnel background/roles, physical space, and operational tools that support and maintain the center's existence and work. The center operations category includes day-to-day functions that maintain overall center programming that was then subcategorized into operations pertaining to specific stakeholders associated with the center, including faculty, students, and community partners. Survey items in these categories focused on specific operational activities.

Table 1. Review of Practice and Structural Elements of Campus Centers

Practice	Source
Institutional Architecture/Policy	
Academic Affairs reporting line	Battistoni, 1998
Budgeted institutional funds	Carnegie; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2002; Walshok, 1999
Campuswide commitment to civic engagement	Carnegie
Central coordinating center/office	Carnegie; Bucco & Busch, 1996
Civic engagement in institutional strategic plans	Carnegie
Course designation process	Carnegie
Institutional leadership promotes civic engagement as a priority	Carnegie
Official/operational definitions of service-learning, CBR, engagement	Carnegie
Transcript notation of engaged courses	Carnegie
Center Infrastructure	
Adequate office space	Walshok, 1999
Advisory/governing board	Carnegie; Fisher, 1998
Annual report	(Other)
Center vision/mission statement	Fisher, 1998; Furco, 2002; Hollander et al., 2002
Center alumni association	(Other)
Center director background (faculty, Student Affairs, Community)	(Other)
Center director credential/degree (terminal degree, graduate degree)	(Other)
Clear internal/external access entry points to the Center	Pigza & Troppe, 2003

Table 1. cont...

Community representative to advisory board	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Database tracking system/ hardward	Carnegie; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Development officer	(Other)
Faculty advisory committee/board	Carnegie; Fisher, 1998
Faculty liaison to academic units	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Full-time administrative assistant	Bucco & Busch, 1996
Newsletter/web updates	(Other)
Support programming staff	Walshok, 1999
Center Operations	
Assessment mechanisims/procedures	Carnegie; Hatcher & Bringle, 2010
Announce/provide resource materials	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Community voice/input	Carnegie; Furco, 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hollander et al., 2002
Conduct research on faculty involvement	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Conduct surveys on student involvement	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Create student course assistants	Bringle 7 Hatcher, 1996
Provide course development grants	Furco 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Maintain course syllabi file/database	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Database on faculty involvement	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Establish faculty award	Carnegie; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hollander et al, 2002
Evaluate community partner satisfaction	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Evaluate student satisfaction with SL	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Facilitate faculty research on SL/CE	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Fund-raising mechanisms	Carnegie; Holland & Langseth, 2010
Involve students in creating SL courses	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Presentations at student orientations	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Publicize faculty accomplishments	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Risk Management policy/procedures	Rue, 1996
Recognition of student accomplishments	Rubin, 1996
Recognition of faculty accomplishments	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Rubin, 1996
Student leadership and decision making	Furco, 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Transportation coordination/policy	Rue, 1996
Center Programming--Faculty	
One-on-one consultation/support	Furco, 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Faculty fellowships	Furco, 2002; Fisher, 1998

Table 1. cont...

Faculty professional development program	Canegie; Clayton & O'Steen, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hollander et al., 2002; Rue, 1996
Faculty mentor program	Fisher, 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Center Programming--Students	
Opportunity for student research	Carnegie
Opportunity for student leadership	Carnegie
Opportunity for student internships	Carnegie
Opportunity for Student study abroad	Carnegie
Cocurricular programs and opportunities	Pigza & Troppe, 2003
Offer service-learning minor/emphasis	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Service-learning/CBR student scholars	Fisher, 1998
Center Programming--Community Partners	
Presentation/publications wtih partners	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Award to community partner	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Collaborative grant proposals with partners	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Educate partners on engaged pedagogy	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Initiate site visit/meetings with partners	Bringle & Hatcher, 1996
Community incentives and rewards	Furco, 2002

A survey instrument was developed using this list of "critical practices." A prototype instrument was field tested by two practitioners who then provided feedback used to make revisions. The revised survey consisting of 66 items and study methodology was reviewed and approved by the University of Massachusetts–Boston Institutional Review Board, the institution of one of the authors. The instrument was then sent via e-mail to 311 directors of centers at campuses that received the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement in 2006, 2008, or 2010. The electronic survey included a detailed description of the study outlining safeguards for confidentiality, respondents' rights and options for participation, and an informed consent response button. Electronic reminders were sent twice over a 2-month period. This procedure generated 147 responses for a response rate of 47%. Because we were interested in overall features of institutions receiving the community engagement classification, we did not ask for or record the specific types of institutions that responded. Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain any specific pattern of responses by type of institution. This type of analysis will be conducted in future phases of the research project. Table 2 indicates the Carnegie Foundation's "basic classi-

fication" of the campuses surveyed. Large master's degree granting campuses (comprehensive universities) and research universities were oversurveyed and community colleges were undersurveyed.

Table 2. Carnegie Classifications of Institutions Surveyed

Basic Classification	Number of Institutions
Assoc/Pub2in4: Associate's--Public 2-year colleges under 4-year universities	1
Assoc/Pub4: Associate's--Public 4-year Primarily Associate's	2
Assoc/Pub-R-L: Associate's--Public Rural-serving Large	5
Assoc/Pub-R-M: Associate's--Public Rural-serving Medium	4
Assoc/Pub-S-MC: Associate's--Public Suburban-serving Multicampus	3
Assoc/Pub-S-SC: Associate's--Public Suburban-serving Single Campus	3
Assoc/Pub-U-MC: Associate's--Public Urban-serving Multicampus	7
Assoc/Pub-U-SC: Associate's--Public Urban-serving Single Campus	1
Bac/A&S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences	41
Bac/Assoc: Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges	1
Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields	12
DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities	23
Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)	76
Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)	26
Master's S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)	10
RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)	43
RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)	47
Spec/Arts: Special Focus Institutions--Schools of art, music, and design	2
Spec/Health: Special Focus Institutions--Other health professions schools	2
Spec/Med: Special Focus Institutions--Medical schools and medical centers	1
Spec/Tech: Special Focus Institutions--Other technology-related schools	1

Additionally, the survey gathered information regarding institutional architecture such as budgets and reporting lines, center infrastructure, center operations, center programming, and the director's degree and disciplinary background. Respondents used a modified Likert scale to indicate the status of these components: (a) in place for operation, (b) in the process of being implemented, (c) hoped to be in place, or (d) not in place. When responses indicated that a component was in place or in the process, that component was considered essential to a center's operation. When responses placed a component into "hope to be in place," that component was considered aspirational, thus indicating ways in which the work of centers is continuing to develop.

The survey concluded with an open-ended question in which respondents were asked for their "Top Ten" list of essential components of a campus center. These responses were compared to the list of practice and structural elements that generated the 66 survey items as a form of reciprocal validity *(Welch, Miller, & Davies, 2005)* in which practitioners socially validate best practices enumerated in the professional literature. Reciprocal validity involves reviewing the literature to identify salient theoretical features and cross-referencing those features or concepts by practitioners to determine social validation. This is a form of action inquiry *(Reason, 1994; Torbert, 1976)* in which events are observed and interpreted by active participant-observers to make meaning. The process ascertains whether the theoretical concepts articulated in the professional literature appear or take place in authentic settings or situations. The aim of reciprocal validity is to produce practice-based evidence.

There were 955 individual responses to the Top Ten list question. One of the investigators and a staff member from his office conducted a narrative analysis *(Berg, 1998)* by sorting each individual response into one of the six categories of the survey. The sorting process was accomplished by considering literal and related words or phrases in the response in light of the categories. Once the categorization was completed, the two reviewers performed a blended manifest and latent content analysis *(Berg, 1998)* to reach consensus. This approach combines quantitative and qualitative interpretation by counting the frequency of responses, then interpreting their deeper structural meaning. A decision criterion that a topical response had to appear on at least five of the Top Ten lists was incorporated. The rationale for this criterion suggests these topical areas were deemed significant by at least half of the respondents. The data from the reciprocal validity process have been examined to identify innovative practices as well as to ascertain

which of the components initially enumerated in the literature are among those that practitioners do not deem essential to the work of centers.

Results

The results of the survey are presented in two parts. The descriptive findings that provide a profile of campus centers organized by the six structural categories of the survey described above is presented first, followed by the open-ended Top Ten list responses.

Descriptive Statistics—A Profile of Centers

Institutional Architecture/Policy Context

The survey data reveal that a typical community engagement center exists in an environment of campuswide commitment to community engagement and is structured as a central coordinating office reporting to academic affairs with a budget from institutional funds. The director of the center has a graduate degree and is most often professionally aligned with academic affairs; however, the disciplinary background of the administrator varies considerably. Only a third of the respondents had a background in student affairs, and a quarter reported coming from a community leader role. Just over half (53.9%) of the directors have a doctorate, and slightly less than half (47%) have a master's degree. Among the latter, a variety of areas are represented (e.g., M.Ed., MBA, MFA, MPA).

Table 3. Degrees Held by Center Directors

Degree	Count	Percentage
B.A/B.S	5	3.9%
M.A.	42	33.6%
Ph.D.	61	47.7%
Ed.D.	7	5.5%
J.D.	2	1.6%
Other	17	13.3%

Nearly three quarters of the respondents indicated there is institutional commitment to community engagement. This is supported by the large number of respondents (90.9%) indicating that they either currently have a central coordination structure or that one is in process of being established. Community engagement is enough of an institutional priority that it is included in the campus's strategic plan (83.6% of respondents) and is part of the criteria used in accreditation processes (63.4% of respondents). The context for community engagement includes the existence of an institutional operational definition of service-learning, community-based research, and/or engagement at the vast majority of campuses.

Likewise, just over half (57.1%) of the respondents indicated that community engagement courses are "designated" in some way, although methods of designation varied considerably. Some campuses indicate community engagement options in the course catalogue, and others designate courses after completion, on transcripts. A number of responses indicated that a faculty curriculum committee reviews all courses that specify the service-learning designation. In addition, a number of respondents indicated that the director of the center was responsible for course designation.

Table 4. Institutional infrastructure and Architecture

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Academic affairs reporting line	77.6% 107	5.8% 8	3.6% 5	13.0% 18	138
Budgeted institutional funds	95.8% 135	3.5% 5	0.7% 1	0.0% 1	141
Campus wide commitment to civic/community engagement	74.5% 105	16.3% 23	8.5% 12	0.7% 1	141
Civic/community engagement in institutional strategic plan(s)	83.6% 117	12.1% 17	2.9% 4	1.4% 2	140
Civic/community engagement in accreditation criteria	63.4% 83	12.2% 16	14.5% 19	9.9% 13	131
Offficial/operational definitions of service-learning, CBR, community engagement	70.2% 99	24.1% 24	4.3% 6	1.4% 2	141
Central coordination center/ office for civic/community engagement	81.0% 115	9.9% 14	3.5% 5	5.6% 8	142

Center Infrastructure

How a community engagement center on campus is structured affects the extent and kinds of programming it can offer. The survey data reveal that a typical community engagement center currently has a physical space on campus but is in need of more space. It has an articulated mission/vision to guide its work, and a staff paid for out of institutional funds that consists of a full-time administrator without faculty status, a full-time administrative assistant, and a part-time administrative staff. It involves faculty through a faculty liaison and an advisory board with faculty representation. It gathers data in a systematic way and reports on its activities through an annual report and newsletter. At the same time, the typical center is evolving: it aspires to greater community partner and student representation on its advisory committee, is moving toward greater faculty involvement in center operations, and is seeking to increase its fund-raising capacity and ability to involve alumni in supporting the center.

Institutional funds typically support program staff, but the level of staffing varies. Over 91% of campuses responded that the center has a full-time administrator, but less than 40% of these full-time directors have a faculty appointment. More common than a full-time administrator with faculty status is a faculty liaison to the center: 55.9% of respondents report currently having a liaison. Just over half (53%) of campuses have a full-time administrative assistant; more commonly (82%), a part-time administrative assistant, graduate assistant, or VISTA provides administrative or operational support.

Respondents indicated that an advisory committee/board is an important aspect of center operations, with nearly half of the respondents reporting they currently have such a body. Faculty have significant advisory capacity representation, but community partners and students are less represented. Community representatives are not prominent on center advisory committees, but most respondents report that clear internal/external community access entry points to the center are in place or are in the process of being established.

Over half of respondents indicated that their campuses currently have a database tracking system/software to gather community engagement data. Respondents revealed that 64.8% of their campuses have an annual report and 84% either have a newsletter or are in the process of creating one. Just under half of the respondents reported that they have a center development officer (either

on staff or assigned to support the center). Only 4.7% of respondents reported having a center alumni association, yet over 45% are in the process of creating an alumni association or hope to in the future.

Table 5. Center Infrastructure

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Adequate office space to meet program needs	71.9% 92	16.4% 21	7.0% 9	4.6% 6	128
Advisory/governing board	58.6% 75	18.0% 23	11.7% 15	11.7% 15	128
Advisory/governing board with community represtntation	43.0% 55	20.3% 26	20.3% 26	16.4% 21	128
Advisory/governing board wtih student representation	40.2% 51	25.2% 32	18.1% 23	16.5% 21	127
Annual report	64.8% 83	21.2% 27	10.9% 14	3.1% 4	128
Center vision/mission statement	87.5% 112	9.4% 12	0.8% 1	2.3% 3	128
Center alumni association	4.7% 6	13.3% 17	33.6% 43	48.4% 62	128
Clear internal/external community access entry points to the center	69.3% 88	18.9% 24	6.3% 8	5.5% 7	127
Database tracking system/ software	54.7% 70	25.0% 32	12.5% 16	7.8% 10	128
Development officer (either on staff or assigned to support the center)	41.4% 53	7.8% 10	13.3% 17	37.5% 48	128
Faculty advisory committee/ board	56.7% 72	18.2% 23	9.4% 12	15.7% 20	127
Faculty liaison to academic units	55.9% 71	16.5% 21	9.4% 12	18.2% 23	127
Full-time administrator	91.4% 117	1.6% 2	3.9% 5	3.1% 4	128
Full-time administrator with faculty status	39.4% 50	3.9% 5	7.1% 9	49.6% 63	127
Full-time administrative assistant	53.1% 68	3.1% 4	7.1% 9	36.7% 47	128
Part-time administrative assistant,, graduate assistant,VISTA	82.1% 100	3.3% 4	2.5% 3	12.3% 15	122
Newsletter/web updates	72.0% 90	12.0% 15	7.2% 9	8.8% 11	125
Institutional funds support programming staff	91.4% 117	0.8% 1	3.1% 4	4.7% 6	128

Center Operations

The survey data reveal that a typical community engagement center currently has responsibility for overseeing campuswide community engagement requirements. In addition to coordinating these requirements, the vast majority of centers serve a significant clearinghouse function by announcing and providing resource materials on service-learning, community service, and community engagement. Centers are now taking increased responsibility for risk management functions, as slightly more than half of the centers have risk management policies and procedures in place. Fewer than half of the campuses have transportation policies or responsibility for coordinating or providing transportation to service sites.

Fund-raising mechanisms are also prioritized, with over two thirds of respondents indicating an existing mechanism or one that is being implemented. Center operations are also heavily focused on providing resources for capacity building, particularly among faculty, and for gathering assessment data for accountability and improvement.

A major focus of center operations is directed toward gathering data for tracking, assessment, evaluation, and research. Nearly 80% of respondents report currently maintaining a database on faculty involvement in service-learning/community-engaged pedagogy as well as conducting student satisfaction surveys. Similarly, 85% of the campuses report either conducting community partner satisfaction surveys or being in the process of creating them.

Table 6. Center Operations

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Center manages/coordinates campuswide community service/ civic engagement requirements	67.5% 85	7.9% 10	5.6% 7	19.0% 24	126
Mechanisms/procedures to assess learning outcomes	44.5% 57	35.2% 45	15.6% 20	4.7% 6	128
Mechanisms/procedures to assess programs	58.6% 75	30.5% 39	10.9% 14	0.0% 0	128
Announce/provide resource materials	92.9% 118	3.9% 5	1.6% 2	1.6% 2	127
Conduct research on faculty involvement in service-learning/ engaged pedagogy	35.9% 46	23.4% 30	25.1% 32	15.6% 20	128
Conduct surveys on student involvement in service-learning/ civic engagement	64.8% 83	15.6% 20	14.1% 18	5.5% 7	128

Table 6. Center Operations cont…

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Create/utilize student course assistants	34.6% 44	10.1% 13	13.4% 17	41.7% 53	127
Provide course development grants	62.5% 80	7.8% 10	10.2% 13	19.5% 25	128
Maintain course syllabi file/ database	41.4% 53	23.4% 30	16.4% 21	18.8% 24	128
Database on faculty involvement in service-learning/community-engaged pedagogy	54.7% 70	25.0% 32	9.4% 12	10.9% 14	128
Evaluate community partner satisfaction	66.7% 84	18.3% 23	11.1% 14	4.0% 5	126
Evaluate student satisfaction with SL	63.3% 81	16.4% 21	14.2% 18	6.3% 8	128
Facilitate faculty research on SL/CE	46.9% 60	19.5% 25	20.3% 26	13.3% 7	118
Fund-raising mechanisms (grants & donors)	54.7% 70	14.1% 18	16.4% 21	14.8% 19	128
Involve students in creating SL courses	27.6% 35	6.3% 8	22.8% 29	43.3% 19	127
Presentations at new faculty orientation	68.5% 87	7.1% 9	13.4% 17	11.0% 14	127
Presentations at student orientation	72.6% 93	10.2% 13	5.5% 7	11.7% 15	128
Have/implement risk managment procedures	53.9% 69	25.0% 32	9.4% 12	11.7% 15	128
Recognition of student accomplishments	72.8% 91	17.6% 22	7.2% 9	2.4% 3	125
Student leadership & decisions-making	60.9 % 78	20.4% 26	7.8% 10	10.9% 14	128

Center Programming

Data from the survey indicates that the typical center has academic, cocurricular, and partnership programming functions. Because of a strong academic focus, there is significant programming aimed at faculty (to develop capacity to deliver community-based teaching and learning) and at students (to take advantage of the opportunities for community-based courses). At the same time, centers nurture students' leadership development by providing opportunities for a range of leadership responsibilities. Centers work with both faculty and students around community

partnerships, and they work with community partners as coeducators essential to community engagement as an educational priority.

Faculty.

The survey responses indicated that center operations have a strong focus on faculty assistance and faculty development, with over 90% of respondents reporting that one-on-one consultation with faculty is part of the work of the center. Additionally, three fourths of the respondents reported that new faculty orientation to community engagement is currently offered or is in process. Over 81% of the respondents reported either that they provide a faculty professional development program or that the creation of one is in process. Providing faculty with course development grants and faculty fellowships is a common practice. Faculty mentoring was less prominent.

In addition to faculty development support, almost 80% of the respondents reported that their centers utilize undergraduate student leaders as assistants to faculty teaching community engagement courses. Many centers also reported providing a faculty award to recognize faculty work associated with community engagement.

Students.

Students are a core focus of center operations and programming. Opportunities for cocurricular student leadership are widely offered, with nearly all centers reporting that this is either part of their current programs or is being implemented. Likewise, most centers recognize student accomplishments, and over 70% have an established student recognition award or are in the process of creating one. Just over a quarter of the respondents reported that their center supports service-learning and/or community-based research student scholars.

Centers also remain involved in providing community-based curricular opportunities to students. However, the wording of the questions in this part of the survey may have led to confusion that resulted in underreporting of this type of programming. Curriculum-related questions focusing on majors, minors, certificates, internships, student research, and study abroad may have inadvertently indicated center direct responsibility for components rather than center support for individual faculty members in providing opportunities for students in these areas. Thus, the question "Offer service-learning major?" could have yielded responses reflecting that (1) the center offers a service-learning major, or (2)

students are offered a service-learning major and the center has programming in place to assist faculty with the major. Responses appear to be in line with the latter, as community-based internships were reported most often.

Half of the respondents reported that their campus offers majors with service-learning requirements, and 56.7% reported that there are opportunities for students to participate in community-based study abroad. Almost 25% of the respondents reported that a service-learning minor or certificate is in place or in process, but only 4.7% of respondents reported that a service-learning major is offered on campus.

Just over 60% of respondents reported that center operations include opportunities for student leadership and decision-making. A majority of centers (80%) provide opportunities for academic student leadership as part of their student programs. Within this context, one third of the centers indicated that students are involved in creating service-learning courses.

Community Partners.

More than in any other area, the responses reflect high aspirations for community programming compared to what already exists or is in process. The most prevalent programming reported is in initiating site visits and meetings with partners, with over 95% of the centers reporting this in place. Over half of the centers also provide a recognition award for the community partners.

Similarly, there are opportunities for collaboration and cocreation with community partners in the areas of seeking funding, teaching and learning, and scholarship. Most prevalent is collaborative grant writing, with just over three fourths of respondents indicating that this is something that the center already does or is in the process of establishing. Almost 85% of respondents indicated that the center provides opportunities to educate partners on engaged pedagogy. In the area of collaboration on scholarship, nearly 70% of respondents indicated that the center provides opportunities for collaboration on presentations or publications with community partners. Conversely, far less common is compensation for community partners as coeducators, as less than 10% of respondents reported currently providing funding for community partners to coteach courses.

Table 7. Center Programs

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Factuly Programming					
One-on-one constultation/support to faculty	90.6% 116	3.9% 5	1.6% 2	3.9% 5	128
Faculty fellowship/grants	65.4% 83	5.5% 7	10.2% 13	18.9% 24	127
Faculty development programs	69.5% 89	11.7% 15	5.5% 7	13.3% 17	128
Faculty development funds (e.g, to attend conferences)	68.0% 87	7.7% 10	6.3% 8	18.0% 23	128
Faculty mentor program	22.8% 29	17.4% 22	30.7% 39	29.1% 37	127
Established faculty recognition award	56.7% 72	11.8 % 15	15.7% 20	15.8% 20	127
Course support from undergraduate student leaders	60.3% 76	16.7% 21	11.9% 15	11.1% 14	126
Course support from graduate student leaders	23.6% 29	11.4% 14	13.0% 16	52.0% 64	123
Student Programming					
Opportunity for student research	60.9% 78	7.8% 10	11.7% 15	19.6% 25	128
Opportunity for cocurricular student leadership	82.0% 105	5.5% 7	3.1% 4	9.4% 12	128
Opportunity for academic student leadership	74.8% 95	5.5% 7	6.3% 8	13.4% 17	127
Opportunity for student community based study abroad	56.7% 72	7.9% 10	15.0% 19	20.4% 26	127
Cocurricular programs	86.7% 111	5.6% 7	0.0% 0	7.8% 10	128
Offer service-learning major	3.1% 4	1.6% 2	9.5% 12	85.8% 109	127
Offer majors with SL requirement rather than traditional internships/practica	50.8% 64	6.3% 8	9.5% 12	33.4% 42	126
Offer service-learning minor/certificate	15.7% 20	8.7% 11	20.5% 26	55.1% 70	127
Student service-learning/community-based research scholar	27.6% 35	11.0% 14	15.0% 19	46.4% 59	127
Have student leadership recognition award	64.1% 82	7.0% 9	9.4% 12	19.5% 25	128

Table 7. Center Programs cont…

	Yes	In Progress	Hope to	No	Responses
Community Partner Programming					
Presentations/publications with partners	57.8% 74	10.9% 14	16.4% 21	14.8% 19	128
Award to community partner	47.8% 61	7.0% 9	19.5 25	25.8% 33	128
Collaborative grant proposals with community partners	62.2% 86	9.4% 12	16.4% 21	7.0% 9	128
Educate community partners on engaged pedagogy	64.8% 83	19.5% 25	9.4% 12	6.3% 8	128
Initiate site visits/meetings with partners	89.8% 115	6.3% 8	2.3% 3	1.6% 2	128
Community incentives and awards	43.0% 55	5.5% 7	21.1% 27	61.1% 77	166
Provide funding for community partners to co-coteach courses	9.5% 12	4.0% 5	25.4% 32	61.1% 77	126

Top Ten List of Essential Components

This study was also designed to determine what center directors deemed the most critical components of community engagement centers as a form of reciprocal validity. In other words, directors of community centers reported the following as "must haves" to coordinate an effective center. At least 17 critical themes or factors consistently emerged from respondents' "Top Ten" lists. Most of the responses fell within operational or infrastructural categories, indicating that these are prerequisites to creating and maintaining programs. Of these, five items fell within the Center Operations (COP) category, four items were within the Institutional Architecture/Policy (IAP) and Center Infrastructure (CI) category, and one item was categorized as Center Programming for Faculty (CPF). Three additional items that were not included in the survey items or categories emerged from the reciprocal validity process. The responses are presented in Table 8, with results ranked in terms of frequency of responses rather than importance. The results are described by category below.

Table 8. Top Ten Responses for Essential Components for Community Engagement Centers

# of Responses	Category	Essential Component
49	IAP	Budgeted institutional funds
47	IAP	Administrative support
33	CI	Programming staff
32	CPF	Faculty Development
24	*	Faculty leadership/buy in
23	COP	Student leadership/decision making
21	COP	Assessment mechanism/procedures
21	CI	Full-time administrator
21	IAP	Acadmic affairs reporting line
15	CI	Database/tracking system
15	CI	Adequate office space
12	IAP	Define/designate courses
12	COP	Fund-raising mechanisms
12	*	Communication/outreach
11	COP	Transportation coordination/policy
11	*	Cross-campus collaboration
11	COP	Course development grants

* = responses not included in survey items: CI = Center Infrastructure; COP= Center Operations; CPF = Center Programs for Faculty; IAP = Instutitional Architecture/ Policy

Center operations.

Student leadership/decision-making and assessment mechanisms/procedures were both viewed as critical elements of campus centers. Respondents value providing opportunities to students that would develop their leadership skills and allow collaborative decision-making for programming. This included allowing students to oversee and coordinate community engagement programs with staff oversight. Likewise, respondents indicated giving students a voice in center operations and activities as a high priority. It is important to note that student leadership and participation in decision-making were evident in both cocurricular and curricular programming. Examples of this included students serving as course assistants in the planning and coordination of service-learning courses as well as advising on policy/procedures to provide a student perspective.

Respondents also indicated that establishing and maintaining procedures for assessing center programs were being critical.

Formative evaluation on program operations and summative evaluation of program outcomes completed by students, faculty, and community partners was viewed as essential. Survey responses revealed a widely held view that centers must incorporate fundraising to help maintain operations and programs. This included grant-writing as well as development efforts to find donors and sponsors. This result suggests that institutional funding alone is not adequate. Directors responding to the survey indicated coordination of transportation to and from service experiences as a key role and responsibility for the center. This ranged from actual logistical coordination of vans transporting students to creating and enforcing campus policy on the use of private vehicles. Finally, respondents noted that providing funds and grants to faculty and departments to develop new courses was an essential task and role of the center.

Institutional architecture/policy.

Unsurprisingly, directors reported budgeted institutional funds as the top priority. Rather than relying solely on grants, respondents indicated that "hard lines" in the institutional budget were essential for center operation. A close second priority was administrative support, meaning that upper level administrators must publicly acknowledge their philosophical and political support for campus centers to give them legitimacy across campus. This requires administrators' full understanding of the role and function of the center. Survey responses also consistently revealed the pedagogical and political advantage of having the campus center under academic affairs. Comments suggested that faculty afford much more respect and attention to operations of the center if it is on the academic side of the house. Finally, operational definitions for service-learning courses, as well as an official course designation process, appear to be important. Responses indicated significant agreement on the need for operational definitions of service-learning; however, there was considerable variance on how courses were designated. Some campuses reported a committee structure to review course descriptions; others simply allowed instructors to self-designate their classes as service-learning. Despite these discrepancies, directors consistently noted the importance of differentiating service-learning from other similar forms of experiential learning.

Center infrastructure.

Responses also indicated that a community center must have adequate and qualified support staff to carry out its operations. As centers and their programs evolve and expand, additional staff members are required. Respondents also revealed that centers require at least one full-time qualified professional director with background and experience in higher education. Descriptive statistics indicate that a director with a terminal degree is both common and a critical component, regardless of the academic discipline. Survey results also reveal that a database or tracking system to manage curricular and cocurricular programming is needed to coordinate and manage how many students are placed in a given site as well as how many cocurricular programs and/or courses are in operation at any one time. These systems also track the number of hours, students, and partner sites in operation to provide information for documentation and reports. Respondents reported that effective center operation requires adequate office space. Finally, high visibility and easy physical access to the center by students, faculty, and community partners were deemed essential.

Center programming for faculty.

Directors clearly and consistently indicated that one critical role of a center was to assist faculty with acquiring the skill and information necessary to develop and implement engaged courses. The responses did not, however, elaborate on the content and scope of faculty development other than mentioning formats such as workshops, retreats, and one-on-one technical assistance. Instead, respondents repeatedly articulated the need for ongoing, quality professional development opportunities for faculty.

Reciprocal validity findings.

In addition to validating the empirical research by cross-referencing responses to a list of current, essential practices, this process allows new information to emerge that may merit inclusion in the literature or may even contradict premises that were originally posited, indicating a need to revisit or reconsider a topic. In this study, responses yielded at least three themes that were not found in the professional literature and therefore were not included in the survey instrument. These might be characterized as relational factors rather than tangible or structural components.

Faculty leadership or "buy-in" was articulated in one way or another at least 24 times in the respondents' Top Ten lists.

Respondents noted that respected faculty members who had embraced this form of pedagogy had to serve as advocates or "cheerleaders" to their peers and administrators to garner a sense of legitimacy for the center and its work. This response represents a unique relational and/or political element that is outside the structural and operational dimensions in other survey items and open-ended responses. In other words, the survey items derived from the professional literature focused primarily on systemic and operational dimensions of centers, but these anecdotal responses suggest that center directors strategically identify and utilize highly respected faculty members for what might be considered "professional evangelism" or marketing to help promote the center and its programs.

A second finding was related to communication and outreach. Analysis of nearly a dozen comments revealed that this involved more than reporting on the center's work through public relations media such as annual reports, newsletters, or websites. Again, the comments were relational in nature, suggesting the necessity for center administrators and staff to reach out to faculty and community partners not merely to disseminate information and resources or provide technical assistance, but to establish and maintain a relationship. Respondents offered examples that reflected communications of a more conversational nature in which directors "checked in" with instructors and representatives of community agencies to see how things were going and to solicit and/or provide input and feedback.

Finally, 11 respondents also indicated that cross-campus collaboration was an essential component of a successful center and program. Complementing the critical need for a reporting line within academic affairs that the majority of respondents indicated, equally important was the ability to work with other units within student affairs. Directors provided examples and instances in which their offices worked with nonacademic units such as campus ministry and residential life. These responses most likely occurred in the context of cocurricular programming, but may in fact also reflect the necessity of curricular collaboration across academic disciplines to design, implement, and maintain service-learning courses.

Analysis and Implications

Institutional Architecture/Policy Context

The results of this investigation suggest that centers play a critical role in coordinating greater institution-wide commitment to community engagement. This appears to have implications for understanding how structures of campus centers not only reflect but influence institutional change. The results of this survey clearly suggest that campus centers have evolved throughout what might be called the first generation of this field. These offices have generally expanded from primarily coordinating cocurricular volunteer service, often within student affairs, to a comprehensive and professional administrative role funded by institutional dollars within academic affairs to coordinate campuswide community engagement initiatives. Roles and responsibilities now include logistical coordination of tracking and assessing programs coupled with management of transportation, implementation of risk management policy and procedures, and additional development and fund-raising.

Another significant role that has emerged over the past 25 years is providing faculty development opportunities to instructors who teach these types of courses. These data do not, however, include qualitative or detailed information on the content, format, or duration of the professional development, which will be important information to gather in the future. Survey responses indicated that most centers have at least three full-time staff members, with the director typically holding a faculty appointment. However, the professional pathway that brought these directors to this role is unclear and warrants further investigation.

Most of the respondents indicated that their institution either has a campuswide definition of community engagement or is in the process of establishing one. This raises a number of questions for further consideration: What is the role of creating an operational definition of community engagement activities in advancing community engagement as an institutional priority? Do established centers resist official definitions as a way of providing a broad umbrella of community engagement activities by many units on campus? Or are centers excluded from the process as a result of faculty-driven policy- and decision-making in which academics may or may not have the necessary expertise and background? Is a single official definition an obstacle to the development of disciplinary definitions of community engagement and thus a detriment

to encouraging departments to commit to community engagement? Is there a process that serves to open up space for many definitions on campus that then evolves into a move to conceptual clarity for the campus as a whole?

This study reveals widespread use of institutional funds, or "hard dollars," instead of grant monies, or "soft dollars," suggesting that these centers have become institutional priorities and that they are part of the longer term identity of the campus. It seems that if community engagement efforts are part of the core academic work of the campus, these centers are less likely to be to eliminated or reduced. The campuses in this study are independently recognized for their commitment to community engagement and are likely to overrepresent this core academic commitment. A comparative study of Carnegie classified campuses with those that are not classified could help determine whether institutions where community engagement is not tied closely to faculty work and the curriculum are more likely to scale back on a community engagement commitment in tight economic circumstances than campuses where community engagement is established as central to the academic enterprise.

The data on the background of the director deserves further study. What the survey does not reveal about career pathways into a center director position is potentially significant information. For example, a community leader may have received an advanced degree, taken a faculty position, and moved into directing community engagement, and may have checked multiple boxes. It would be useful to know more about the career pathway of community engagement center directors.

Finally, results from the reciprocal validity Top Ten lists reveal the important role of informal faculty leadership in promoting this work. This is related to yet separate from the topic of faculty development; however, the need for a critical mass of influential faculty has both cultural and political implications. Consequently, center directors must be cognizant of this factor and use it as an approach to garner support for programming. Similarly, the Top Ten responses revealed the important role of institutional administrators in publicly advocating centers and their mission to establish legitimacy across campus.

Center Infrastructure

These findings also suggest that the creation of an infrastructure to support community engagement is an evolving process. As

the operations of a center develop, the work becomes more complex and expansive. This investigation suggests that the evolutionary direction of centers includes (1) a need for more staff, more space, larger budgets, and more intentional fund-raising; (2) deeper affiliation with academic affairs and faculty roles and responsibilities; (3) better data gathering and reporting/communicating the work of the center and its outcomes; and (4) greater community partner voice and student voice in center planning and operations. Thus it appears that centers are in flux, which may indicate a growth and shift of the field as a whole. This suggests a growing level of importance of community engagement in higher education at a time of significant challenges and change. These results may indicate a trend in the structure and organization of campus centers that could be useful in program planning.

Center Programming

Because the sample in this study consists of highly engaged campuses, it should not be surprising that there is strong emphasis on community engagement as a core academic enterprise as part of the work of faculty. Significant effort is focused on faculty for building capacity, creating wider curricular options, and providing recognition. The emphasis on faculty development within the center's programming is critical in ensuring high-quality pedagogical practices. The greater the capacity of the faculty to deliver high-quality community engagement courses, the more curricular options for students an institution can offer. As a result, community engagement minors and certificates are emerging curricular options. There is also growing effort to recognize faculty who participate in community engagement through fellowships, grants, awards, and through making their work visible. Some aspects of recognition, however, are beyond the scope of this study. If faculty are not being recognized and rewarded for community engagement though the official reward structures for promotion, is there an effort to provide other forms of recognition being offered by the centers? If community engagement were rewarded as part of the scholarly work of faculty, would centers be focused as much on providing recognition for community engagement work?

Centers in this study seem to incorporate a great degree of student leadership in all aspects of community engagement. Students appear to have a voice, input, and an active role in the delivery of curricula and cocurricular community engagement. Students working with instructors embody reciprocity and the cocreation

of knowledge and reflect "students as colleagues" as described by Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams *(2006)*.

Conversely, the results also suggest that programming around community partners and partnerships lags behind programming for faculty and students. However, the high number of the aspirational "hope to" responses indicates recognition of the need to improve this balance of offerings.

Finally, results suggest that campuses distinguish between service-learning as a pedagogy and service-learning as a distinct body of knowledge. Service-learning as a major is rare, but service-learning as a pedagogical practice integrated into courses across majors is common.

Three factors or components emerged from the reciprocal validation in this study that were not included in the professional literature (faculty leadership, outreach/communication, cross-campus collaboration). These results suggest a need for further research in these areas.

Center directors might consider convening an advisory group consisting of students, faculty, representatives from community agencies, and midlevel administration to review and consider the results presented here. Such a review may assist in identifying which of these critical factors are in operation and in determining priorities for adding other components to a strategic plan. Directors of new centers might consider presenting the results of this study to administrators as a "wish list" to help implement and maintain the center and its work. Finally, this preliminary investigation should serve as a foundation for creating an assessment tool that campus centers could use to identify strengths and weaknesses in planning for improved operation and growth.

Conclusion

This investigation was conducted to identify defining features of campus centers for community engagement. Likewise this study attempted to identify purposes and goals of campus-community partnerships evident in the systemic structure of the centers. Finally, the survey was designed to determine which activities of these centers are directly related to collaborative work between campus and community agencies. The descriptive statistics and open-ended responses seem to reveal essential components for community centers on campus. These findings provide an important foundation for continued work.

However, additional research is needed to fully understand these data. Results of this study present a "brushstroke" of information regarding operations and programs, but the scope and structure of the survey did not provide adequate depth for a complete picture of operations and issues. The respondents are from centers and institutions that have received the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement and thus represent a unique sample pool; therefore, it is not possible to compare these programs to others. Likewise, it was not possible to ascertain whether certain practices and characteristics are associated with specific types of institutions, as the investigation did not include a mechanism for identifying and differentiating institutions. Continued research addressing these limitations is warranted and planned. This will broaden the scope of the results and allow for comparative analysis to identify common features unique to specific types of institutions (e.g., faith-based institutions, public research universities). A multiple regression analysis could be employed to identify components that predict or correlate with the Carnegie Classification.

These results provide an overview of essential features and practice. However, the data do not give us a detailed view of specific features. For example, the vast majority of respondents reported faculty development as a key component of their programming and operations, but detail regarding structure, content, duration, and delivery cannot be derived from these responses. Additionally, the professional pathway of center directors is unclear and thus an area of interest and further study. Therefore, the initial information gleaned from this investigation provides a compass point for future study.

In sum, the initial findings of this study should be of interest and value to campus administrators and center directors. The information presented here can be used to take inventory of current structures and practice to determine strengths and areas of need. This type of review and assessment will be a useful tool in creating goals in strategic planning that will enhance and support community engagement on college campuses.

References

Battistoni, R. M. (1998). Making a major commitment: Public and community service at Providence College. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education* (pp. 169–188). Bolton, MA: Anker Press.

Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221–239.

Bucco, D. A., & Busch, J. A. (1996). Starting a service-learning program. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 231–245). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation. (2012). *Community engaged elective classification*. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php

Clayton, P. H., & O'Steen, B., (2010) Working with faculty: Designing customized developmental strategies. In B. Jacoby & P. Mutascio (Eds.) *Looking in/reaching out: A reflective guide for community service-learning professionals* (pp. 95-136). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Etienne, H. F. (2012). *Pushing back the gates: Neighborhood perspectives on university-driven revitalization in West Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fisher, I. A. (1998). We make the road by walking: Building service-learning in and out of the curriculum at the University of Utah. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education* (pp. 210–230). Bolton, MA: Anker Press.

Furco, A. (2002). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. The *Journal of Public Affairs, 6,* 39–68.

Harkavy, I. (2004). Service-learning and the development of the Democratic Universities, Democratic Schools, and Democratic Good Societies in the 21st century. In M. Welch & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 3–22). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (2010). Developing your assessment plan: A key component of reflective practice. In B. Jacoby & P. Mutascio (Eds.), *Looking in/reaching out: A reflective guide for community service-learning professionals* (pp. 211–230). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Holland, B., & Langseth, M. N. (2010). Leveraging financial support for service-learning: Relevance, relationships, results, resources. In B. Jacoby & P. Mutascio (Eds.), *Looking in/reaching out: A reflective guide for community service-learning professionals* (pp. 185–210). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Hollander, E. L., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2002). Indicators of engagement. In M. E. Kenny, L. A. K. Simon, K. Kiley-Brabeck, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning*, (pp. 31-50). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.

Jacoby, B. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kecskes, K., & Kerrigan, S. (2009). Capstone experiences. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 117–139). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kendall, J. C. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vols. 1 & 2). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2010). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pigza, J. M., & Troppe, M. L. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 106–130). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Reason, P. (1994). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Rubin, S. (1996). Institutionalizing service-learning. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 297–316). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rue, P. (1996). Administering successful service-learning programs. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 246–275). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E., & Cruz, N. L. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Torbert, W. R. (1976). *Creating a community of inquiry: Conflict, collaboration, transformation.* New York, NY: John Wiley.

Walshok, M. L. (1999). Strategies for building the infrastructure that supports the engaged campus. In R. G. Bringle, R. Games, & E. A. Malloy (Eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp. 74–95). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Welch, M. (2009). Moving from service-learning to civic engagement. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 174–195). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Welch, M., Miller, P., & Davies, K. (2005). Reciprocal validity: Description and outcomes of a hybrid approach of triangulated qualitative analysis in the research of civic engagement. In S. Root, J. Callahan, & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impacts* (pp. 119–139). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Zlotkowski, E., Longo, N. V., & Williams, J. R. (2006). Students as colleagues. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

About the Authors

Marshall Welch is the Director of the Catholic Institute for Lasallian Social Action at Saint Mary's College of California since 2007. Marshall has been in higher education for 25+ years as a faculty member and Director of the Lowell Bennion Community Service Center at the University of Utah. He earned his doctorate in teacher education at Southern Illinois University. Marshall has taught service-learning courses and has been involved at the

local, regional, national, and international levels with publications, presentations, workshops, and consultation. Marshall has leadership roles with the International Association of Research on Service-learning and Community Engagement and Campus Compact.

John Saltmarsh is the Co-Director of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) at the University of Massachusetts, Boston and faculty member in the Higher Education Administration Doctoral Program. He leads the project in which NERCHE serves as the partner with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification. He holds a Ph.D. in American History from Boston University and taught for over a decade at Northeastern University and as a Visiting Research Fellow at the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College. John has numerous publications in the field of service-learning and community engagement.

 ISSN 1534-6104
© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 57, (2013)

The Impacts of Seed Grants as Incentives for Engagement

James J. Zuiches

Abstract

This article reports on an assessment of North Carolina State University's Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program (2004–2009). The research questions addressed the extent to which the grants (1) stimulated faculty interest in the engagement and outreach mission of the university; (2) served as incentives for faculty members to develop programs resulting in new partnerships with government, nonprofits, private sector, and other academic units; and (3) served as a platform to build a larger externally funded program of engagement and outreach activities as measured through grant proposals and awards.

Introduction

Creating incentives to encourage faculty to develop and grow research programs is a strategy often used by administrators in research and knowledge transfer offices. Some believe that seed grants, matching funding, and allocation of equipment and space can "nudge" faculty in directions that an institution considers high priority; however, such incentives are often justified by a philosophical position rather than statistical analysis.

This article evaluates the impacts of the 80 seed grants provided by the Office of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development at North Carolina State University (NC State) from 2004 to 2009 to faculty and non-faculty professionals. These competitive seed grants are available for innovative program development and for individual professional development to strengthen skills in extension, curricular engagement of students in community-based research, and partnership development—a crucial element in collaborative interdisciplinary and engaged programming. Proposals also had to address the use of seed funds to achieve sustainability through partnerships, and internal or external funding sources.

Two hypotheses undergirded the establishment of the Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program.

1. The seed grants would stimulate faculty interest in the engagement and outreach mission of the university, complementing the commitment of faculty to teaching and research.

2. The seed grants would serve as incentives for faculty members to develop programs resulting in new partnerships, and would serve as a platform to build a larger externally funded program in engagement and outreach activities.

Few studies have treated these hypotheses in a testable fashion.

Research Review

Tornatzky, Waugaman, and Gray *(2002)* have argued that specific organizational structures and processes, such as incentives, must be in place to create a positive environment that encourages innovation, engagement, and beneficial impacts. At the 2008 National Outreach Scholarship Conference *(Bruns & Kalivoda, 2008)*, a session was devoted to understanding what incentives exist to encourage the scholarship of engagement. Although the session identified multiple incentives, no evaluation of the impact of these incentives was provided.

Seed grants serve many functions. For junior faculty, they may initiate a research and extension educational program; for senior faculty, they may provide the opportunity to redirect research and extension activities into new realms. For non-faculty professionals not on tenure track, they provide a means to start new programs or grow current programs.

NC State University's Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program

The source of funds for NC State's Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program (Extension Seed Grant Program) is an important aspect of this project. Faculty generated over $267 million in sponsored projects for their teaching, research, public service, and extension programs during the 2010 fiscal year. Of that $267 million, over $48 million was directly attributable to faculty members who generated funding for public service, extension, and engagement projects. Externally funded projects usually include some level of indirect costs to support the facilities, the administration, and other overhead expenses associ-

ated with managing the projects. Not every organization will pay overhead costs. For example, many foundations and nonprofit organizations will not pay for overhead expenses; they expect the university to provide that as part of its cost share. State agencies will pay some overhead but often take the position that the state is already paying for the administration of the university and thus overhead expenses should be cost-shared. Similarly, the federal government, which negotiates overhead rates with the university, does not fully pay for the costs of the facilities and project oversight by university administrators.

When a university does receive funding from a granting agency in reimbursement and support for overhead expenses, some of that funding is often reinvested in the grant recipient's departments and colleges, or in senior administrative units (e.g., office of the vice chancellor or the vice president for research). In this article's example, from the $2.8 million generated in public service overhead, the Office of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development received $225,000 to support the office, and dedicated $160,000 to the Extension Seed Grant Program. Some funds are also reserved for a Just-In-Time program, a bridging grant program, and for program development and support activities within the Office of the Vice Chancellor. This rationale for reinvestment in program development then drove the expectation that the faculty grant recipients would use the seed grant funding to invest in programmatic development, and to grow the programs with additional external funding.

Assessment Methods

The methods used to assess the Extension Seed Grant Program involved an analysis of the 80 grants awarded over a 5-year period (2004–2009). Three research questions formed the basis for the assessment.

1. To what extent did the Extension Seed Grant Program stimulate faculty interest in the engagement and outreach mission of the university?
2. To what extent did the Extension seed grants serve as incentives for faculty members to develop programs resulting in new partnerships with government, nonprofits, private sector, and other academic units?
3. To what extent did the Extension seed grants serve as a platform to build a larger externally funded program of engagement and outreach activities as measured through grant proposals and awards?

The assessment included, first, a description of the seed grant process and characteristics of the awardees. Second, a review of each seed grant was performed to assess the type of partnerships proposed by the faculty member (principal investigator). Third, the principal investigators of each project were tracked in the university's grants and contracts system to determine whether they had submitted, in the years since the seed grant, one or more proposals for external funding on the seed grant topic. Finally, each grant proposal was assigned a code on the funding decision identifying the proposed sponsor, and whether the grant proposal was awarded the funding amount was reported.

Over the five years of seed grant proposals, 173 proposals were submitted and 80 funded. By comparing those funded internally with those not funded, one can test the hypothesis that the seed grant funding stimulated greater effort and success at external funding by the awardees than by other faculty not successful in the seed grant process.

The Extension Seed Grant Process

The Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program is administered by the University Standing Committee for Extension and Engagement. The committee includes faculty and non-tenure-track professionals, whose charge is to advise the Office of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development. The committee manages the entire seed grant process, including the proposal peer review.

Purposes of the program.

The purposes of the Extension Seed Grant Program are to stimulate both faculty and non-faculty professionals to address the needs of the citizens of North Carolina, to encourage external and multidisciplinary partnerships, to involve students in the application of knowledge to societal problems, and to leverage additional funds for extension and engagement endeavors. The seed grants are available for faculty and such professionals to pursue one or more of the following program goals:

- program development—initiate new and innovative programs that utilize personnel expertise to address critical issues;

- professional development—develop skills of faculty and other professionals to enhance the application of appropriate methodologies and the capacity to do extension work;
- student engagement—engage students with faculty and professionals to address critical issues and participate in the selection and implementation of appropriate methodologies; and
- partnership development—develop and position collaborative, interdisciplinary, and external partnerships to create comprehensive responses to critical issues. Position interdisciplinary teams to attract external funding and resources for extension efforts by providing support for grant-writing expertise and assistance.

Successful proposals must address the use of the seed grant funds toward sustainability of the project, whether through internal or external funding sources. Seed grant proposals can also set up pilot projects to strengthen applications for upcoming state, federal, or foundation grant competitions, or for development of a self-sustaining program through fee-for-services or generation of receipt revenue. Proposals that are deemed by the proposal reviewers to be only research proposals are not considered. Extension, engagement, and economic development proposals are distinguished from research proposals in that Extension seed grant projects

- apply research-based knowledge to a well-defined problem;
- test innovative solutions and applications for expected results;
- influence professional practice;
- improve quality of life and benefit the public good, particularly of North Carolina citizens;
- identify and develop reciprocal relationships with external constituencies; and
- include a communication and dissemination plan.

All North Carolina State University faculty members or non-faculty professionals are eligible to submit an Extension Seed Grant Program proposal. A total of $160,000 is available for the program each fiscal year. The maximum Extension Seed Grant award is

$10,000. The funding cycle is July 1 through June 30. Projects may not be renewed, but carryover of funds may be approved upon request. The process of proposal preparation, submission, and review is detailed in the Appendix.

Characteristics of the Awardees

In 2004, the first year of the program, 61 proposals were submitted and 18 were funded. Perhaps the low success rate (30%) caused a fall-off in applications, because in 2005, only 21 applications were received and 13 funded (a 62% success rate). After 2005, the number of applications fluctuated, with 35 in 2006 (16 funded), 22 in 2007 (17 funded), and 34 in 2008 (16 funded).

An analysis of the five program cohorts demonstrated an increase in the diversity, if not the number, of applications over time as faculty members from more of the university's colleges submitted applications. Seed grant awards averaged $8,850, with a range from $2,500 to $10,000. In the 5 years, 68 different faculty members were awarded seed grants, with 60 receiving one, four receiving two, and four others receiving three.

Describing the awards by faculty status, and without double-counting, shows that 38% (27) were awarded to tenured associate or full professors, 19% (13) to tenure-track assistant professors, 12% (8) to County Cooperative Extension field faculty members, and 31% (20) to non-tenure-track professionals leading outreach and extension programs. The success rate (50%) for tenured associate and full professors was higher than that for tenure-track assistant professors (46%); field faculty had a 40% success rate and non-tenure-track professionals a 45% success rate. An analysis by gender showed no difference in the success rate.

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of seed grants over the 5 years among the units of North Carolina State University. The largest number of proposals came from and were awarded to faculty members in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences through both its on-campus departments and its County Cooperative Extension offices. Thus more than 37% of seed grants were awarded to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; however, the success rate of 41% was less than the overall rate of 46%.

Extension seed grants were made to each college within the university. Members of units that report to the chancellor, the provost, the vice chancellor for research, and student affairs were also eligible to apply for the seed grants, and five seed grants were awarded to these units.

Types of Partnerships

An expectation of engagement with communities of interest, of place, or of purpose, requires the development of working relationships and strong partnerships to accomplish the mutual goals of all the partners, which can include university students, faculty

Table 1. North Carolina State University Extention, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grants, 2004-2009

College/Unit/Organization	Applications	Awards	Success Rate (%)
College of Agriculture Departments (22), Cooperative Exxtension Counties (8)	74	30	41
College of Design	11	8	73
College of Education	9	6	67
College of Engineering	19	5	26
College of Humanities & Social Sciences	10	8	80
College of Management	10	4	40
College of Natural Resources	14	7	50
College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences	5	4	80
College of Textiles	6	1	17
College of Veterninary Medicine	2	1	50
Other Units:	13	6	46
Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development, Shelton Leadership Center (1) Chancellor's Office/Kenan Institute (1) Provost's Office/Honors Program (2) Research and Graduate Studies/North Carolina Sea Grant (1) Student Affairs/Athletics (1)			
TOTAL	173	80	46

members, and administrators as well as community partners. As part of the Extension Seed Grant Program assessment, Cheryl Lloyd *(2009)* initiated a study to determine the degree of engagement with community partners. A partial analysis by Lloyd of 47 of the 80 seed grants showed that every principal investigator engaged others as partners. Those partners were either internal (members of the university) or external (community members). Partnerships included government agencies, nonprofits, the business sector, and student organizations.

Table 2 summarizes the primary partnerships for the 80 Extension seed grants in this assessment. The nonprofit and governmental agencies each reflected about 30% of the partnerships. These nonprofit, community-based organizations were often the beneficiary of the seed grant project as well as the source of

collaborative support, co-funding, and ideas for the delivery of programming. The government agencies ranged from local school districts and state agencies (e.g., the North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, and the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs) to county offices in which the needs of the county were brought to the local Cooperative Extension office for educational support and assistance. About 15% of seed grant projects focused on students and linked to North Carolina State University student organizations and youth groups, or family organizations. Finally, 26% of the seed grant projects worked with the private sector (e.g., businesses, manufacturing firms, farmers and farm organizations, entrepreneurs).

In addition to the primary partners, 31% of the projects had secondary partners, typically with County Cooperative Extension offices.

The following partial list of principal investigators in 2006–2007 who showed significant diversity in programming and university-

Table 2. Primary Partnerships in Extension Seed Grants, 2004-2009

Partner	Number	Percentage
Nonprofits (Community -based organizations)	23	29%
Government agencies (Local, state, county, school districts)	24	30%
Students, youth, and families	12	15%
Private sector (Business, manufacturing firms, farmers and farm organizations, entrepreneurs)	21	26%
TOTAL	80	100%

community partnerships gives a sense of the depth of collaboration. For example, Andrew O. Behnke, assistant professor/Extension specialist, Department of 4-H Youth Development and Family and Consumer Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, in his project Working with Latino Families to Develop Rural Safety and Health Education Program: Building Capacity Collaboratively, developed a community-wide event to share health and safety information with Latinos in rural Western North Carolina. The event occurred in 2007 and again in 2008, and the number of community collaborators increased from 32 in 2006–2007 to 142 in 2007–2008. Christine Grant, professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering, in her project, ADVANCE-ENGR Girls to Women: An Innovative Engineering Faculty-Student Mentoring Summit for Underrepresented Girls and Their Mothers, involved 76 faculty volunteers from engineering schools across the country.

Chris Reberg-Horton, professor, Department of Crop Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, in his project, Developing an Organic Grain Industry in North Carolina, connected individual farmers to buyers, seed-cleaning companies, crop consultants, county Extension agents, and others in the industry. David Tarpy, associate professor and Extension apiculturist, Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, in his project, Preparing for the Africanized "Killer" Honey Bee in North Carolina, tapped into the Cooperative Extension network of over 100 agents to distribute publications, press releases, CD ROMs, and other materials regarding Africanized ("killer") honeybees.

Proposals for External Funding

The 80 Extension seed grant awards to 68 different faculty members resulted in 76% (52) of the principal investigators applying for at least one external grant to expand and support their seed grant project efforts (Table 3). Of the 52 external grant applications, 81% (42) were successful, meaning that one or more grant proposals were funded. Even for projects unsuccessful in growing programs with additional internal or external grant funding, the creation of partnerships and the ability to generate funds from gifts and fees often sustained the projects. Not every seed grant resulted in a proposal for external funding. Professional development seed grants might benefit the faculty members in submitting future grant proposals, but they were unlikely to result in proposals for more professional development unless the faculty members were pursuing awards such as Fulbright Scholarships. Similarly, some projects represented institutional investments rather than projects that would be good candidates for external funding. For example, the North Carolina Aerospace Initiative was eventually funded by the institution. Nevertheless, in 88% (60/68) of the cases, seed grant awardees prepared and submitted external proposals on the project or on other topics. Many faculty members submitted multiple proposals to multiple agencies, but for purposes of this assessment, the author determined whether or not at least one proposal had been submitted and then whether or not at least one external grant proposal had been funded. In eight cases, the award winners did not write a proposal based on the work of the seed grant, nor did they move their program in that direction, but they wrote proposals on other topics, and received external funding. Overall, 84% were successful in generating additional funding.

Comparing Seed Grantees and Other Faculty Success Rates

The analysis for this section sought to answer the research question: To what extent did the Extension seed grants serve as a platform to build a larger externally funded program of engagement and outreach activities as measured through grant proposals and awards? Between 2004 and 2009, 68 faculty members were awarded 80 seed grants; 78 other faculty members submitted at least one Extension seed grant proposal, but were not funded. Although this is not a perfect control comparison, one could argue that Extension seed grant awardees (who have already convinced a peer group that they have good ideas) were more likely to increase their external grant activity and success.

To eliminate the effect of multiple applications and/or successes, there was no double-counting in the analysis. A faculty member who was awarded one or three Extension seed grants was counted only once. The same was true for applicants, regardless of how many times they applied for an Extension seed grant. Similarly, if a faculty member was awarded a seed grant in one year, but was declined in other years, the author counted the faculty member only once (in the grantee column).

Table 3 illustrates that being awarded an Extension seed grant stimulated principal investigator efforts to seek external funding for the seed grant topic. Since those Extension seed grant proposers who were not awarded seed grants were unlikely to pursue funding related to their seed grant proposal topic areas, the author evaluated their efforts and external grant proposal and award success in all topic areas (e.g., research, instruction, engagement and outreach). For the purpose of making comparisons, the same was done for Extension seed grant awardees (i.e., external grant proposal and award success in all topic areas is presented in Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Extension Seed Grantees and Unfunded Seed Grant Proposers: External Grant Proposal Award Success, 2004-2009

	Funded Extension Seed Grand Faculty Members	Non Funded Extension Seed Grant Faculty Members
Number of Faculty Members	68	78
External Grant Proposal Application Rate		
Seed Grant Topic	76% (52/68)	Not Available
All Topics	88% (60/68)	64% (50/78)
External Grant Proposal Success Rate		
Seed Grant Topic	81% (42/52)	Not Available
All Topics	95% (57/60)	86% (43/50)
Overall External Grant Proposal Success Rate	**84% (57/68)**	**55% (43/78)**

Those awarded Extension seed grants were more likely to submit external proposals both on the seed grant topics and on other areas of their interest, as 88% submitted at least one proposal to an external agency during the evaluation period. In contrast, only 64% of those not awarded Extension seed grants submitted external agency proposals. Both groups, however, had success when applying for external funding; 95% of the seed grantees secured external grant funding, as did 86% of the non–Extension seed grant group. More important for those interested in university-community engagement, is the greater percentage (84%) of Extension seed grant awardees (compared to 55% of the non-Extension seed grant faculty members) who wrote proposals for external funding, and increased the size and scale of their extension and engagement programs.

Seed Grants and Their Impacts

Examination of individual projects indicates that a number of faculty members were dramatically successful in extending their programs beyond that initiated by the Extension seed grant. Three examples are listed below.

- In forensic anthropology, the Extension seed grant resulted in a Center for Forensics Research and Education, and a National Science Foundation (NSF) $1.3 million grant to strengthen forensic sciences.
- Extension seed grant funding was provided to the General H. Hugh Shelton Leadership Initiative, which is now the General H. Hugh Shelton Leadership Center and has developed six Shelton Challenge Summer Institutes for high school students—completely funded by gifts and fees.
- In the College of Design, one faculty member has built on two Extension seed grants to generate eight community-based projects, leveraging $247,000, and involving dozens of NC State students and external partners.

One could sum the external funding generated by faculty members who had Extension seed grants, but attributing all subsequent external funding to the seed grant project would be overreaching. Very conservatively, however, it is estimated that follow-up grant funding that built on the Extension seed grants exceeds $5 million, a return of 7:1 on the $708,120 invested.

Specific institutional successes include the following, in which multiple sources of funding contributed to the sustainability of the program:

- In 2004, Chris Brown and the Kenan Institute won a seed grant to develop a strategic approach to involving the public and private sectors in strengthening and developing the aerospace economy in North Carolina. During the next 5 years, a number of studies, workshops, conferences, and state of the industry assessments were completed (Brown, Nayaran, & Watts, n.d.). In 2009, NC State University created the North Carolina Aerospace Initiative (NCAI), with the goal of creating a North Carolina Center for Aerospace Research and Development. Internal resources of over $100,000 were marshaled for NCAI.
- In the College of Education, Jessica DeCuir-Gundy received a seed grant to strengthen the achievement of minority students in the Raleigh, North Carolina area. She then partnered with Christine Grant in Engineering to win an NSF ADVANCE Leadership Award. This program provides networking support for minority women across the country in STEM disciplines. Grant was especially effective at obtaining in-kind support for her mentoring summit from seven partners.
- The Center for Environmental Farming Systems won a seed grant in 2007 to develop a community-based food system in Wayne County, North Carolina. The Center recently announced a W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant ($1.5 million) to extend its local food systems efforts across the state and a Kellogg gift of $3.15 million for two endowed professorships.
- The College of Textiles conducted a needs assessment and developed a series of short courses for textile leaders and industry participants. The Textiles Extension Program lin 2010 generated nearly a million dollars in fees for its educational program to the industry.
- The North Carolina Sea Grant program received a seed grant to develop a program for UNC-TV (a public television network that is part of the University of

North Carolina system) on North Carolina Now. This successful three-part series of stories about Sea Grant research and outreach programs has been broadcast across the state.

- The North Carolina tax system has huge implications for economic development. With two seed grants, Roby Sawyers, College of Management, has engaged the business community in a comprehensive state and local tax modernization conversation in meetings and workshops. This project supports the Institute for Emerging Issues "Financing the Future" work. If tax laws were changed, the impact of this work on the state would be enormous.
- The diversity of NC State's student body in the next 10 years will change dramatically as more Latino students matriculate. With three different seed grants, Andrew Behnke, Department of 4-H Youth Development and Family and Consumer Sciences, and his colleagues have developed programs that create a Latino parent education network, provide rural safety and health education, and focus on school success of Latino children.
- The Great Smokies Community and Leadership Development Institute was held in Waynesville, North Carolina with partial funding from the seed grant to Robert Hawk, Cooperative Extension county community development field faculty member.
- The Science House has received two seed grants to extend science-related outreach to K-12 students and teachers across North Carolina. It recently announced two major NSF (National Science Foundation) grants to expand and extend its efforts to prepare rising 10th graders for careers in scientific fields, and in the FREEDM System Center for K-12 outreach with its pre-college partners to provide energy-related outreach and educational programs. A Golden LEAF Foundation grant is supporting satellite offices in Asheville, Edenton, Fayetteville, Jacksonville, and Lenoir, North Carolina, providing services to 4,400 teachers and 27,000 students annually.

- John Begeny, assistant professor in the Department of Psychology, received two seed grants. He works not only with community partners at the institutional level, but also with schoolteachers, counselors, and volunteers, and directly with parents and elementary school children. He has created a nonprofit organization, Helping Early Literacy with Practice Strategies (HELPS), a One-on-One Program, and associated HELPS Curriculum. Begeny is an active and prolific scholar, having 25 current publications, including two books, and 18 more completed projects that are in the process of being written for publication. Many publications are co-authored with students and community partners, demonstrating his commitment to collaboration and engagement. The nonprofit foundation he created, the HELPS Education Fund, is home to two of his books and all his instructional materials, so that his reading programs are available free to schools everywhere. In 2010, NERCHE recognized Begeny's work with a Citation for Distinguished Engaged Scholarship.

Areas for Future Consideration

In addition to the expectation that an awarded seed grant will result in external funding or other forms of institutional support, one would expect that the faculty members would demonstrate the scholarship of engagement *(Scholarship of Engagement Task Force, 2010)*, and that their work would result in journal articles as well as reports to the community. The current assessment did not address this, but it would be a legitimate area of study. Similarly, the impact on a faculty member's reappointment, promotion, and tenure would also be an important area for research. In addition, the Extension seed grant process itself deserves serious review in areas such as recruitment of proposals, the proposal review process, criteria for evaluating proposals, end-of-project reporting, and evaluation of the connection with partners and long-term impacts.

Conclusion

In summary, North Carolina State's Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development Seed Grant Program has inspired faculty interest, created partnerships, increased external grant agency proposals, and generated significant external funding to grow the

diversity of programs in extension, engagement, and economic development at the university.

The assessment reported in this article demonstrates the value and impact of the seed grant program. Early career faculty members were able to initiate extension and engagement programs, build community partnerships, and grow their programs with external funding. Senior faculty members initiated new areas of engagement and outreach work. Often their projects were not likely to be funded initially by research agencies; the demonstrated results increased the likelihood of securing alternative sources of funding from state agencies, foundations, private grants, and fees-for-services. Non-tenure-track professionals were able to leverage partnerships and funding to continue efforts started with the seed grants. These results alone argue for a continuation of the Extension Seed Grant Program.

References

Brown, C. S., Nayaran, R., & Watts, D. T. (n.d.). Ready to soar: Aviation and aerospace in North Carolina. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.

Bruns, K. S., & Kalivoda, T. (2008). *Incentives and support to encourage the scholarship of engagement—examples*. Conference session at the 9th National Outreach Scholarship Conference, State College, PA.

Lloyd, C. L. (2009). *Engagement institutionalized*. Unpublished manuscript, Raleigh, NC.

Scholarship of Engagement Task Force. (2010, June). *Integrating learning, discovery, and engagement through the scholarship of engagement*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.

Tornatzky, L. G., Waugaman, P. G., & Gray, D. O. (2002).. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Growth Policies Board.

Appendix

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

Proposals should follow the Proposal Outline Form and be no longer than five (5) pages in length using 12-point font and 1-inch margins. The Proposal Budget Form must also be completed and attached to the proposal. In preparing the budget, awards may not be used for salary supplements. Awards may be used for student support, temporary labor, travel, communications, and supplies. A 50 percent match is required from either internal and/or external

sources. The match from external sources may be in-kind or cash. For internal sources—we prefer a split of 25 percent cash and 25 percent in-kind.

Proposal Review and Selection Information

Faculty and other professionals who are members of the University Standing Committee on Extension and Engagement review proposals. Following an initial screening by the Committee for eligibility, each proposal is evaluated by at least three members based on the following eight criteria:

1. Is the proposal an extension and engagement proposal as defined in RFP?
2. Does the proposal address a critical need facing North Carolina, as evidenced by literature, core studies, audience analysis, or needs assessment?
3. Will the proposal strategies adequately address the identified need?
4. Do the principal investigator(s) and/or implementation team have the capacity to carry out the proposal?
5. Is there evidence of a collaborative, multidisciplinary partnership—internal or external to the University?
6. Does the proposal provide opportunities for students to become engaged in this work?
7. Can the project be completed or show significant impact by June 30 in one year?
8. Is the project sustainable with either internal or external funding after the seed grant funding ends?

Each proposal is rated by its reviewers on a scale of 1 (high) to 10 (low), based on a proposal's ability to meet the prescribed criteria.

Extension Seed-Grant Award Administration

Those awarded an Extension seed grant must conduct an appropriate evaluation of the project to determine the benefits to the population served. Faculty and staff who plan to develop new skills and abilities must identify how the professional development experience will enhance a target population or address a critical

issue. Awardees are expected to complete a final report, no longer than three (3) pages in length, to be submitted to the Office of Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development no later than mid-September following the award.

The final report should include the following information:

Required:

- Program Objectives and Impacts—How was the identified need or opportunity addressed and how were these impacts evaluated? How did this project contribute to the economy or overall quality of life of North Carolina or the target population?
- Human Enrichment—Describe the involvement of and impact on individuals who worked with the project, including principal investigator(s), students, collaborators and program participants. How were these impacts evaluated?
- Sustainability and Future Funding—Will the program continue? Describe additional funds for this program that have been sought and obtained or are pending.

Additional Contributions:

- How did this project contribute to the University?
- How did you communicate the outcomes of this project to the broader community (department, college, university, state or nation)?
- Describe and include when possible any media coverage of this project.
- How did this project contribute to your scholarship?

About the Author

James J. Zuiches is retired vice chancellor for Extension, Engagement, and Economic Eevelopment at North Carolina State University. He earned his bachelor's degree in philosophy and sociology from the University of Portland, and his master's degree and Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 75, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

Curricular Placement of Academic Service-Learning in Higher Education

Amy Phillips, Steven R. Bolduc, and Michael Gallo

Abstract

The higher education service-learning literature is rich with case studies, guidelines for service-learning course and program development, and demonstrations of the impact of service-learning on students. Minimal discussion, however, focuses on the *strategic placement* of service-learning in disciplinary curricula, and how curricular placement might support and enhance student learning and developmental outcomes. This study offers a summary of curricular placement themes from the service-learning literature and reviews findings from a survey of two national service-learning electronic mailing lists about intentional decision making related to departmental curricular placement of service-learning. Both the literature review and survey data support the need for a curricular placement research agenda, particularly tied to promotion of student learning and developmental outcomes.

Introduction

The higher education service-learning literature contains significant discussion about the impact of service-learning on student learning and its potential for civic and educational transformation through community-university partnerships *(Calderon, 2007; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hancock, Smith, Timpte, & Wunder, 2010; Jacoby & Associates, 2003, 2009; Kelshaw, Lazarus, Minier, & Associates, 2009; Nadel, Majewski, & Sullivan-Cosetti, 2007; Root, Callahan, & Billig, 2005; Spann, 2010; Welch & Billig, 2004)*. Numerous resources are also available to assist faculty and universities in conceptualizing, implementing, assessing, and institutionalizing service-learning courses and programs *(Battistoni, 2002; Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2003; Campus Compact, n.d.; Howard, 2001; Rouse & Sapiro, 2007; Stallwood & Groh, 2011; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009; Westdijk, Koliba, & Hamshaw, 2010; Zlotkowski, 2007)*. In the midst of this wealth of information, however, the strategic placement of service-learning in disciplinary curricula has received limited attention as a line of inquiry. Does curricular placement play a role in the usefulness and impact of service-learning? How can academic departments best use different types of service-learning activities at different points in the curriculum? How does curricular

placement support student learning and developmental outcomes? Do academic departments make intentional decisions about the placement of service-learning in their curricula, and if so, what information informs those decisions? These are the types of questions Zlotkowski *(2000)* raised in reference to research directions for "service-learning in the disciplines." Additional authors, before and since, have discussed service-learning in relation to topics such as first-year adjustment, student developmental phases, and prefield preparation. Although these discussions, and others, refer to curricular placement, none has featured curricular placement as its central focus. In addition, no evidence-informed framework has emerged to help faculty, and their departments, decide what types of service-learning projects to place at what points in the curriculum to promote selected learning and developmental outcomes.

In an effort to support a new direction for service-learning research, the authors undertook a two-part exploratory study that (1) reviewed service-learning literature for themes related to service-learning curricular placement, and (2) surveyed members of two national service-learning electronic mailing lists to determine whether, and how, academic departments made intentional decisions about the strategic placement of service-learning in their curricula. As this was an exploratory study, it did not exhaustively encompass all service-learning literature, nor does it offer generalizable research findings. The authors, however, hope the study will encourage a line of inquiry that may ultimately provide information to support intentional faculty and departmental decision-making about the curricular placement of service-learning. Such intentionality may then further enhance student, and even community, outcomes.

The following sections outline findings from the literature review, and discuss the results of the service-learning survey.

Curricular Placement in the Service-Learning Literature

To gain some understanding of the extent to which service-learning theorists, researchers, and practitioners have referenced service-learning curricular placement and in what context, Phillips reviewed service-learning journals and books published between 1994 and 2010 (the References reflect a sampling of the journals and texts reviewed). The selection was by no means exhaustive, but the authors believed the chosen texts, particularly the journal

articles, provided a representative sample of service-learning discourse and offered a good starting point for a review of the topic.

Texts were examined for reference to the *curricular placement* of service-learning in higher education curricula. The authors did not focus on the process by which faculty members matched service-learning with a particular course, but rather on examples of service-learning courses placed at particular locations in departmental curricula and the rationale for such placement. The authors conceptualized connections between curricular placement and student learning or developmental outcomes. As articles or chapters were found that fit these criteria, a list of examples was developed.

Findings

In the texts reviewed, little explicit content about service-learning curricular placement and placement rationale emerged as a central focus of discussion. Most content dealt with service-learning impact on students, purpose/paradigms/models, theoretical underpinnings, implementation strategies, case studies, faculty motivation and perceptions, assessment, institutionalization, community partnership research agendas, and technologies (e.g., reflection activities). Material bearing some connection to curricular placement fell into two primary categories: conceptual and applied. The conceptual writings were of a theoretical nature, discussing service continua and developmental models; the applied material consisted of case examples that contained curricular placement components. The following sections discuss each of these broad categories, with the applied category further segmented into specific curricular placement themes.

Conceptual content.

While not providing explicit direction for curricular placement, the literature that conceptualizes connecting student developmental outcomes to service-learning activities is important to the curricular placement issue. The literature provides examples of matching service-learning courses or activities to a desired student learning outcome or to a student developmental outcome or stage. Delve, Mintz, and Stewart *(1990)* developed a service-learning model that described five phases of student development related to service experience (exploration, clarification, realization, activation, and internalization). The authors suggested that instructors could design service-learning activities to match each of these stages. Introductory through intensive service-learning

projects provide varying depth and breadth of experience but need to be constructed based on students' prior service experience and phases of service development. The model suggests that an intensive service-learning course requiring significant community immersion and student self-directed activity is more appropriate for those students in the activation or internalization phase than for students at the front end of a curriculum who may be in the service exploration phase. Bringle and Hatcher *(1996)*, in referencing the service-learning model, note that "a mature service-learning curriculum will promote this type of student development through coordinated course sequences and assessment of student outcomes" *(p. 12)*.

Giles and Eyler *(1994)* reinforced the notion of stages of service development by positing the idea of a "continuity of experience" for which they suggested the following research questions:

> Is there a developmental continuum of service-learning experiences? What kinds are more likely to be educative in early stages of development? Is there an appropriate sequence of activities? What life histories and developmental biographies can be developed to illuminate this continuum, if there is one? *(p. 82)*

Interestingly, Morton *(1995)* challenged Giles & Eyler by suggesting that the continuum idea results in types of placements (service placements in introductory classes to systemic change activities in capstone courses) that promote a rigid notion of service. Morton contended that a "paradigm of placements" (charity, project, social change) better allows students to operate in any choice of service with "ever-increasing integrity and insight" *(p. 30)*.

McEwen *(1996)* offered an "outcomes first" look at a variety of theories of learning and development. Reviewing models and frameworks about cognitive development, moral development, spiritual development, experiential learning, psychosocial development, identity development, and career development, McEwen detailed the developmental outcomes that service-learning may promote. She suggested that "service-learning educators should consider and be intentional in identifying desired student learning and development outcomes, and then design the course or program so that it promotes specific goals and identified outcomes" *(p. 87)*. Additional authors have discussed the potential for particular outcomes when service-learning is placed in introductory courses

(McCarthy, 1996) or capstone courses *(Enos & Troppe, 1996)*, or is the focus of an "intensive" or "immersion" experience *(Albert, 1996)*.

Zlotkowski *(2000)*, in an article about service-learning research directions, recognized that there had been minimal "attention to the department as a factor in the service-learning equation" *(p. 64)* and asked the following questions:

- What is the role of service-learning in introductory courses? Can service-learning be used in these courses to excite interest in the major?
- In capstone courses, how might service-learning help students synthesize their learning?
- How can service-learning help prepare students for internships and practica? *(p. 64).*

Zlotkowski stressed that faculty must "begin to understand better both what service-learning can be expected to deliver at different levels of disciplinary competence and what it can uniquely contribute as part of an overall program" *(p. 64)*. Zlotkowski's reflections were a clear call for disciplines to think not only about the "value added" role of service-learning but also about what curricular location adds the most value to the curriculum and to student outcomes.

Although service-learning curricular placement was not a central focus of all the texts mentioned above, they certainly point to its importance. Moving students along a continuum of service, supporting their phase of service development, promoting developmental outcomes, or determining the role of service-learning in a department—if the question is how to best accomplish any one of these goals, then examining where to place service-learning courses in the disciplinary curriculum is a necessary part of the inquiry.

Applied content.

In addition to the conceptual discussions mentioned above, the service-learning literature contains numerous case studies, some of which make direct or indirect reference to service-learning course placement in the departmental curriculum. Phillips categorized these "applied" examples according to the placement purpose suggested by the author or implied in the example. Three main purposes emerged for placement in a particular curricular location: to build and strengthen disciplinary knowledge and skills; to support student developmental stages; and to institutionalize

and/or promote service-learning. In the context of these themes, service-learning courses served various functions. Table 1 shows the relationship between curricular purpose and course function. Each purpose is discussed in more depth below.

Table 1. Purpose of Curricular Placement and Course Function

Purpose of Curricular Placement	Build and Strengthen disciplinary knowledge and skills	Support student developmental stages	Institutionalize and/or promote service-learning
Course Function	"Enrich students' understanding of the discipline"	Sequencing to respond to and build student capacities	Centerpiece of degree program
	Connection and collaboration of students in final year Pre-field placement preparation	Address various stages of service readiness	Encouragement for preprofessionals to use service-learning in their own practices
	Long-term project over several semesters	Complement student maturity level	

Purpose 1: To build and strengthen disciplinary knowledge and skills.

Authors from various disciplines discussed how service-learning placement could progressively enhance disciplinary learning outcomes. Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold *(2007)* suggested that sequenced service-learning courses in any discipline could "enrich students' understanding of the discipline" *(p. 295)*. Reflecting this sequencing approach, Coyle, Jamieson, and Sommers *(1997)* described a multi-year, team-based service-learning project in engineering designed for increasingly more advanced learning outcomes; similarly, Lenk *(1998)* reported on a four-semester "strategic alliance model" in accounting.

Service-learning courses could also prepare students for field placements or provide capstone experiences. Social work faculty have used service-learning courses as a "bridge" to field placement *(Kropf & Tracey, 2002)*, and health education programs have incorporated service-learning into "pre-clinical curricula" in order to expose students to community needs *(Connors, Seifer, Sebastian, Cora-Bramble, & Hart, 1996)*. A final course in environmental studies brought students together for an "interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary culminating experience" *(Elder, McGrory Klyza, Northup, & Trombulak, 1999, p. 111)*, and a project-based capstone marketing course used service-learning to strengthen marketing-related

competencies and to prepare "students for a global and diverse workplace" *(Metcalf, 2010)*. Lawrence and Butler *(2010)* emphasized the importance of "alternative field experiences" and their potential to better prepare teacher education students for student teaching and their own teaching practice. Enos and Troppe *(1996)* described several disciplinary capstone courses, noting that these courses can help students "make deep connections between service and their discipline," but that such capstones work best "in combination with other service-learning options that can serve as preliminary stepping-stones for students" *(p. 174)*.

Purpose 2: To support student developmental stages.

In addition to building *disciplinary* knowledge and skills progressively, some departments and universities have used service-learning curricular placement to promote other developmental ends. A management curriculum placed service-learning experiences throughout the curriculum that required, and responded to, increasingly independent levels of learning *(Lamb, Lee, Swinth, & Vinton, 2000)*. DePaul University's Ladder of Social Engagement initiative worked to ensure levels of curricular and co-curricular service-learning so that students "would take on greater responsibilities for social engagement" *(Meister & Strain, 2004, p. 111)*. The 20/20 Program in a teacher education program offered a progression of service-learning projects over the course of the entire curriculum in order to sequentially develop the skills of recognizing community needs, responding to those needs, and functioning as service-learning leaders *(Colby, Bercaw, Clark, & Galiardi, 2009)*.

Maturity levels were also identified as factors in placement consideration, with an accounting instructor *(Pringle, 1998)* using service-learning in intermediate rather than introductory classes because of student increased comfort level with technical material and discussing financial matters with others. Weis *(1998)* and Martin & Coles *(2000)* also note the importance of placing more sophisticated service-learning activities at points in the curriculum that match student maturity level.

Purpose 3: To institutionalize and/or promote service-learning.

Instead of singular locations for service-learning, some departments placed service-learning at several locations in the curriculum

in an effort to move service-learning from the "periphery" to the "center" of a degree program. This effort served to further institutionalize service-learning or to socialize pre-service professionals into the practice of service-learning. Hudson and Trudeau *(1995)* demonstrated how service-learning became the cornerstone of a degree in public and community service studies. Erickson and Anderson *(1997)* gave examples of several teacher preparation programs infusing service-learning throughout the curriculum "in order to make it part of the skill-based repertoire possessed by beginning teachers" *(p. 203)*.

Content Analysis Summary

Although the literature did not demonstrate service-learning curricular placement as an area of research or point to guidelines for curricular placement, a handful of authors discussed the topic conceptually, indicating that faculty and departments should consider placement when promoting or responding to developmental stages. Curricular placement themes in case studies also reflected faculty attempts to locate service-learning in ways that would promote disciplinary knowledge, support developmental outcomes, or institutionalize service-learning.

Service-Learning Curricular Placement Survey

In addition to extrapolating curricular placement themes from the literature, this project explored whether academic departments discussed curricular placement when planning curriculum, and if so, what factors influenced their placement decisions. To this end, the authors developed an online survey that they distributed, after receiving IRB (institutional review board) approval, to two professional electronic mailing lists: the HE-SL Email Discussion List sponsored by Learn and Serve America's National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, and the Community-Based Participatory Research e-mail community operated by the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health through the University of Washington.

The survey comprised three parts: Part 1 gathered basic faculty demographic information and ended with the question, "Does your department discuss and intentionally decide where to place service-learning in the department curriculum?" Part 2 consisted of questions for respondents who replied "yes" to the "intentional decision" question, and Part 3 consisted of questions for respondents who replied "no." The primary focus of this article is on data collected from Parts 1 and 2. The complete survey may be found in the Appendix.

The survey received responses from 86 individuals. Nineteen surveys were incomplete, leaving 67 (77.9%) respondents who completed Parts 1 and 2 or Parts 1 and 3. Of the 67 respondents who completed surveys, 21 (31.3% of completed surveys) replied that their departments intentionally discuss the curricular placement of service-learning courses, and 46 (68.7% of the completed surveys) replied that their departments do not intentionally discuss curricular placement.

Sample Characteristics

No dramatic demographic differences appeared between respondents whose departments discuss curricular placement and those whose departments do not. Neither the average years in higher education nor the number of years engaged in service-learning varied significantly between the two groups. Moreover, neither the size of department nor the number of faculty within a department using service-learning varied significantly.

Of the 21 respondents who replied that their departments do indeed intentionally discuss curricular placement, 16 (76%) were from public institutions, and 5 (24%) were from private institutions. Fifteen were either assistant, associate, or full professors, with six serving as lecturers, instructors, or "other." Seven taught only at the undergraduate level, five only at the graduate level, and nine at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Of the 21 respondents, 18 came from just four academic areas: medicine and human services, with six each (28.6%), and education and social services, with three each (14.3%). The remaining three were from humanities (two respondents) and engineering (one respondent). The business disciplines and the natural sciences were not represented.

Geographically, respondents were relatively uniformly dispersed. Four respondents were from east coast states, three were from the west, another three were from southern states, and nine were from the Midwest. Two respondents did not report their location.

The qualitative analysis that follows explores the content and process of department discussions reported by the 21 respondents who indicated that their departments intentionally discuss curricular placement.

Qualitative Results

The 21 respondents who answered yes to the question, "Does your department discuss and intentionally decide where to place

service-learning in the department curriculum?" were asked to respond to four follow-up questions related to the nature of the departmental decision-making process and a fifth general question about curricular placement. Interestingly, several answers to follow-up questions provided no clear response to the questions or indicated that no departmental coordinated effort related to service-learning exists. Either respondents realized via the follow-up questions that their departments did not actually engage in intentional *departmental* service-learning decision making, or for whatever reason the respondents could not describe their decision-making process. Nevertheless, over half of the 21 respondents provided usable data, and these were analyzed, and then organized according to the frequency or category of responses. The paragraphs below summarize findings from the analyzed data for each of the four follow-up questions.

Question 1: Please describe how often and the process by which your department makes decisions about service-learning in the curriculum.

The most frequent response to this question was that decisions were made annually and in the context of a department meeting or some type of departmental curriculum review (course, syllabus, or larger curriculum review). For example, one respondent stated that the department "reviews course syllabi annually to determine SL [service-learning] components and learning objectives, community partners and service objectives." Another respondent noted, "every year, teacher education faculty review current course syllabi. Service-learning is a part of this discussion."

A few responses indicated that discussions took place quarterly, bi-weekly, once, or were "ongoing" and that the occasions for these discussions were departmental strategic planning sessions, when new adjuncts were hired, or in conversations with a service-learning coordinator or the campus service-learning center. One respondent wrote, "The school of engineering is new, currently in its fourth year. The decision for service-learning in the curriculum was made during the initial curriculum development." Another respondent, who had service-learning coordinating responsibilities, responded,

> I have been meeting informally with course instructors to see where community requests can fit with curriculum under development. We are about to establish an advisory committee with students, staff and community

organizations giving ideas and input. Individual instructors currently make decisions about service-learning in their particular course curriculum.

Question 2: What factors are considered when your department decides where to place service-learning in the curriculum?

Answers to this question coalesced around several response categories, discussed below.

Best match to course goals.

Most responses (n = 10) fell into this category and demonstrated that faculty made service-learning placement decisions simply on the basis of which courses were seen to be best suited in terms of "course goals" or course "learning objectives." As one respondent put it, "Learning objectives for a particular course would probably be the primary consideration. After that, it is a matter of fit between course content and schedule as well as the community's expressed needs and situation." While this category of response is related to curricular placement since the courses selected are located somewhere in the curriculum, the responses do not provide any indication as to whether the locations of these service-learning courses are seen as tied to student developmental processes or a sequence of curricular learning.

Assessment of professional fit or as professional preparation.

In this category, service-learning in both introductory and upper-level courses was viewed as a mechanism to help determine student fit with the profession and to develop skills via professional service activities. One respondent's comment illustrates.

> At this time, our service-learning in this Department is placed as a component in the Teaching in a Democracy course which is offered as the introductory course to our Educational sequence of courses. By engaging in service-learning experiences in the community, they see that being a teacher is a service occupation and that if they do not have a passion for helping others, teaching is not a good career choice. Some determine that this is not a field for them after their experiences, however most become even more excited about their chosen career.

Another response noted that service-learning was used as professional assessment in the capstone year as part of a subject titled "Professional Development and Leadership." Service-learning was also used by one respondent as a fourth-year clinical rotation project and by another as preparation for senior-level engineering design courses.

Sequencing of learning or service.

In several cases, respondents seemed to be placing service-learning at several points in the curriculum to support increasingly complex levels of learning or service. As one noted, "we approach SL [service-learning] developmentally with 100-level classes being closer to reflective volunteering and 200-level classes being more involved in field research or identified community needs." Another respondent indicated: "We have a curricular stream and have identified core courses where community learning would benefit and truly teach the skills so each semester one course is a SL [service-learning] course."

Miscellaneous.

Additional factors discussed regarding curricular placement included how much time students had and when the curricular schedule had flexibility to accommodate the most students. One response asserted that lower division students had more time in their schedules for service-learning, and another response indicated that upper division students had more time. One respondent mentioned that faculty willingness was the primary factor determining the placement of service-learning, and another vaguely identified the primary factor as "How to serve the community."

Question 3: Are any of the following student outcomes or competencies discussed in relation to the curricular placement of service-learning (General education outcomes; Professional/disciplinary competencies; Student developmental outcomes; None of the above)?

In response to this question, which asked specifically about the relationship between student outcomes or competencies and the curricular placement of service-learning, almost all respondents ($n = 20$) answered, either solely or in combination with other answers, that their departments were concerned with Professional

or Disciplinary Competencies in relation to the curricular placement of service-learning. Twelve respondents included General Education outcomes in their answer, and 15 respondents included Student Developmental Outcomes that coalesced around social responsibility, diversity competency, and valuing life-long learning.

Question 4: Does your department intentionally place different types of service-learning projects at different points in the curriculum?

Of the 21 respondents, 9 answered "no" and 12 answered "yes." "Yes" answers were almost equally divided between service-learning projects that appeared to be found only once in the curriculum for a particular purpose and service-learning projects distributed at various points in a curriculum to encourage knowledge and skill development. Of the first variety, one respondent discussed a second-year community service-learning project for medical students in which students interacted with rural elementary children at a camp related to health careers. Another respondent described a senior-level service-learning project connected to two courses in which students engage in neighborhood scans to identify building code violations by absentee property owners. Two other responses identified freshman- and sophomore-level courses in which students engage in service-learning projects to determine their interest in the major or to gather additional volunteer experience based on their personal interests (such as helping with funding for public television).

The second grouping of answers described a continuum of service-learning projects that appeared to provide progressively more intensive experiences or more independent activity. One respondent noted that second-year projects take place in a "well-contained" setting, while final year projects take place in the community and involve "real life preparation for the profession." Another respondent described one-time service experiences (such as serving food in a homeless shelter) for first-year students and more advanced projects for upper-level students (such as conducting a community needs assessment or developing a plan for opening a thrift store). Additional respondents merely noted that service-learning project intensity grew and service-related reflection became more extensive as students moved through the curriculum.

Question 5: Do you think curricular placement matters?

A majority of respondents clearly answered yes, and went on to explain why placement mattered. These responses were grouped around developmental issues and curricular sequencing as the primary reasons for the importance of curricular placement. Respondents who mentioned developmental outcomes indicated that service-learning activities should be matched to student developmental stages. As one participant noted, "placement matters as the skills involved in becoming civically engaged develop over time. If we are to 'create' involved students we should [provide] varied activities and opportunities to meet students where they are at." Another respondent indicated that

> for service-learning to be effective as both a teaching tool and as a genuine contribution to the community, the students' developmental level as well as the skills and experiences must be considered. First year students may be doing service for the first time in their lives and therefore need the proper support or guidance; likewise more advanced students should be contributing a more sophisticated level of service.

A third respondent stressed that placement "definitely matters and must be considered to avoid community service-learning project disasters," explaining that "students have to be conceptually ready, with peer group relationships established and have adequate time . . . to do the project."

Survey participants also saw curricular placement as important to departmental course sequencing or curricular design. Strategic placement of service-learning could help students conceptualize curricular content, better prepare students for internships, and "normalize" service, which may occur frequently throughout the curriculum. One respondent noted that curricular placement was "important for several reasons: students report better preparation for practicum, better understanding of community issues [and] better understanding of prior courses (they see how the courses build on each other)." A second participant from the field of engineering made the following statement:

> the placement before senior design was critical. Our service-learning is very specific to engineering service and not just civic service. That also led to a requirement that the course be in the junior year to ensure that students have some exposure to engineering topics.

An additional participant stated that

> We do not want to confuse the students' placement in service-learning with field placements. We are very intentional in using the service-learning experience as a foundational community based experience with reflection and analysis as part of the process but at a beginning level in comparison to field placements the following year.

Survey Summary

For the 21 respondents who said that their departments engage in intentional decision making about curricular placement of service-learning, most felt that curricular placement was important and indicated that service-learning courses were placed at certain points in the curriculum to help assess professional fit and preparation and to respond to stages of service readiness. Disciplinary competency was the primary student outcome that respondents said their departments hoped to promote through curricular placement, and some respondents noted that their departments used different types of service-learning activities for different learning, assessment, or service outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

There were limitations to both the literature review and survey portions of the study. As mentioned earlier, a relatively small sample of service-learning literature was reviewed. Additional examination of the literature could reveal a more substantive discussion of curricular placement. The number of survey respondents was small (86 respondents, with only 21 responding "yes" to the departmental decision-making question), and Part 2 survey questions could have more clearly indicated that the inquiry was related to the placement of service-learning *courses* and not service-learning *activities*. Some responses reflected this understanding, and others did not. In addition, six respondents indicated that they were currently administrators, coordinators, graduate students, or some other functionary. It was not clear whether these individuals were also faculty members. Future studies about service-learning curricular placement would benefit from additional examination of the service-learning literature (and of experiential education literature as well), and additional surveying of faculty member perceptions.

Discussion

In both the service-learning literature and the survey data, the authors identified common practices regarding service-learning curricular placement. For example, service-learning courses can be placed along a continuum in which departments match increasingly advanced and complex service-learning courses to student levels of maturity and to personal developmental stages. Service-learning placement can be strategic for building disciplinary competencies; preparing students for internships or other types of professional service; or discerning "goodness of fit" with a profession. Curricular placement can be used to support other student developmental purposes, such as cultivating social engagement, diversity awareness, or commitment to learning.

The literature that the authors reviewed offered some conceptual questions and models for thinking about curricular placement in relation to learning and developmental outcomes. However, this review failed to locate a more fully developed framework for considering the most appropriate location of service-learning courses and experiences.

Conclusion

From this exploratory study, the authors conclude that any intentional departmental decision- making about curricular placement of service-learning courses is guided primarily by whatever criteria a department may choose. This is not problematic, but does suggest an area of potential research that could guide the development of a framework for assisting academic departments in deciding where to place service-learning courses that feature particular types of activities to promote selected learning and developmental outcomes.

In the absence of such a framework, the authors suggest that departments hold intentional discussions about the strategic placement of service-learning courses. These discussions could be guided by questions such as

- What disciplinary learning outcomes or competencies is our department pursuing?
- What additional student developmental outcomes do we want our curriculum to support?
- How does the sequencing of our courses support these learning and developmental outcomes?

- How do we not only match service-learning with particular courses, but also match service-learning courses to course sequencing?
- How do service-learning models and paradigms from the literature inform our placement decision making?
- How can we measure the effectiveness of service-learning curricular placement?

In the face of nearly nationwide budget cuts, hiring freezes, and generally declining federal and state financial support, colleges and universities must improve the evidence they can offer for the success of their academic programs. Thus, pedagogical strategies become increasingly important. Giving more intentional consideration to service-learning curricular placement, and demonstrating its positive outcomes, will offer a measure of academic program success.

References

Albert, G. (1996). Intensive service-learning experiences. In B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 182–207). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for service-learning faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*, 67-73.

Bringle, R. G., Phillips, M. A., & Hudson, M. (2003). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student experiences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Calderon, J. Z. (2007). *Race, poverty, and social justice: Multidisciplinary perspectives through service learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Campus Compact. (n.d.). *Resources for faculty*. Retrieved March 16, 2010, from http://www.campuscompact.org/resources-for-faculty/

Colby, S., Bercaw, L., Clark, A. M., & Galiardi, S. (2009). From community service to service-learning leadership: A program perspective. *New Horizons in Education, 57*, 1–12.

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Connors, K., Seifer, S., Sebastian, J., Cora-Bramble, D., & Hart, R. (1996). Interdisciplinary collaboration in service-learning: Lessons from the health professions. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 113–127.

Coyle, E. J., Jamieson, L. H., & Sommers, L. S. (1997). EPICS: A model for integrating service-learning into the engineering curriculum. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4*, 81–89.

Delve, C. I., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (New Directions in Student Services No. 50, 7-29.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Elder, J., McGrory Klyza, C., Northup, J., & Trombulak, S. (1999). Connecting with human and natural communities at Middlebury College. In H. Ward (Ed.), *Acting locally: Concepts and models for service-learning in environmental studies* (pp. 111–119). Washington, DC: AAHE.

Enos, S. L., & Troppe, M. L. (1996). Service-learning in the curriculum. In B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 156–181). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Erickson, J. A., & Anderson, J. B. (Eds.). (1997). *Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education*. Washington, DC: AAHE.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 77–85.

Hancock, T., Smith, S., Timpte, C., & Wunder, J. (2010). PALs: Fostering student engagement and interactive learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(4), 37–60.

Howard, J. (2001, Summer). Service-learning course design workbook [Companion volume]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*.

Hudson, W. E., & Trudeau, R. H. (1995). An essay on the institutionalization of service-learning: The genesis of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*, 150–158.

Jacoby, B., and Associates. (2003). *Building partnerships for service learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B., and Associates. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kelshaw, T., Lazarus, F., Minier, J., and Associates. (2009). *Partnerships for service-learning: Impacts on communities and students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kropf, N., & Tracey, M. (2002). Service learning as a transition into foundation field. *Advances in Social Work, 3*(1), 60–71.

Lamb, C. H., Lee, J. B., Swinth, R. L., & Vinton, K. L. (2000). Learning well by doing: Service-learning in management education. In P. C. Godfrey & E. T. Grasso (Eds.), *Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management*.(pp. 149-166). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Lawrence, M. N., & Butler, M. B. (2010). Becoming aware of the challenges of helping students learn: An examination of the nature of learning during a service-learning experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*, 155–175.

Lenk, M. M. (1998). Reaching our goals together in service-learning: A multisemester accounting information systems course implementation. In D. V. Rama (Ed.), *Learning by doing: Concepts and models for service-learning in accounting* (pp. 147-153). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Martin, P. T., & Coles, J. (2000). How to institutionalize service-learning into the curriculum of an engineering department: Designing a workable plan. In E. Tsang (Ed.), *Projects that matter: Concepts and models for service-learning in engineering* (pp. 41-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

McCarthy, M. D. (1996). One-time and short-term service-learning experiences. In B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 113–134). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McEwen, M. K. (1996). Enhancing student learning and development through service-learning. In B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 53–91). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meister, R. J., & Strain, C. R. (2004). DePaul University: Strategic planning and service-learning. In M. Langseth & W. M. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning* (pp. 101-123). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Metcalf, L. E. (2010). Creating international community service learning experience in a capstone marketing-projects course. *Journal of Marketing Education, 32*, 155–171.

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 2*, 19–32.

Nadel, M., Majewski, V., & Sullivan-Cosetti, M. (2007). *Social work and service learning: Partnerships for social justice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Pringle, L. M. (1998). Expanding the boundaries of accounting education through service-learning. In D. V. Rama (Ed.), *Learning by doing: Concepts and models for service-learning in accounting* (pp. 85-100).. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Root, S. Callahan, J. & Billig, S. H. (Eds). (2005). *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impact*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Rouse, M. K., & Sapiro, V. (2007). *Institutional support for advancing undergraduate service-learning: A case example from a large public research-intensive university*. Madison, WI: WISCAPE.

Spann, S. J. (2010). *Examining the impact of service-learning on college students in an inclusive camp setting*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (ISBN 978-1-1096-2324-6)

Stallwood, L. G., & Groh, C. J. (2011). Service-learning in the nursing curriculum: Are we at the level of evidence-based practice? *Nursing Education Perspectives, 32*, 297–301.

Stater, K. J., & Fotheringham, E. (2009). Mechanisms for institutionalizing service-learning and community partner outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 13*(2), 7–30.

Weis, W. L. (1998). "What I do, I understand": Service-learning in accounting curricula. In D. V. Rama (Ed.), *Learning by doing: Concepts and models for service-learning in accounting* (pp. 37-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Welch, M., & Billig, S. H. (2004). *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Westdijk, K., Koliba, C., & Hamshaw, K. (2010). Collecting data to inform decision making and action: The University of Vermont's Faculty Community Engagement Tool. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(2), 5–33.

Zlotkowski, E. (2007). The case for service-learning. In L. McIlrath, I. MacLabhrainn (Eds.), *Higher education and civic engagement: International perspectives* (pp. 37-52). Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Service-learning in the disciplines. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Special Issue*, 61–67.

About the Authors

Amy Phillips is an assistant professor in the Department of Social Work at the University of North Dakota. Her research interests focus on experiential education, rural social work workforce issues, and multicultural/anti-oppressive organizational development. Phillips earned an M.S.S.W. at Columbia University, an M.Div. at Union Theological Seminary, and a Ph.D. at the University of North Dakota.

Steven R. Bolduc is a professor in the Department of Economics at Minnesota State University Moorhead. His research interests focus on ecological economics and public participation in the policy process. Bolduc earned a bachelor's degree in resource economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and a master's degree and Ph.D. degree in economics at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln.

Michael Gallo is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota. His research interests focus on attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and teacher pedagogy, experiential education, and storytelling and personal narrative in the development of emerging literacy. Gallo earned a bachelor's degree in elementary education from Minnesota State University Mankato, a master's degree in elementary education from Minnesota State University Moorhead, and a Ph.D. in teaching and learning/early childhood education at the University of North Dakota.

Appendix

SERVICE-LEARNING CURRICULAR PLACEMENT
Faculty Survey

Part 1. Faculty Information

1. The state in which you teach
2. Your discipline
3. Your academic department
4. Your rank
5. Number of years you have taught in higher education
6. The type of institution in which you teach (check all that apply.)

   __ Community/Technical College
   __ Liberal Arts College
   __ Public University
   __ Private University
   __ Other:

7. The level(s) at which you teach

   __ Undergraduate
   __ Graduate
   __ Both undergraduate and graduate

8. Number of faculty in your department (including yourself)
9. Number of faculty in your department who use service-learning (including yourself)
10. Number of years you have been using service-learning in your courses
11. Is there an Academic Service Learning Center on your campus? __ yes __ no
12. Does your department discuss and intentionally decide where to place service-learning in the department curriculum?

    __ Yes (Go to Part 2.)
    __ No (Go to Part 3.)

Part 2. Service-Learning in Your Department

1. Please describe how often and the process by which your department makes decisions about the placement of service-learning in the curriculum.

2. What factors are considered when your department decides where to place service-learning in the curriculum? Please give an example of a curricular placement decision and the reason for the decision.

3. Are any of the following student outcomes or competencies discussed in relation to the curricular placement of service learning? You may check more than one.

   __ None of the following is discussed
   __ General education student learning outcomes
   __ Professional/disciplinary competencies
   __ Student developmental outcomes (e.g., moral, intellectual, affective, civic engagement, spiritual). Please list the outcomes you are trying to promote.

4. Does your department intentionally place different types of service-learning projects at different points in the curriculum? (i.e., more intensive service-learning in the semester before internship)?

   __ No
   __ Yes (please give at least one example and discuss the rationale for its placement.)

5. What general thoughts do you have about the placement of service learning in a department's curriculum? Do you think curricular placement matters?

6. Prior to taking this survey, had you given much thought to the curricular placement of service-learning?

   __ Yes
   __ No

Part 3. Service-Learning in Your Courses

1. What prompted you to include service-learning in your course(s)? Check all that apply.

   __ To promote general education student learning outcomes
   __ To promote professional/disciplinary competencies
   __ To promote student developmental outcomes (e.g., moral, intellectual, affective, civic engagement, spiritual)
   __ Other (please specify.)

2. Do you intentionally place less advanced projects in lower level courses and more advanced projects in upper level courses?

   __ No
   __ Yes (please give the course levels and provide an example of a less advanced project and an example of a more advanced project.)

3. In the service-learning courses you teach, do the student outcomes or competencies you are trying to promote through service-learning differ according to the course level? (i.e., you may be more interested in promoting general education outcomes in a freshman level course)

   __ No
   __ Yes (please explain.)

4. What general thoughts do you have about the placement of service learning in a department's curriculum? Do you think curricular placement matters?

5. Prior to taking this survey, had you given much thought to the curricular placement of service-learning?

   __ Yes
   __ No

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 97, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

International Service-Learning: Students' Personal Challenges and Intercultural Competence

Sharon Y. Nickols, Nancy J. Rothenberg, Lioba Moshi, and Meredith Tetloff

Abstract

International service-learning offers students a complex cluster of educational opportunities that include cultural competency acquisition combined with professional development. An interdisciplinary program in a remote area of Tanzania revealed that the journey toward competence can be an arduous one. Drawing from students' reflections in journals and focus groups, the authors identified students' personal apprehensions and challenges, intra-group relationships and processes, reciprocity with the community participants, and students' emerging self-confidence and competencies as the major developmental experiences. The affective domain of learning was prominent in the students' reflections on their experiences and personal development. Constructivist grounded theory guided the qualitative analysis of journals and focus group transcripts. The authors suggest that faculty contemplating an international service-learning program prepare not only for program logistics, but also for processing personal and intra-group challenges, and incorporating them as part of the international service-learning experience.

Introduction

International service-learning is an increasingly popular pedagogy that spans many disciplines. It provides an alternative to traditional study abroad programs and an expansion of the learning processes available in domestic service-learning. Bringle, Hatcher, and Jones *(2011)* describe international service-learning as a unique pedagogy that incorporates the domains of service-learning and international education but with the added dimension of intercultural learning opportunities. International service-learning, through its cultural immersion, enables students to encounter their own ethnocentric perspectives, while simultaneously enlarging their disciplinary knowledge as they apply what they know (and learn) to their experiences in another culture abroad *(Sternberger, Ford, & Hale, 2005)*.

The complex learning opportunities within international service-learning have been described as "transformative" *(Grusky, 2000;*

Kiely, 2004), in that the experiences available to students in an international setting, particularly one without a familiar infrastructure in relation to language, physical comforts, culture, and/or belief systems, stretch students in both expected and unanticipated ways. Although the experience has the potential to be transformative in its culmination, the processes through which that transformation happens have not been explored in depth. The authors sought to gain insight into the ongoing experiences of students as they coped with the challenges of international service-learning. Such an understanding could assist faculty members in preparing to lead international service-learning programs.

The purpose of this study was to explore the internal challenges, coping processes, and developing competence acquired during international service-learning through the lens of a group of nine students who were enrolled in a 4-week interdisciplinary program. The location was a remote island in Tanzania. This program was arranged under the auspices of a university-community partnership. The students and faculty members shared a mutual commitment to the program goals and objectives that included working with local community groups on their priorities for improving the quality of their living conditions. Concurrently, inherent in this experience was a focus on developing students' global understanding and acquisition of competence for working in international settings.

The dearth of scholarship in this area led the authors to focus on the affective processes that appeared to be an intrinsic part of the students' experience and possible maturation. Drawing from the students' reflections on their daily experiences as recorded in journals and expressed in focus groups, the authors identified nuances within the dynamics of this international service-learning experience that clustered in four themes: personal apprehensions and challenges, intra-group relationships and processes, emergence of reciprocity with the community participants, and development of self-confidence and competencies. The observations and conclusions presented herein are intended to benefit faculty members planning to engage in international service-learning programs.

Literature Review

International Service-Learning

Among the myriad definitions of service-learning offered during the past two decades, Jacoby's *(1996)* succinctly captures the

intent of the program in Tanzania: "Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development" *(p. 5)*. Much has been written about the unique learning benefits available in an international service-learning course.

The benefits of this pedagogy for students that have been identified in the literature include increased global awareness; development of leadership, management, communication, and teamwork skills; personal development in areas of adaptability, flexibility, maturity, values, and spiritual beliefs; and the ability to analyze and appreciate local customs and cultural contexts *(Bringle et al., 2011; Crabtree, 2008; Gillian & Young, 2009; Jacoby & Brown, 2009; Johnson, Johnson, & Shaney, 2008; Maher, 2003: Pagano & Roselle, 2009; Sternberger et al., 2005; Tonkin, 2004)*. Other research suggests that service-learning offers students transformational learning outcomes. For example, Kiely *(2005)* describes how transformational learning theory (as developed by Mezirow, *2000* applies to the personal empowerment that occurs in service-learning, ideally leading students to become more socially responsible and self-directed, and less dependent on false assumptions.

One way to evaluate the learning that comes from this pedagogy and to enable students to integrate and deepen their learning experiences is through the process of reflection, both spoken and written. Reflection has its roots in the work of John Dewey *(1910)*, and its centrality in service-learning has been extensively discussed *(Bringle et al., 2011; Cooper, 1998; Correia & Bleicher, 2008; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Schmiede, 1996; King & Kitchener, 1994; Pagano & Roselle, 2009; Silcox, 1995)*. The most frequently identified benefits of reflection are development of intercultural competence and the promotion of critical thinking about experiences that challenge students' previous assumptions *(Dunlap & Webster, 2009)*. According to Whitney and Clayton *(2011)*, reflection is particularly important in the international arena. Pagano and Roselle *(2009)* propose that in successful reflection, the application of critical thinking leads students to synthesize the academic content of a program with the practice or related work and context in a process they call "refraction." Furthermore, structured reflection helps learners integrate experiences that can positively affect future behavior, according to Rogers *(2001)*.

In this article, the authors focus on the affective domain of learning as it was captured through reflection. The affective domain

and its connection to overall learning is an area of increasing focus in higher education, particularly in the context of the scholarship of engagement. The affective domain can be best understood as the values, attitudes, and behaviors linked to direct experience *(Shepherd, 2008).* Researchers suggest that affect plays an important role in learning outcomes *(Batchelder & Root, 1994 Picard et al., 2004; Shepherd, 2008; Sipos, Battisti, & Grimm, 2008).*

Contribution to the Literature

The advantages in the experiences of service-learning are well documented and seemingly intuitive, but little attention has been paid to the intra-group processes that contribute to students' maturation and personal growth. Conflicts that emerge when any group works, lives, and travels together under close and unfamiliar living circumstances are especially compelling and are typically understood to be an expected part of the experience. Still, personal issues and difficult peer relationships in such living arrangements have the potential to overshadow the academic learning. Practical issues and institutional challenges related to international service-learning have been addressed *(Chisholm, 2003; Jacoby, 2003; Jacoby & Brown, 2009; Kezar & Rhoads, 2001; Sternberger et al., 2005)*; however, the tensions and challenges experienced by students (and faculty) when engaging in service-learning, as well as the processes of working through them toward competence, have received relatively scant attention *(Carver, 1997; Grusky, 2000; Lowery et al., 2006; Williams & Nickols, 2011)*. How students relate to and with each other may contribute to developing their competencies at least as much as the learning gained through interaction with community partners; however, there is little attention to intra-group dynamics in the service-learning literature.

The authors hope that this study of students' responses to an international service-learning experience extends the literature on international service-learning by exploring students' social and affective responses to their intercultural experiences. It provides evidence of the value of reflection through focus groups and journaling as processes for coping with personal, intra-group, and intercultural issues. As a contribution to the literature on international service-learning, it lays a foundation for further qualitative studies of the developmental processes students experience in international service-learning programs.

Logistics of the Tanzania Service-Learning Program

The service-learning program was developed as a result of a collaborative relationship between a member of the Parliament of the Republic of Tanzania who represented the district in which the service-learning program was located, and the University of Georgia. The destination site was a remote area of Ukerewe District, a cluster of islands in Lake Victoria, accessible by a 3-hour ferry trip from the mainland. The site was chosen following a visit to ascertain the feasibility of working in selected communities *(for further description of the site review, see Nickols, Mullen, & Moshi, 2009)*. Identification of the partnership groups and translators, as well as local arrangements for lodging, meals, transportation, and cultural activities, were handled by staff of a Tanzania nongovernmental agency working with the Tanzanian host.

Course Format

The service-learning program was held during "Maymester," a period of nearly 4 weeks. Students enrolled in directed studies (electives tailored to students' interests) for 3 to 6 hours course credit. The first three authors of this article were the faculty members for the service-learning directed studies courses. Faculty members met with students periodically to discuss assigned readings and students' observations and experiences related to women in development, child welfare, community organization, African studies, and professional development. Students enrolled in the program to gain firsthand experience working in an African community, to increase their cultural understanding, and to explore their interests in international development.

Local Partners

The community groups in the service-learning program were a self-managed women's economic cooperative, an agro-forestry project led by a retired forester, and a girls' organization led by women volunteers. The women's cooperative included six women, each of whom worked her family's small-scale farm. They had been formally organized into a cooperative for about five years, and had developed a set of bylaws and a system of accounts to keep track of revenue they earned from selling cassava flour. Their goal was to purchase a manually operated machine that presses chalk into classroom chalk sticks that they would sell to schools to generate additional income. However, they had been unable to secure

enough money (about 400,000 Tanzania Shillings, equivalent to US$350) for the purchase of the machine.

The agro-forestry project had been functioning for several years to develop seedlings for reforestation projects and to serve as a model for sustainable small-scale farming practices. This group of women and men was well-organized with nominal leadership from an elected committee and oversight by the retired forester. Residents of nearby neighborhoods who participated in the agro-forestry program received modest payment for preparing seedlings, tending small plots of row crops, and caring for a few chickens. Ironically, though located on an island in Lake Victoria, the most pressing need of the group was a deep well to secure irrigation water. The cost of the well was estimated at 6 million Tanzania Shillings (approximately US$3,000).

The program for girls focused on personal development and goal setting. Public officials and local women teachers set a high priority on the girls' program as a means of reducing the gender disparity in school drop-out rates and empowering girls to cope with the challenges they face in a society that favors male privilege and power. Local goals for the girls' program were reaching a larger number of girls and training adult leaders.

Students and Faculty

All nine students were female and from the University of Georgia. They represented a variety of disciplines: social work, wildlife biology, consumer economics, child development, international affairs, and ecology. Six were Euro-American and three were African American. Their ages ranged from 19 to 38, but most were in their early 20s. Five were graduate students and four were undergraduates. Two of the graduate students had extensive international experience in other African countries, another had lived in an African country during her childhood, and one had been a member of a mission trip to Mexico. One undergraduate had previous study abroad experience; another had traveled internationally with her family. The remaining two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student, both African American) had never traveled abroad.

The faculty members' disciplines and ethnicity were as follows: family and consumer sciences (Euro-American), social work (Euro-American), and comparative literature (Tanzanian and fluent in Swahili). Each was affiliated with the African Studies

Institute of the University of Georgia and had previous study abroad experience.

Activities

Prior to the 3-week residency and engagement in Tanzania, the students and faculty members met monthly during the academic year to discuss goals, activities, logistics, and local culture. The "home base" for the program was a guesthouse, comparable to a modest hotel in the United States, where everyone had a private room. A large walled space partially covered by a tarp at the center of the facility served as an area for meals, study, Swahili and other classes, and relaxation. Students chose to work and interact with one of the three community groups, based on the fit with their academic majors and interests. Each faculty member worked with a specific student group at the community site. The typical daily schedule was that each team worked with the local partners in the morning or the afternoon, and classes or group activities were held during the alternate periods. Free time was available almost daily, allowing the students and faculty members to visit the local market and other merchants in the small community. In the evening, the students and faculty members planned for the next day's activities as needed, wrote in their journals, or informally discussed their experiences.

Assessment Method

The design of this study of students' affective experience in international service-learning was developed by the first and second authors. The study sought to understand the challenges, coping processes, and development of competencies during an international service-learning program from the perspective of the student participants. Data were collected from student journals and five focus groups conducted during the time abroad. The second author facilitated the focus groups, and the fourth author transcribed the recordings and the journals. Transcripts of the journals and focus group tape recordings were content analyzed for themes characterizing the students' reflections about their experiences and responses by the first, second, and fourth authors. The third author, who reviewed the findings and contributed to the article, was the overall study abroad program director. Well in advance of the departure for Tanzania, the research plan was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Georgia.

Methodological Approach

The methodological approach for this qualitative study was constructivist grounded theory *(Charmaz, 2009)*, a revision of classic grounded theory *(Glaser & Strauss, 1967)*. Grounded theory is a method to study process, using the inductive, comparative, emergent, and open-ended approach, and iterative logic *(Charmaz, 2009)*. The analytical process itself benefited greatly from the detailed description of procedures for qualitative analysis, interpretation, and representation by Hesse-Biber and Leavy *(2011)*. Charmaz *(2009)* points out that constructivist grounded theory rests on social constructions, which are influenced by the researcher's positions, perspectives, privileges, interactions, and geographical locations, all of which the authors acknowledge were present in the service-learning program in Tanzania. The assemblage of experiences were filtered through the students' reflections and then again filtered through the authors' attempts to make meaning of the students' experiences.

Data Collection

Eight students' journals and the transcriptions of the five focus groups provided the data for this qualitative analysis. Students were informed that submitting their journals was voluntary and would not affect grades in their courses in any way. Signed consent forms indicated the students' permission to use their journals and the focus groups as the source of data for the study. Although all the students signed consent forms prior to departure, one student did not submit her journal at the end of the program.

Educators agree that reflection is a necessary part of service-learning because reflection helps students make connections between theoretical perspectives, observations and plausible interpretations, and practice. Furthermore, reflection facilitates personal and professional growth in that it helps students make meaning of the often dissonant observations and feelings they experience. Journaling and focus groups are among the methods recommended for facilitating reflection. Indeed, reflection has been described as "the operational linchpin of contemporary service-learning pedagogy" *(Cooper, 1998, p. 52)* and particularly important in the international arena *(Whitney & Clayton, 2011)*.

In writing their journals, the students were asked to reflect on their experiences, focusing on their observations about self: what they were learning, experiences and feelings they found challenging or rewarding, and the meanings they were making of their experi-

ences. Five focus groups were conducted in evenings at various times during the program to facilitate group sharing about experiences and to promote communication among the participants. After the service-learning program, the journals and focus group tape recordings were transcribed.

Analysis

Journal entries and focus group transcripts were analyzed separately by three of the authors, as noted previously, to identify emergent themes about the students' experiences, self-insights, understanding of the community, connection to their previous knowledge, and relationships with the local participants and within the service-learning group. The interpretations of themes were then discussed by the authors and compared for consistency. This open coding technique from grounded theory methodology, which Moustakas *(1994)* describes as "composite textural descriptions," facilitates the emergence of insights by grouping together participants' reflective comments. The most prevalent themes contributing to an understanding of students' emotional and developmental experience were personal apprehension and challenges; intra-group relationships and processes; reciprocity with the community participants; and self-confidence and competencies. In reporting the findings, a letter of the alphabet was assigned to each student ("Student A," etc.) in order to provide anonymity.

Findings

Using the student journals and transcripts of focus groups, four themes emerged from the narrative analysis. In this section, brief descriptions introduce each theme and selections from the students' journals or the focus group comments illustrate the theme.

Personal Apprehension and Challenges

Questions reflecting uncertainty and mild anxiety about having adequate expertise needed by the community groups were expressed by the students during the pre-travel monthly meetings. Although reassurances from the faculty seemed to ameliorate the expressed concerns, as events unfolded, the anxieties were again expressed, sometimes in the focus groups and more often in the student journals. The sub-themes related to personal challenges clustered around anxieties and doubts, and physical and emotional stress.

Anxieties and doubts.

Anxieties and doubts took many forms, including performance anxiety, and feeling unworthy, incompetent, or even "too American." Student H, who was traveling out of the country for the first time, initially focused on her mixed feelings as she succinctly stated, "I am extremely excited but nervous at the same time." Early in the program, it became apparent that most of the students' anxieties were not about travel-related issues, but rather focused on their ability to carry out the purposes of the program. A seasoned traveler, Student A, echoed the feelings expressed by Student H as she wrote:

> I'm still feeling apprehensive about the work we're going to do there. It will be nice to be involved in a community for a while though. I'm excited but definitely nervous. I don't like being unprepared . . . and that's exactly how I feel for this venture.

A similar concern was expressed by Student E as she voiced her discomfort with her own perceived shortcomings as a learner in a new culture: "The greatest challenge I have already faced is my own ignorance and self-consciousness. I am growing more and more afraid to fail."

Student G's anxiety took a slightly different twist as she wrote, "I was feeling like I was the only nervous one and the youngest and least knowledgeable. . . ." Part of her learning was realizing that her initial anxieties were shared by others, and sharing in the group could normalize her concerns and provide relief, as her journal entry suggests:

> but now I think some of my anxiety is just characteristic of the nature of our project and ambitions. Honestly, I never thought about bringing up my anxiety in a group meeting or really at all but I think expressing those feelings took a huge burden off and furthered the development of trust within our group.

Student A's self-consciousness began before she boarded the airplane in the United States, as she reported: "I was horrified when I got to my gate in the airport, looked at myself and all my gear and realized how American I looked. I'm sure I can be identified a mile away!" Her anxieties continued as she experienced irritability in her work group, as she commented in her journal: "Today was

a hard day for me. I found myself impatient and sometimes even a little annoyed with other people. My insecurities are showing up right now . . . it's just building inside me."

Most students exhibited or expressed feeling stressed, and some had unique ways of understanding it. Also an experienced traveler, Student B observed that her areas of discomfort were challenging for her due to past experience as well as inexperience. She wrote:

> I am starting to realize that my last 10 years have been monopolized by a male-dominated profession. . . . I have not fully developed my more intuitive/introspective side. I'm also nervous (trepidation) about working with children. I'm not a natural with children.

Physical and emotional stress.

Fortunately, there were no significant health issues during the program. However, students experienced physical fatigue and lack of energy, and emotional states that included irritation, annoyance, and intolerance. Often this stress was attributed to the structured schedule necessitated by the availability of the local partners and limited transportation, as well as the course expectations. Student G shared her frustration as follows:

> Right now I am really annoyed but I feel like I'm not allowed to take time out for myself so I can't do anything about it. I also don't feel well at all but I am not being given sufficient time or space to take care of myself. I'm burnt out on journaling.

Without some quiet time, Student A recognized that the quality of her time with other people was compromised, as she wrote: "I need a balance of being alone and being social and it's hard for me to find that balance in this situation."

Homesickness was an emotional strain experienced by some of the students. A passage by Student F reflects a common theme of ambivalence, expressing both negative feelings and appreciation of the gains inherent in the service-learning program.

> I think I officially miss home now. Today was not one of my best days. I am having a lot of mixed emotions in terms of my purpose here, my relations with other members in the whole group. I think this transition in emotions began a few days ago. However they seemed

> to intensify today. I began becoming extremely homesick. I am missing my family, my boyfriend, and my car. The interesting thing is that this has been a very fulfilling journey.

The interactive effect of the intensity of group living, working within another culture, and personal stress appeared frequently in the journals. This may account for a large portion of the students' fatigue, as well as their complaints about having very little time to themselves. The strain was evident, for example, when a planning session with the local group was protracted. Student B commented on her need to recuperate:

> It was a good day. All of the haggling and debating and compromising paid off, yet it also left me drained. I needed time alone in the afternoon and a long nap just to be able to recover. Otherwise, I could feel myself too stretched and unable to deal with the slightest frustration. The group living does strain everyone.

Intra-group Relationships and Processes

Group dynamics, a term coined by renowned social psychologist Kurt Lewin, refers to the interacting forces that define how a group functions. Brown *(1988)* credited Lewin's "field theory" with strongly influencing the understanding of group process. These concepts seemed particularly relevant as students shared the rigors of an international service-learning experience.

The challenges of group living include sharing living quarters, traveling and eating together, and working collaboratively. The intense group interaction can generate emotional reactions around a sense of belonging and emotional safety. Negative feelings such as hurt, annoyance, lack of tolerance, and rejection—often brought on by fatigue—can emerge after an initial "honeymoon" period. A typically stressful middle stage can develop into mutual support, affirmation, acceptance, and shared feelings of accomplishment as the group's work moves forward. This intra-group process indeed manifested itself in the Tanzania program. Tuckman's *(1965)* model of group development, with stages that he labeled "forming," "storming," "norming," and "performing," is particularly applicable.

Stage 1 (Forming).

In this beginning stage, group members build trust and focus on being liked and finding one's niche. For example, early in the

program, Student G, who was struggling to feel competent about her contributions, discovered the positive potential of finding support within the group as she wrote:

> It was like a huge weight was lifted off of me though it was a great leap of faith for me in terms of putting my trust in our group not to judge me and to recognize my feelings. When I said it, [Student A] actually said she shared identical feelings. . . . I hope others realize I have a lot to offer even though on occasion I can lose that confidence.

Student A used her group experience for self-reflection and also emerged early as a group leader, which contributed to bolstering her confidence. She wrote in her journal,

> I was the [appointed] leader today and it was a task—organizing and keeping track of everyone but it was fun. I got many compliments from people and even a short round of applause, which made me feel good. I haven't had much leadership experience and authorities and peers have never put me in leadership roles. It's nice that I'm finally getting some experience.

The students' diversity was noteworthy in terms of their different backgrounds, races, ethnicities, ages, and disciplines. This greatly added to the richness of the early group process. Student A commented enthusiastically about this early on:

> A feeling of appreciation for our diverse group has stuck with me all day. I'm loving seeing this experience through the eyes of people who have a different view from me and how all of our interests overlap and combine in so many necessary ways. I'm continually amazed by how much I love the people in our group.

Student H was especially sensitized to the issue of diversity and her wanting to be seen in her entirety as she, too, commented, somewhat more skeptically,

> Most say how proud they are of the group but there are underlying issues that I hope can be worked out. I have to understand and I do because I have dealt with being

> uncomfortable all my life. I am a woman but not just that I am also a woman of color.

Stage 2 (Storming).

Typically this stage occurs as group members are feeling that their personal needs are not being met or are being compromised. They begin to test or question the leaders' competence, and dyads and triads within the group often form. These issues can become the source of conflict and can escalate to work against the general sense of well-being of the group. However, they can also provide the fuel for personal growth and insight as true group bonding can emerge. Many of the students commented regularly on the state of the group in their journals. For example, Student H expressed this conflict: "I am extremely frustrated and irritated with some people. This is the day that hands down, I wanted and was ready to go home. I didn't want to go to the focus group let alone participate in any discussion."

Student A, too, was not only sensitive to the group tension but was also aware of the feelings this triggered in her, as she wrote:

> There's some conflict going on in our group which makes me sad. Of course it's going to happen but it seems pretty destructive and I'm not sure how it will be fixed. It would really suck if anybody left this experience completely at odds with another person. It's especially difficult in a situation like this where roles are not so defined. . . .

Student F dealt with her discomfort with the group tensions by withdrawing, as she reflected, "Group living was tough, but it sure was nice to have my own room. There was tension in the group. I did not fully understand it. . . . I like when people just get along and are nice to one another."

Toward the middle of the program, when group tensions were highest, the group participated in an activity by dividing into two subgroups for a day. Most of the students enjoyed this change, and the experience seemed to function relieve the tension. Student G commented, "It was also nice to have a smaller group for a while. Being in a large group gets kind of exhausting and it was great to have fewer people to coordinate."

Stage 3 (Norming).

As the program progressed, activities with the local partners were implemented, and increased acceptance between most of the students appeared to occur. Interestingly, this intra-group acceptance seemed to coincide with self-acceptance and increased self-confidence. While some intra-group tensions continued for Student H, her journal entry suggests that she had developed a level of realistic acceptance and, although still annoyed, had come to terms with the intra-group relationships. She wrote:

> The people here are amazing but the people we brought with us should have stayed in America. This trip wasn't just service-learning, the most valuable lesson I learned was how to deal with people you have to work with. We not only worked together, we played together and lived together. It was/is too much we are bound to get on each others nerves or have disagreements.

Stage 4 (Performing).

As the program's end loomed, the students' energies became more externally focused, and they worked more harmoniously to accomplish tasks. Student A expressed a sentiment shared by many as she made meaning out of the group experience, including a sense of accomplishment. She reflected:

> Trying to get that grant done is a huge task! It took a lot of adjustment for our group as a whole, as well as me individually, but I feel like I'm finally in a good place with it. I'll leave here feeling like I contributed something worthwhile. I'm pretty happy about that.

Student B described the cohesiveness that developed among the local participants and the students as she admired another student's demonstration of building an improved mud cook stove.

> I like the way she started with a series of strategic questions, asking if they used three rocks to cook on; if they ever had problems with their skirts burning; whether they had to walk far to get firewood . . . "ndiyo, ndiyo," "yes" again and again. [Student C] had built her case for the improved cook stove . . . we all took handfuls of mud and patted them on the circular wall.

Student B concluded that everyone felt they could reproduce the same stove at home, and the demonstration fostered relationship building among the students and between the students and the community, "as we all got muddy together."

Ultimately, most of the students developed tolerance for the small obstacles and challenges of everyday life, as one student noted in a final focus group with a helpful touch of humor: "And we always said all along, this is Africa, 'hakuna matata,' go with the flow."

Reciprocity with Community Participants

The notion of reciprocity is a key component of service-learning, and programs are designed to facilitate students' doing things *with* others rather than for them *(Jacoby, 1996)*. Some of the challenges of achieving clear communications between the host country participants and the service-learning team became apparent during the initial meetings with the local groups in Tanzania. Although the local groups had been briefed ahead of time about the intentions of the students and faculty to work with them, an early misunderstanding was the expectation on the part of leaders of the local groups that the group from the university were experts who would have answers for their problems. While the meaning of service-learning may never have become entirely clear to the Tanzanian partners, the activities undertaken were ultimately jointly determined and executed.

Early gaps in expectations led to initial anxiety on the part of the students, as noted in their journals. For example, Student D, who worked with the girls' empowerment group, wrote: "Something else that surprised us was that the women were expecting us to train them—not to work directly with the girls. They were expecting seminars and workshops on working with the girls—something we were completely unprepared for!" After a session with the agroforestry group, Student C reflected on their level of organization and high expectations:

> We had a long meeting describing why we were there and what the Garden's main priorities were. I was pretty surprised at how organized they were. Very intimidated as well! One of their questions for us was: "What qualifies you to come here and help us? " I gave my Peace Corps résumé, feeling inadequate. . . . I feel uncomfortable . . . this is a whole different culture.

As the students, faculty, and local participants communicated and worked together during the ensuing days, mutual understanding developed. Students working with the girls' program appreciated the eagerness with which the Tanzanian girls engaged in group activities and the effort it took for them to attend the sessions. Some of the girls walked for nearly half an hour after doing chores at home in order to participate.

Students gained appreciation for the indigenous knowledge they observed among the Tanzanian women and men. The degree to which the women's cooperative and the agro-forestry group were organized prompted a high level of respect from the U.S. participants, such as Student H's comment about the women's group: "they know their big project is to purchase a chalk machine. They had the numbers, how much it would cost, and what profit they would make, so that was surprising to me." A faculty member's knowledge about grants for community development in Tanzania enabled the students to assist the women's group and the agro-forestry group in developing applications for a chalk machine and the deep well, respectively. The U.S. group perceived that the Tanzanian participants recognized and appreciated the goodwill, knowledge, and skills of the U.S. participants. For example, Student B commented in her journal,

> Today we worked on the chicken coop some more. We made sure they knew we liked their approach better than our own. Everyone jumped in and helped with the work—men, women, and children. It was a lot of fun, and it felt that we were very accepted and absorbed into their community. It definitely seems to create a stronger partnership to acknowledge the good work and skills that folks already have.

Some students were immediately aware of specific aspects of their new surroundings; for example, Student G recorded in her journal,

> The first experience I had today was waking up to the 5 am prayer call (from the mosque). It was amazing to me the devotion people have to wake so early everyday to pray. Even the "extremely" devout people in the US hardly do anything similar.

Sometimes students pushed themselves to be more cognizant of their intercultural attitudes and understanding. Student E commented on her efforts to understand, and thus appreciate, the culture, as she reflected in her journal,

> I told myself that today I want to find something I really like about this culture. There are already aspects that fascinate me, such as the performance styles and the food, but I feel those aren't substantial enough reasons. So, while walking through the marketplace I looked on all the vendors and decided that entrepreneurship is an aspect to praise.

A week later, she added:

> Reflecting on the day of work with the women . . . , I am amazed at the work and load of responsibility put on women and girls. They toil in order to provide comfort and shade and provisions for their families. They are confined by society to stand in the background . . . their power is not recognized.

Through the many hours of activities with the local people, the students became a familiar presence in the community. Comfort levels increased on the part of local participants and the students, and a sense of reciprocity emerged. Awareness of this was expressed by Student F, who worked with the girls' group:

> One of the girls kept inviting me to either sit or stand with her every time we engaged in a new activity. They are definitely beginning to trust us. I am glad they are becoming more comfortable with us. I am also starting to become more comfortable with them.

Self-confidence and Competencies

The benefits attributed to international service-learning include personal development related to adaptability and maturity. Many of the students identified increased self-confidence and other personal competencies as growth areas. A variety of experiences, both planned and unanticipated, contributed to the students' development. For most students, their journal reflections revealed self-discoveries, personal insights, and clarifying goals, as Student G expressed:

> I feel more independent, have had more thoughts about my own aspirations and dreams on this trip than in a long time. It's partially because I am in a new place and that always inspires me. But I also think it is partly due to the people I am around right now. Because they are all older and have had incredible adventures I think more about where I want to be in my life when I reach their age.

The challenges and rewards of continuous interaction and communication were noted throughout many of the student journals. For instance, Student B wrote: "The discussions reinforce my understanding of the difficulty of communicating ideas between different cultures, genders, and economic levels." Later she wrote that after protracted discussion a plan was in place for an activity, and work commenced: "men, women, and boys were all hammering nails with us and everybody wanted their picture taken."

Participating in cultural activities, such as joining in the dances of a local performance group, provided opportunities for the students to immerse themselves in other aspects of the culture, and in so doing develop a sense of competence and solidarity. Student G's description of dancing with a large group at a local community gathering captures many layers of response to the experience and the self-insight she gained from it:

> In the afternoon . . . we drove to a small village and were met by traditional dancing and singing. We watched a performance, which I was amazed by. They never stopped moving with the incredible intensity but their shoulders and hips were so loose and comfortable. [Soon] I realized we were all about to be up there dancing. The anxiety I felt was unbelievable . . . after they tied a kanga around me I couldn't stop laughing and felt super awkward. Once we started dancing, though, I realized I had more to lose from not participating than from doing it imperfectly. It was a huge moment for me because it made me realize that I finally have the confidence to put myself out there and fully enjoy experiences . . . [Dancing together] helped me build trust with them so that I may feel vulnerable among them, but it can be okay because it is a safe place. When we finished dancing no one was ready to leave.

Student B's conviction about the value of experiencing other cultures was written after a trip to the weekly area market at a distant place on the island. She observed,

> Speaking with, or trying to speak with, different strangers stretched my envelope further. Seeing the types of goods in their market brings home the reality of their limited resources. Cheap children's bags, one-speed bicycles, cloth, vegetables, flours, grass mats, used shoes, and cheap flip flops. Seeing it all spread out in a muddy field on a rainy day is so much more meaningful than reading a statistic in a textbook. Everyone should experience other countries and cultures firsthand.

Summary

The use of reflective journals and periodic focus groups offered structured opportunities for students in an international service-learning program to express their personal anxieties and doubts, make observations about other participants and group dynamics, explore their feelings about the relationship with local participants, and consider the development of their intercultural competence and ability to cope. These reflections resulted in insight about the affective development experienced in the unfamiliar surroundings of international service-learning. The international service-learning experience was an arduous one in many respects, yet students gained personal insight and intercultural competence that will have an enduring impact on their personal and professional development. The methodological approach of open-ended coding to identify themes related to the students' experiences produced a deep and rich understanding of their journeys. Although this study had some limitations, the insights gained can be of value to faculty as they develop international service-learning programs.

Limitations

The authors acknowledge that there are limitations inherent in the generalizability of qualitative research. In this study, a different combination of gender, subject matter expertise, age, international experience, and personalities of the students, as well as different international settings, most likely would have resulted in different experiences and conclusions. Conversely, the dissimilar age and experience factors could be viewed as strengths, because they brought diversity to the program. Diversity of age and expe-

rience are often lacking in service-learning programs involving only undergraduates or graduate students in a specific discipline. A second limitation of this study is the possible reticence on the part of some students to fully express their thoughts and feelings in journals that were to be read by faculty members who assign grades for the course. Moreover, in this study, some journal entries indicated "journaling fatigue" that may have affected the scope and quality of the entries. Although the length of time (4 weeks) in the international setting could also be considered a limitation, the richness of the data indicated that the students experienced a range of emotions and opportunities to develop knowledge, coping strategies, and intercultural competence.

Finally, like so many other service-learning programs, this program did not attempt to gather detailed feedback from the local participants, a repeated and often-criticized omission in studies related to the impact of service-learning projects (*Billig & Eyler, 2003; Tryon & Stoecker, 2008)*. However, the U.S. participants learned later that their assistance in facilitating the agro-forestry group in preparing a grant proposal for a deep well resulted in funding for the well. This represented one direct benefit to the community.

Conclusion and Implications

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal challenges, intra-group dynamics, coping processes, and emerging competencies of students in an interdisciplinary service-learning program. These personal elements are an often under-examined part of understanding the impact on students of an international service-learning experience. Thus, the study helps fill a gap in the literature about the personal experiences of students. The findings may also offer guidance regarding these seldom-explored aspects for faculty members who plan international service-learning programs. A list of "lessons learned" as they relate to the predominant themes of the student experience in this study follows.

Personal Apprehension and Challenges

In this study, even experienced student travelers identified personal apprehensions as they embarked on the international service-learning program, and all students met a variety of challenges during the stay abroad. When planning international service-learning programs (and other study abroad experiences), faculty members need to be aware of the emotional ups and downs experienced by students and how those processes may contribute to their

personal development. The pragmatic aspects of preparing for a program of this magnitude may include travel itineraries, facilities, local partnerships, translators, health precautions, course offerings, student recruitment, finances, orientation sessions, and institutional policies. These aspects often overshadow the social and affective aspects of the experience that are likely to occupy a considerable amount of the students' attention and energy throughout the program. Students may outwardly express a sense of self-assurance and enthusiasm, but silently harbor anxieties about their abilities and competencies for international service-learning. Faculty members' acknowledgment of these personal uncertainties can provide early reassurance. Mentoring can lay the groundwork for a richer overall learning experience.

Intra-group Relationships and Processes

The time-tested model of stages of group development was apparent in the Tanzania service-learning program. Tuckman's *(1965)* model of group development provides a conceptual framework that can serve to ameliorate the effects of intra-group dynamics in daily living that may otherwise be vexing for individuals and the group. Anticipating the typical group dynamics of close travel and living experiences, and using them as opportunities for learning, can help faculty members as they facilitate student learning. Periodically incorporating structured reflection experiences (e.g., group debriefing sessions, faculty-led focus groups) can provide not only a coping mechanism for students, but also a formal learning experience about group behavior and interpersonal relations.

Reciprocity with Community Participants

In this study, entries from student journals revealed that building reciprocity with local participants was an interactive and iterative process. Students in service-learning programs usually approach the experiences with a desire to make a positive difference in the circumstances at the service-learning destination, even as many harbor anxiety about what lies ahead. Local participants have expectations that may or may not be consistent with the collaborative philosophy of service-learning. The process of working with local groups requires continuous communication, clarification, and interaction with oversight on the part of the faculty members. It may be difficult to convince the international partners in a service-learning venture, especially in situations where they have

been accustomed to hosting "experts," that students and faculty want to work with them and learn from them. Faculty undertaking new international service-learning programs may need to put additional effort into clarifying the purpose of the program, and leaders who direct sustained programs may find they must reiterate the service-learning philosophy and goals as new local participants become engaged in the program.

International service-learning has almost daily frustrations and rewards. One of the rewards for faculty is sharing the successes with students, but faculty should also expect to offer support and counsel when efforts fall short of a student's or the program's ideals. This too provides an opportunity for faculty members to mentor students as they process misunderstandings and disappointments. Finishing a program well is also an important part of the overall experience. A myriad of emotions are likely to be generated at the end of such an intense experience. Rituals of leave-taking and affirmation, such as a closing meal or exchange of memorable moments and tokens of appreciation, are opportunities to show respect for the local participants. Faculty who plan ahead for the leave-taking experience can help to solidify the reciprocity that has developed between student groups and community members.

Self-confidence and Competence

The experience in international service-learning described in this article corroborated the centrality of the process of reflection in acknowledging students' affective concerns and insights about their emerging self-confidence and international competence. Individual adjustment to the international setting did not follow a prescribed pattern; rather, the development of coping skills and competencies was an ongoing process, as was reflected in the students' journals and in the focus group transcripts.

In this program, reflection occurred formally in journals, focus groups, and class sessions. It occurred informally in student small group discussions, and in individual conversations with faculty members. As a research tool, the journals were invaluable to the analysis of the students' lived experience. The assignment to keep a journal let students reflect on their experiences and what they learned from them; further, it provided students an opportunity to take time for themselves, and to recuperate away from the intensity of activities and the ever-present group dynamics. As faculty present the pedagogy of journaling to students, it would be helpful to also acknowledge the likelihood of "journal fatigue,"

while emphasizing the value of gaining self-insight through this process. Furthermore, journaling offers a mechanism for retrieving details of the service-learning experience that are likely to fade from memory as time goes by.

Although focus groups provide an opportunity to process experiences and make observations, they also hold significant potential to digress into gripe sessions as students express disappointments and frustrations with challenging situations. Faculty who are alert to this group dynamic and who are prepared to shift topics or ask for counterbalancing observations can maximize the benefit of the group process while providing a climate of emotional safety.

Faculty Self-care

Faculty members who lead international service-learning programs should expect to do much more than be distant bystanders, available in case of emergency. In fact, faculty, especially those relatively new to service-learning in an international setting, would be well advised to anticipate that they may experience anxieties similar to those of students. It is suggested that faculty members recognize their own vulnerability to the demands of international service-learning, and build collegial relationships with co-leaders and local partners that help to diffuse stress.

Faculty members who facilitate international service-learning programs will assume many roles that are atypical of the classroom environment. The close living arrangements of an international service-learning program mean that conversation, reflection, and learning may occur over a meal, while doing the dishes, on a bus, during a trip to the marketplace, or after a knock on the door in the middle of the night. Faculty members who are also fatigued and a long way from the support systems of home are not always immune to the drama of group dynamics or their own diminished coping skills. However, allowing students to see their humanness may offer another opportunity for student learning and group cohesiveness. It was the authors' experience that one of the most rewarding roles in international service-learning was functioning as mentors and coaches while students experienced challenging situations and gained mastery.

In conclusion, preparing students to live and work in a global world has become integral to the mission of higher education, with particular emphasis on global citizenship and engagement. Participating in an international service-learning experience provides a unique opportunity to accomplish those goals. This

study underscores the need for faculty members who plan to lead international service-learning programs to adequately prepare to facilitate the many challenging aspects of their students' experiences that are part and parcel of this form of experiential learning. Navigating the arduous journey of international service-learning with students is rewarded by the evidence that students have coped, matured, learned, and otherwise transformed during the process. The benefits to the service-learning team and local participants are mutual respect and appreciation, a cornerstone of intercultural competence.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their appreciation to the students who provided the grist for this study through their straightforward and detailed journals and wholehearted engagement in the service-learning program. We wish to thank The Honorable Gertrude Mongella and members of her team for their logistical and personal support. We pay tribute to the women, girls, and men in the Ukerewe District communities who generously welcomed the service-learning participants into their daily activities. This international service-learning program was supported, in part, by the President's Venture Fund of the University of Georgia.

References

Batchelder, T.H., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, pro-social, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 341-355.

Billig, S. H., & Eyler, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Jones, S. G. (Eds.). (2011). *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Brown, R. (1988). *Group processes: Dynamics within and between groups*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Carver, R. L. (1997). Theoretical underpinnings of service learning. *Theory into Practice*, 36(3), 143–149.

Charmaz, K. (2009). Shifting the grounds: Constructivist grounded theory methods. In J. M. Morse, P. N. Stern, J. Corbin, B. Bowers, K. Charmaz, & A. E. Clarke (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory: The second generation* (pp. 127–154). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Chisholm, L. A. (2003). Partnerships for international service-learning. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 259–288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, D. D. (1998). Reading, writing, and reflection. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 47–56). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Correia, M. G., & Bleicher, R. E. (2008). Making connections to teach reflection. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 41–49.

Crabtree, R. D. (2008). Theoretical foundations for international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(1), 18–36.

Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston, MA: Heath.

Dunlap, M. R., & Webster, N. (2009). Enhancing intercultural competence through civic engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and perspectives* (pp. 140–153). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). W*here's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., & Schmiede, A. (1996). A *practitioner's guide to reflection in service-learning: Student voices and reflections.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

Gillian, B., & Young, T. (2009). Educational benefits of international experiential learning in an MSW program. *International Social Work,* 52(1), 36–47.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Grusky, S. (2000). International service learning: A critical guide from an impassioned advocate. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(5), 858–867.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 3–25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. (2003). Fundamentals of service-learning partnerships. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 1–19.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B., & Brown, N. C. (2009). Preparing students for global civic engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 213–226). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, P. D., Johnson, P. W., & Shaney, N. (2008). Developing contemporary engineering skills through service learning in Peru. *Journal of Community Engagement*, 1(1), 81–84.

Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A philosophical perspective. J*ournal of Higher Education,* 72(2), 148–171.

Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning, *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5–20.

Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 5–22.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lowery, D., May, D. L., Duchane, K. A., Coulter-Kern, R., Bryant, D., Morris, P. V., . . . & Bellner, M. (2006). A logic model of service-learning: Tensions and issues for further consideration. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(2), 47–60.

Maher, M. J. (2003). Individual beliefs and cultural immersion in service-learning: Examination of a reflection process. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26(2), 88–96.

Mezirow, J. & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nickols, S. Y., Mullen, J. D., & Moshi, L. (2009). An emerging partnership for addressing chronic conditions in Ukerewe District, Tanzania. *Kappa Omicron Nu Forum, 18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/forum18-1.html

Pagano, M., & Roselle, L. (2009). Beyond reflection through an academic lens: Refraction and international experiential education. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 18, 217–229.

Picard, R. W., Papert, S., Bender, W., Blumberg, B., Breazeal, C., Cavallo, D., . . . & Strohbecker, C. (2004). Affective learning—A manifesto. *BT Technology Journal,* 22(4), 253–269.

Rogers, R. (2001). Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. *Innovative Higher Education,* 26, 37–57.

Shepherd, K. (2008). Higher education for sustainability: Seeking affective learning outcomes. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 9(1), 87–98.

Silcox, H. C. (1995). *A how to guide to reflection: Adding cognitive learning to community service programs* (2nd ed.). Holland, PA: Brighton Press.

Sipos, Y., Battisti, B., & Grimm, K. (2008). Achieving transformative sustainability learning: Engaging head, hands and heart. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 9(1), 68–86.

Sternberger, L. G., Ford, K. A., & Hale, D. C. (2005). International service-learning: Integrating academics and active learning in the world. *Journal of Public Affairs, 8,* 75–96.

Tonkin, H. (2004). *Service-learning across cultures: Promise and achievement.* New York, NY: International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

Tryon, E., & Stoecker, R. (2008). The unheard voices: Community organizations and service-learning. J*ournal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement, 12(*3), 47–59.

Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 63*(6), 384–399.

Whitney, B. C., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Research on and through reflection in international service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G.

Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 145–190). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Williams, N. R., & Nickols, S. Y. (2011). Traversing the bumpy road of learning: Exploring faculty and student experiences in an international service-learning program in Tanzania. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping*, 17(1), 76–95.

About the Authors

Sharon Y. Nickols is Dean and Professor Emerita in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences at the University of Georgia. She held the Janette M. Barber distinquished professorship in the College. Her research interests include women in international development, and the history of home economics. Nickols earned a B.S. degree from Kansas State University, an M.A. degree from Teachers College at Columbia University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Missouri–Columbia.

Nancy J. Rothenberg is an associate professor of social work at the University of Georgia. Her research interests include service-learning, and expressive arts in social work education. Rothenberg earned a B.A. degree from Montclair State University, an M.S.W. degree from the University of Georgia, and a Ph.D. from Florida State University.

Lioba Moshi is a professor of comparative literature at the University of Georgia and is former director of the university's African Studies Institute. Her research interests include language, gender, and culture. Moshi earned B.A. and M.A. degrees at the University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, a Master of Philosophy degree at the University of York, England, and a Ph.D. degree at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Meredith Tetloff is an assistant professor of social work at the University of Montevallo, Alabama. Her research interests include community organization and university-community relationships. Tetloff earned a B.A. degree at Birmingham Southern College, an M.S.W. degree at Columbia University, and a Ph.D. at the University of Georgia.

Reflective Essays

© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 17, Number 4, p. 127, (2013)
 ISSN 1534-6104

A Reflexive Interrogation: Talking Out Loud and Finding Spaces for Works of Public Good

Leslie D. Gonzales and James Satterfield

Abstract

Over a year, we engaged in an ongoing dialogue about what it means to be a professor and how we might do a better job of making the public contributions of our work more explicit. Throughout our dialogue, we continually discussed how we, as faculty members, must always work within the institutional constraints that allow the professoriate to exist in the first place. This conceptual essay, which is anchored by a critical theoretical perspective, is poised to make a contribution to the scholarship on faculty careers, professorial understandings of the public good, as well as the practice of faculty evaluation.

Introduction

Academia has long been the target of criticism. Over time, and especially recently, these critiques have led to heightened surveillance and accountability systems *(O'Meara, 2011)*. State governments, activist boards, think tanks, and other commentators continually attack the tenure system, arguing that it is not a profitable or sensible way to conduct the "business" of higher education *(Olivas, 2004; Riley, 2011; Shrecker, 2010)*. Attempting to get a handle on faculty productivity, many of these same commentators assess faculty work as if it were akin to manufacturing looking at inputs, outputs, and returns *(O'Donnell, 2011)*. Such critics suggest that their commentary is justified because, it seems, most professors seem all too willing to sacrifice teaching at the altar of research although "the instructional function of higher education [is what] most endears higher education to the public . . ." *(Hearn, 1992, p. 21)*.

Inside academia, however, scholars of the professoriate suggest that these critiques simplify a complex problem *(O'Meara, 2011)*. Primarily, these scholars point out that faculty are embedded in a system where research expectations, grant writing, and obtaining grants for research are the activities for which they are rewarded. In fact, Melguizo and Strober *(2007)* argue that professors are rewarded for these activities because they function as indicators of excellence, legitimacy, and prestige for colleges and universities *(Archer,*

2009; Gonzales, 2013; O'Meara, 2002). Other scholars suggest that it is unfair to quantify the contributions of faculty with measures that are derived from the logics of business and neoliberalism *(Archer, 2009; Gildersleeve, Kuntz, Pasque, & Carducci, 2010; Sauder & Epseland, 2009; Tuchman, 2010)*. And yet, even among academia's defenders, some accept that most of us fail to demonstrate our contributions in ways that are meaningful to a broader public *(see especially Boyer, 1990; Kezar, 2004)*.

We, a first-year professor and an up-for-tenure professor, have wondered about the aims of the critiques launched at our profession. We have tried to figure out how, as faculty members, we might do a better job of demonstrating the contributions we make through our work. Our awareness of these critiques and desire to respond to them reflect our having entered the professoriate hoping to serve the public good—a notion that we wrestle with in this conceptual essay. We made our way into academia because there were people, including professors, who were willing to invest in us and take chances on us. Since we have been given so much, each of us has always aimed to "give back." Yet, the mounting critiques against this career give us pause and make us wonder if we are, in fact, serving the public good.

In this essay, we share a yearlong dialogue in which we have grappled with this very question. The essay is anchored in critical theory and in particular aspects of critical race and critical feminist perspectives, which place narrative, experience, and the recognition of power relations and positionality at the core of critical scholarship *(Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Gildersleeve et al., 2010; Pasque, Carducci, Kuntz, & Gildersleeve, 2011; Urrieta, 2008; Yosso, 2005)*. Following the aim of these critical traditions, we hope that this essay can serve as both a conceptual and practical tool for other faculty members who are struggling with these kinds of questions.

After sharing large portions of our dialogue, in which we work on clarifying for ourselves what serving the public good means, we present an analysis of promotion and tenure guidelines to highlight opportunities as well as hindrances to serving our conception of public good. Here, we explicitly deploy the agentic elements of critical theory to explore how faculty might negotiate their most immediate constraints in order to serve the public good. In this way, we agree with Córdova *(1992)* who wrote, "the university as an institution is a key arena where 'legitimate' knowledge is established. While discourses of power may have qualities of constraint and repression, they are not, nor have they ever been, uncontested" *(p. 18)*. We acknowledge that contestation requires one to engage

the structures, take them in to understand them and simultaneously to modify them. Because of this, much of our dialogue is also a demonstration of how we grapple with our own position in academia, and how in order to contest we must engage.

Literature Review

To set the context for this essay and situate it in a body of scholarship, we first discuss the literature that addresses faculty work and faculty evaluation practices. Our goal is to illustrate how faculty evaluation practices and traditions often encourage faculty to engage in forms of work that are more distant from what the public might perceive to be important functions of the professoriate, such as teaching and service to the community (e.g., public schools, local businesses).

Extant literature, anchored in diverse methodological approaches and perspectives, has documented how faculty evaluation processes privilege particular kinds of work, which can deter faculty from investing deeply in teaching or service *(Boyer, 1990; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; Kezar, 2004)*. For example, Fairweather *(2005)* examined the relation between faculty productivity and faculty rewards. In this replication of several earlier studies, Fairweather again determined that across all institutional types, even liberal arts colleges, professors were rewarded more when they produced research rather than when they invested time in teaching or service. This "publish or perish" culture not only has been shown to constrain faculty *(Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Boyer, 1990; Fairweather, 1996; 2005; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Lewis, 1996; O'Meara, 2002),* but it also frustrates public constituents who believe that faculty ought to focus disproportionately on teaching and perhaps service to nearby communities *(Boyer, 1990; Fairweather, 1996, 2005; Fairweather & Rhoads, 1995; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Lewis, 1996; O'Meara, 2002)*.

Connected to the "publish or perish" culture described above, scholars have shown that faculty members are highly aware of a prestige maximization model *(Melguizo & Strober, 2007)* that drives the evaluation of their work. The prestige maximization model that Melguizo and Strober conceptualized has been described in many ways and written about extensively *(Alpert, 1985; Clark, 1978; Jencks & Riesman, 1968)*. The consistent and central premise is that higher education organizations operate from a prestige (rather than profit) maximization perspective. Melguizo and Strober explained that prestige is awarded via professional disciplines, publication

outlets, accreditation or other ranking bodies, and reward/resource-awarding entities *(Gonzales, 2013)*. This means that a professor must be concerned not only with producing scholarship, but also with producing research that discipline-based peers are likely to consider a contribution to their larger conversations. For example, more prestige and legitimacy is often attributed to publications in "high-impact journals" whose chief audience is academic *(see Hart & Metcalfe, 2010; O'Meara, 2002; O'Meara, Rice, & Edgerton, 2005)*.

Frustrated with the research-dominant approach to the evaluation of faculty work and highly sensitive to the critiques launched at the professoriate with regard to the "publish or perish" culture, higher education leaders like Ernest Boyer *(1990)*, in his capacity as the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, sought to create new methods and mechanisms to assess faculty work. Bringing legitimacy to all forms of faculty work was the underlying goal of the "redefining scholarship" movement sparked by Boyer's *(1990)* book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Boyer adopted this approach because he was cognizant that how faculty are evaluated, or perhaps more accurately, how faculty members are legitimized, matters and gives shape to how they carry out their work.

Subsequent to Boyer's work was Eugene Rice's effort to construct a national, interdisciplinary, and ongoing forum to discuss faculty roles and rewards. Complementing the faculty forums, private foundations sponsored research and partnerships aimed at supporting the development of a distinct brand of scholarship, which connected faculty more directly to the public through efforts that are now referred to as "engaged scholarship" *(Driscoll & Sandmann, 2001; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O'Meara, 2008)*. To this end, scholars have developed a robust literature to consider what engaged scholarship means. Inherent to this scholarship is a consistent reference to notions like "the public good," "civic engagement," and "service" as well as "community." Yet, always attempting to avoid dense normative prescriptions, most scholars accept that being "engaged" means many things *(Ellison & Eatman, 2008; O'Meara, 2008)*. O'Meara *(2008)*, one of the leading scholars on the topic, asserts that faculty-community engagement is

> work that engages a faculty member's professional expertise to solve real-world problems in ways that fulfill institutional mission and are public, not proprietary. . . . [and that] the term engagement is used inclusively to mean forms of service-learning, professional service,

> community-based research, and applied research that engage professional or academic expertise in partnership with local expertise to address real-world issues. *(p. 8)*

In our review of the literature, we found that flexible parameters have been established and accepted to describe how faculty might carry out a more publicly engaged kind of career. One of the additional themes in this literature is that broadening scholarship demands a particular epistemological stance, not only among those who wish to carry out such work, but also among those who evaluate such work *(Schön, 1995)*. With engaged scholarship, the faculty member acknowledges and appreciates the value of constituents external to academia and recognizes them as holders and constructors of knowledge. Of this, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara *(2008)* noted:

> This [epistemological] shift raises critical questions of how knowledge is constructed and what is accepted as legitimate knowledge in the academy. It is marked by movement away from traditional academic knowledge generation (pure, disciplinary, homogeneous, expert-led, supply-driven, hierarchical, peer reviewed, and almost exclusively university-based) to engaged knowledge generation (applied, problem-centered, transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, hybrid, demand-driven, entrepreneurial, network-embedded, etc.). *(p. 48)*

Because of the difficulties involved in such epistemological shifts, scholars have developed national standards, handbooks, and exemplary cases to demonstrate how, on the one hand, one might "package" engaged scholarship, and how, on the other hand, a colleague might evaluate such work *(see Driscoll & Sandmann, 2001; Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & O'Meara,2008)*. Yet, when scholars have examined the extent to which "revised" evaluative guidelines and approaches are actually used, the results are disappointing (*Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Gonzales & Rincones, 2011; O'Meara, 2002; O'Meara, Rice, & Edgerton, 2005)*. Such findings consistently reflect that efforts to broaden the definition of scholarship have not taken root in faculty evaluative practices, which points to the central role that we academics play in the perpetuation of narrow faculty evaluation practices. Additionally, is also suggests that unless there are academic spaces and academics who see such scholarship as legitimate

kinds of faculty work, engagement and the epistemological stance that underpins it will not be institutionalized *(Driscoll & Sandmann, 2001; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; O'Meara, 2002; Pasque, Carducci, Kuntz & Gildersleeve, 2011)*.

In the next section, we present our dialogue in which we take a reflexive position on the many issues presented thus far. We wrestle with our position in academia in relation to power, privilege, and responsibility. We grapple with our preconceptions about what our careers would be like, how our careers are unfolding, how we consume, but also how we aim to negotiate the processes that govern our work.

Situating the Dialogue

This work grows from dialogic inquiry *(Pasque et al., 2011)* and is also an example of a counter narrative. Counter narrative is a form of narrative inquiry derived from critical theory, which has gained particular prominence within critical race and feminist scholarship *(Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Urrieta, 2008)*. In short, counter narrative inquiries require researchers to position themselves in relation to the texts that they put forward and to account for the import of experience in relation to one's ethic, racial, and cultural backgrounds. In dialogic inquiry, the exchange, itself, is used to assess, analyze and interrogate a particular problem *(Carducci, Kuntz, Gildersleeve & Pasque, 2011; Pasque et al., 2011)* and it also requires an acute sense of positionality and power relations. Both methodological approaches assert multiple ways of knowing. Both suggest that there are always spaces and possibilities for resistance and agency. Of such spaces, bell hooks *(1990)*, a critical race scholar, asserted the possibilities for agency even in a system that pushes one to the margins, wrote, "I am located in the margin. [Yet] I make a definite distinction between that marginality which is imposed by oppressive structures and that marginality one chooses as site of resistance—as location of radical openness and possibility.,"*(p. 153)*

To this end, we begin by situating our personal history, which is impossible to untangle from our work and position as scholars. We work to consider our position in academia, in what ways we have held up or tried to negotiation what seems to count as valuable, legitimate knowledge, faculty work, and faculty roles.

Leslie's Story

It is impossible for me to disentangle my history and experiences when I examine issues of higher education, particularly in relation to the construction and legitimization of knowledge *(Delgado Bernal, 2008)*. Perhaps most powerful for me is the influence of my mother and father and the life they made for me. My father and his family, like so many Latino families, moved around the southwest with the rhythms of the planting and harvesting seasons. My mother, the daughter of a cook and a maid, stayed home with me to teach me my ABCs, my numbers, and everything she could to ensure that I was "ready" for kindergarten. As much as it pained them, my parents made the conscious decision to teach me English instead of Spanish because they were worried that any sign of Spanish might have led to my marginalization in school.

Thus, it has always been clear to me that my parents made deliberate decisions about my "formal education." I was advised by them to always respect my teachers, and to be thankful for my education and for the opportunities that would follow my education, if I studied hard enough. This perspective of deference is common in Latino families *(Valdés, 1996; Yosso, 2005)*. I believe that this deep respect for schools and education has shaped my views on schooling and college. It also gave impetus to my intrigue with faculty careers, how faculty members intersect with universities, and how we construct and legitimize knowledge, and how we put such knowledge to work for our communities-near and far.

Although I can now question and interrogate professional knowledge, I clearly remember being a student at a small, comprehensive university sitting in class in awe. I listened carefully and I read everything my professors assigned, always juggling one and sometimes two jobs with my studies. Eventually, I learned about graduate school; I thought it sounded right for me. I was not too sure what a master's degree was or what I would do afterward, but it was an opportunity to extend my learning. While writing my thesis under one of my most steady academic mentors, I learned about scholars like Ana Castillo and Sandra Cisneros, and about other writers who questioned normative views and dominant forms of knowledge carried in grand narratives. Through their work, I was given license to do the same, to assert why—despite my love for learning and school—I had never truly seen myself nor understood how I fit in the canons of political science, sociology, history, public administration, or law. Exposed to such exciting and new areas of scholarship, I felt compelled to continue my education.

Perhaps it is because I spent some of my time straddling the luxurious world of questions and theories, and the rest of my time scurrying between work and school, that it always made sense to me that the work of academia should have resonance and connection to real life, and to the world of work and practice. Perhaps this is why I found myself seeking a doctorate in higher education. In some ways, the educational field represented a space, to me, within academia where one's work was inevitably connected to practice—through interacting and learning with practitioners inside the classroom, and through the wide range of outlets that allow one to publish work for the "pure academic audience" as well as for "communities of practice." Taken together, all of these experiences "make" me, and shape how I understand the roles and responsibilities of university faculty. Next, James describes his starting point and how it shapes his view of the world and faculty roles.

James' Story

My feelings, desires, and level of understanding for the wider field of education have developed over time, and are shaped from a long line of educators. Perhaps this is why, while most people tend to put stock in the prestige of a place (e.g., college or university), I find myself rooted in the pedigree of ideas. One of the most formative ideas for me is from a conversation that I had with my mentor in graduate school. I clearly remember my mentor saying, "As you develop your ideas and begin to socialize students, you must remember whose shoulders you stand on." As a result, I realize every day my ideas about education and the role of faculty are rooted in George Brown's *(1971)* notion of "confluent education" and Laurence Iannaccone's *(1975)* understanding of the "politics of education." More than anyone else, though, my father, who earned his Ph.D. in community education in the late 1960s, shaped my ideas and beliefs about the purposes of education.

Now a professor, I recognize my own privilege. That privilege is not, however, traditional in the sense of being born with a level of privilege. I believe my privilege is rooted in being able to negotiate multiple worlds. I believe that attending a historically Black college and university as an undergraduate, working at a historically Black college and university, attending graduate school at a predominantly White institution, and starting my faculty career at a Hispanic-serving institution, prepared me for a life as a faculty member. My education experiences ground my philosophy about faculty life, which is that faculty members should be more con-

cerned with the development of others and less concerned with the development of self.

Our Dialogue

Our dialogue began around the time that I (Leslie) was hired, and just as James was about to begin the promotion and tenure process. Our conversations often turned to concerns that most early-career tenure-track professors have: work-life balance, the mystique of promotion and tenure, and how to do meaningful work. In one of these conversations, James, who is one of my mentors, said something to the effect of "Well, it is important for you to know what kind of faculty member you want to be." Although a simple statement, these words fueled a serious discussion about the nature of the professoriate and the different "kinds" of professor one can be.

In our conversations, I (Leslie) described research as a critical strategy to affect how people conceptualize problems. I have always been anxious to talk with formal and informal leaders, such as teachers, administrators, or policy makers, to ensure that they are exposed to perspectives, theories, and research that challenge the all-too-common deficit views of Latina/o communities, for example. I believe that reading just one article can really shift and challenge one's perspective.

At the same time, I (James) found myself revisiting why I had come into the professoriate as I spoke to my new colleague, Leslie. I talked about entering the professoriate to develop individuals and educational leaders. I also talked about the kind of faculty member that my father was when he was in academia. My father's work has always inspired me. I like to talk about how my dad took action, got out there into the community. It was not just about sitting and writing-there was an action piece expected of faculty. I think we are missing the action piece today. When we first started this project, I had a stale sentiment about my work as a faculty member. I remember saying in one of our early conversations that I just wanted to "do something already."

As we worked through these early conversations, we realized we had similar aspirations for our careers: to contribute to the public good, but we envisioned different ways of achieving this common goal. We also realized as we talked about this notion of serving the public good that faculty members across different disciplines may have different conceptions of how their work contributes to the public good *(Pasque, 2010)*. For example, whereas O'Meara *(2008)*

notes that engaged scholarship should not be proprietary, it is possible that business, engineering, or other science faculty members have complex compensatory contracts in which most of their work is "compensated." However, perhaps it is through these compensated relationships that they contribute in other ways *(see Mendoza, 2007; Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Slaughter, Archerd, & Campbell, 2004)*.

After several casual conversations, we decided to be more pointed in our discussion, working in the lines of dialogic inquiry *(Pasque et al., 2011)*. We structured conversations to answer the following questions: (1) What does it mean when we say we want to do work for the "public good"? and (2) How can we ensure that we are, in fact, doing such work? In practice, how do we value it or not? Below, we present notes from our structured conversations. The italicized words or phrases in this section denote particularly important ideas for us.

> **Leslie**: So, when we talk about serving or the public good and wanting to do the public good, what do we mean?
>
> **James:** Well, I think of the idea of our work *being good to the society as a whole*, where it is *not just about me*, but about the whole state of society. You know, human rights, like the right to work, the right to [collectively] bargain, the right to education. I see that, too. The public good is about protecting those kinds of ideas.
>
> **Leslie:** You know, this is hard because we can say it, but what do we really mean? And, without being prescriptive, how do we say this. I think, first and foremost, *the public good cannot hurt others*—I mean, like *medically, emotionally, educationally*. I also agree it has to be something like working towards things bigger than us. For me, it is about *openness in a lot of ways*. Although some people do, I don't really get stuck on the idea about teaching versus research when we talk about the public good, but more about the, kind of, underlying purpose, philosophy of your work, *the willingness to be critical and to pose hard questions* is what I want to do. Access, equity, opportunity, critical understanding, taking the place or the position of others, having my students do that, so that they get beyond parochial ideas and norms and views of the world to understand and learn from

others, especially since they are school and university leaders.

James to Leslie: But, why does it matter to you? Why do you think we should think about those things or do those things?

Leslie: I feel like I—for sure—need to do those things! We are so privileged in this work. I see how hard my parents work. I mean my *Grampo* [*Grampo*, rather than Grandpa, is representative of the northern New Mexican dialect that characterizes Leslie's linguistic heritage and familial past], my Grandma, my tios [uncles]: they drive a bus. They have always driven because it was an important contribution. No one gets rich doing it . . . but it is a way of getting us kids, the rural, ranch kids, to school. And, here I am. I just feel like I have such a privilege, such a responsibility to ask hard questions, to ask people to think about class, color, race, gender, especially in education, we need people who can lead with a critical eye for the problems that they confront.

James: Well, for me, *it is less about me and more about others,* but my approach does not fare well in terms of evaluation in academia—especially in research universities. I have to try not to hide, but to go unnoticed, under the radar, kind of.

Leslie to James: Talk about going unnoticed.

James: Unnoticed or maybe under the radar, yeah. Sure, I can produce quality scholarship but since the university is not quite at the top yet . . . I can really focus on what I like: student productivity.

Leslie: So, is student productivity how you see your public good contribution? What does that mean?

James: Producing the next wave of knowledge producers—*the scholarship of teaching and learning; shaping "clinical scholars."* There are many ways to describe it. You know, academia rewards us like this is about the development of self, but I think it should be about *the development of others*.

Leslie: That is really interesting. I guess I never thought about the development of others versus self; like, never juxtaposed it like that. I mean, I don't see them as really exclusive, but it's all where you put the accent, right? I wonder, so, do you see the research as selfish—about "self-development"? Because I think about it and I love the research, the writing because I feel like we can ask some important questions. In my research, I feel like I ask them. *I am always concerned about the recognition of power relations, you know, how someone earns legitimacy in academia—you know.*

James: Yeah, but I think the action is lost in higher education. It's sad. All we are doing is producing people that function off perspective of self. It is important to do the research, but there is no *do.*

Leslie to James: No *do*?

James: There are no action items. We look down on action research, on applied research. We do. I am not saying we need to only do action research, but if we write something, *there has to be an actualization of the work,* I think. . . . When I work with students: that is when I feel like I am self-actualizing. *The "do" for me is sending people out there, helping them develop their ideas*. . . . For me, my doing is about developing students, not just in the strict academic sense, but helping them build a network. You know, we talk about prestige of institution and how that amounts to the prestige of a student or scholar, but to me there is an important aspect of pedigree in terms of a school of thought, and less about institution. *I want to make sure that my students are part of an academic family, for their ideas and also for their connections*.

Leslie: So, this kind of work is how you feel you are doing your part—making sure that your students are part of an academic family.

James: Well, yes, it is valuable, and it's how I see me doing the public good, but to be clear, it's not tenurable. You know, starting at [former university] gave me time to learn what kind of professor I wanted to be. It taught me, it showed me what was important. Like, I

had all these dreams for myself, you know, like being an international scholar, and then I realized at [my first institution] that I was really good at helping other people actualize their goals, and that I was better at that than at some of my own goals. I almost took a step back and like, you can fight it, you can try to fight it. And I did, you can try to suppress it, but when you are a teacher, and a person comes to you and says, "I don't know, and I know I don't know. Help me." Only a jerk does not help. *And that's when I realized that there are other ways to do a faculty career, and developing my students was what mine was going to be about.*

Leslie: Tell me a little bit about you trying to fight it.

James: Oh yeah, *you fight it because that is not what academia is about because academia is about the development of self rather than the development of others.* There are no "real" deliverables. Again, no real "do."

Leslie: So, then, do research questions always have to be practice focused? Are only those who like to teach doing the public good? I mean, can't we do the public good by asking our students or peers hard questions, whether we are in classrooms or in a journal article. I mean, what about the idea of giving back by helping to develop a critical citizenry? You know, like C. W. Mills (1959) or, I think, of some of my own mentors?

James: Right, research and research questions do not always have to be practically driven, but they should be *practically explained.*

Leslie: Ah, that is interesting, really interesting. I like that. *Unpacked?* We should unpack and use what we know for public ends? So, like, I am a professor, and I am interested in organizational development and behavior, I can write about it for my peers, but maybe the public good is in the *writing for others locally or in practice focused newsletters or maybe going to help an organization through a planning process or collecting data* and working with them to help them think through the data? When I did that back home, I felt like it really mattered.

James: Right, right. But, we don't value that.

Leslie: For me, yes, that is really important and a way that I can see myself doing the public good—aside from writing and trying to study important issues. Like, I think about my dissertation work, and I am happy that I sent my participants a summary and did a member's check because that gave me an opportunity to go and "unpack" the analysis and illuminate the common interests and tensions. And I am glad that I went back and presented to the formal leadership, even if it was difficult and stressful. I shared the work in a practical and directly meaningful way.

Conceptualizing Public Good through Dialogic Inquiry

We took our conversation, some of which is captured above, and analyzed it to develop a conception of the public good that resonated with both of us. Specifically, after looking at the body of data that we generated, we agreed that it was unlikely we would ever completely agree with one another about all of the ways that faculty might serve the public good. For example, I (Leslie) clearly suggest that scholarship, in and of itself, can be a contribution to the public good. James sees the need to unpack one's scholarship for audiences in a more direct manner via talks or by working in hands-on ways with communities of practice. We also view scholarship in slightly different ways. James suggests that the "publish or perish" culture facilitates "development of self" rather than "development of others" (students), but I (Leslie) do not see "development of self" and "development of others" as mutually exclusive. Our willingness to allow the very notion of "serving the public good" to be fluid reflects the kind of epistemological bent that is necessary for critical work, which values multiple ways of knowing and doing as long as there is consistent commitment to social justice, equity, and the recognition of power relations *(Pasque et al., 2011).*

Ultimately, through standard qualitative data analysis (reading, rereading of data, and cursory coding) *(Creswell, 2008)* and dialogic techniques (talking extensive and notating those talks to articulate arguments/points) *(Carducci et al., 2011),* we developed a conception of the public good that we could agree on. The features of this conception are presented in Table 1. Many of these features are reflected in the literature that addresses engaged scholarship, which we referenced earlier *(Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Kezar, 2004; O'Meara, 2002;*

O'Meara, Rice, & Edgerton, 2005; O'Meara, 2008; Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & O'Meara, 2008). In the table, we display features along with supporting excerpts from our narrative. Note that our agreed-upon features are italicized in column 1 along with supporting sources from the literature while key exemplary excerpts from our narrative are italicized in column 2.

Table 1. Serving the Public Good

Types of Engagement Work	Excerpts from Dialogue, Notes, or Literature
Efforts that *advance democracy, in its social* rather than its liberal conceptulization *(Gildersleeve et at., 2010)*	**James:** our work *being good to the society as a whole*, where it is *not just about me,* but about the whole state of society. Leslie: I also agree it has to be something like *working towards things bigger than us…*
Doing the public good cannot *hurt or violate others (Slaughter et at., 2004: Shrecker, 2010)*	**Leslie:** I think, first and foremost, *the public good cannot hurt others*—I mean, like *medically, emotionally, educationally.*
The public good can *unfold in many kinds of work*. The public good is not the province of teaching, researching, or service. Works of public good come in diverse forms *(Pasque, 2010: Pasque et al., 2011).*	**Leslie:** It is about *openness in a lot of ways*…it's more about the, kind of, underlying purpose, philosophy of your work. **James:** *And that 's when I realized that there are other ways to do a faculty career, and developing my students was what mine was going to be about.*
Working toward the public good promises safe spaces for *critical inquiry,* disrupting what is perceived as normal *(Gildersleeve et at., 2010)*	**Leslie:** We are so privileged in this work. I see how hard my parents work. I just feel like I have such a privilege, such a responsibility to ask hard questions, to ask people who can lead with a *critical eye for the problems that they confront.*
Works of public good include the attempt to *communicate with different constituencies, especially those most impacted by one's area of work/expertise (Driscoll& Lynton, 1999; O'Mera, 2002, 2008; Pasque, 2010).*	**James:** *work does not have to be practice driven, but it should be practically explained.*

Reflecting and Learning From Our Dialogue: Towards Praxis

We started this project unknowingly. Engaged in what seemed to be casual conversations about the tensions in faculty careers, we realized that as faculty members who claim to want to serve the public, we needed to take a reflexive position, interrogate and understand better what we mean by serving the public good, and consider the ways in which we are or are not working towards such conceptions ourselves *(Gildersleeve et al., 2010)*. For example, as we have noted throughout, achieving legitimacy in academia requires that one earn the "approval" of individuals and groups at many levels, and within academia, especially, sometimes the norms for earning legitimacy are removed from ideas of serving the public good as we have defined it. Similarly, as has been noted many times

in the literature, the work that "counts" in academe is the work that can be counted (e.g., publications, grant dollars, number of students taught) *(Archer, 2009; Huckaby, 2008)*, and yet, as academics, we are part and parcel of this evaluation process, which means that we must take an active and reflexive stance as we participate/intervene *(Pasque et al., 2011)*.

To this end, following the tenets of critical work, which prized praxis or application of scholarship *(Pasque et al., 2011)*, we examined how our conceptions of serving the public good compare to the promotion and tenure guidelines that are administered within our own working context. Specifically, we asked ourselves, "What are the moments, the phrases, or the frames already embedded in the promotion and tenure guidelines that govern our work, which we might deploy in order to frame our work for those carrying out the evaluative process?" We also asked, "What are the hindrances to the conception of serving the public good?"

I (Leslie) analyzed the guidelines first for spaces and hindrances. Then, James read my analysis of these documents. Again, drawing from dialogic inquiry practices, we revised and talked through the coding work. On one hand, we aimed to more carefully consider the opportunities and hindrances embedded in our own evaluative context, but the ultimate goal was to demonstrate for other faculty members how we worked through this process and to provide a tool that might be used by others who want to make sense of how they might serve and frame their work in the face of constraint while simultaneously negotiating what might be viewed as legitimate and valuable work.

Spaces and Hindrances for Serving

As we examined the evaluative guidelines that govern our work, we sought to illuminate spaces that reflect our conceptualization of the public good. We also sought to recognize the hindrances to such work. We found several such spaces, as well as hindrances to serving the public good. Like most evaluative documents pertaining to faculty work, these guidelines made clear that the faculty role is constituted by three major tenets: research, teaching, and service. We reviewed each of these areas in relation to our conception of the public good.

One of the guiding principles for the promotion and tenure team at our school is that "applied fields require grounding in authentic settings across faculty responsibilities for research, teaching, and service . . . which demand integration of research, teaching, and

service within practical contexts" [Tenure & Promotion Guidelines *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, hereafter, p. 2)*]. Immediately, this language seemed a useful entry point for faculty who want to carry out locally and regionally grounded research *(Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Sandmann et. al., 2008)*. If a scholar focuses on and/or prefers action research and working directly with communities of practice as James suggested in his narrative, that scholar's tenure dossier should refer back explicitly to this language. This is one of the most important spaces that we found in our comparative review of the guidelines and our conception of the public good.

We continued our reading of the guidelines, which begin with a discussion of research. The guidelines state that to receive tenure and promotion to associate professor, a faculty member must be able

> to provide evidence that his or her accomplishments in the [research] area are well-recognized by peers and have begun to have had a national impact. Evidence of such contributions includes publication in refereed, nationally distributed, and abstracted/indexed journals; publications of books, book chapters, and monographs (refereed and indexed); and external funding for scholarship and research *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 7)*.

Given its presentation as the first area of faculty responsibilities addressed in the guidelines, research clearly has primacy. Continuing the description of research, the guidelines incentivize faculty to employ narrow rather than diverse dissemination of their scholarship. For example, the guidelines noted that to evaluate the quality of a candidate's research and scholarship, the tenure and promotion team will consider the

> reputation of the journals in which the candidate has published, the acceptance/rejection rates of the journals in which he or she has published, the frequency with which the candidate's works are cited in the literature (e.g., citation index), the reputation of funding sources, the acceptance/rejection rates of funding sources, and the amount of external funding *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 7)*.

Furthermore, junior faculty members are advised to organize and present their scholarship by placing their international and national publications atop the list.

The guidelines describe how research is appraised according to a three-pronged classification: (1) competence, (2) achievement, and (3) achievement with distinction. Under each classification are examples for these various levels of achievement. Competent scholarship includes "presentations at state or regional conferences or articles published in refereed state and regional journals, technical reports, and university grants." Achievement includes "(co)-principal investigator on external grant (funded); publications in national refereed professional journals or monographs (abstracted/indexed); book chapters, presentations at national or international professional conferences (evidence of refereed process); or national impact of electronic or technological tools." Finally, "achievement with distinction" will be earned by demonstrating

> sustained contributions in *nationally recognized professional* journals (refereed and indexed) and edited books; national recognition for publications (e.g., awards, articles in national newspapers); editorial board member for *nationally recognized,* refereed journal, or invited presentations at *national or international conferences*. [emphasis added] *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 8)*.

To this end, tenure-track faculty members are advised to organize their dossiers in ways that highlight their most valuable achievements or what are referred to as "achievements with distinction."

These guidelines make it evident that national renown or impact is highly important to earning legitimacy. On the one hand, this is understandable. Faculty members work on and produce specialized bodies of knowledge that are "checked" for relevance or soundness by other scholars working across the country on similar issues. However, as Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara *(2008)* noted, there are other interested and capable constituencies that consume and also produce knowledge. Refusing to give space and/or legitimacy to these external knowledge consumers/producers (policy bodies, nonprofit organizations, practitioners, etc.) inherently marginalizes them, as pointed out in the recent work of Pasque *(2010)*. Furthermore, as González and Padilla *(2008)* argue, what other professional academics view as important and legiti-

mate may not be relevant to local or regional communities, communities of practice, and so forth. For example, González *(2008)* described how he reached a point in his professorial career where he no longer looked to national agencies or professional colleagues to help him formulate research questions. Instead, he looked to local community members, schools, and other organizations to see how he might serve in the ways that they needed and in the ways that made sense to them. Thus, like González and other scholars *(Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Gonzales, 2010; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; O'Meara, 2008)*, we argue that if scholars are encouraged to publish in high impact, national and international outlets, then it becomes difficult or risky for faculty to spend time crafting research agendas anchored in local matters with the help of local and external constituencies. In other words, exclusive reliance on tight circles of professionals from within academia can impose limits to other forms of faculty work, such as unpacking scholarship in practice or policy briefs.

Still, it is important to point out that the evaluative guidelines do highlight multiple kinds of outlets. For example, as evidence of "competent scholarship," the guidelines refer to practice, local, regional, policy-focused, and/or technical reporting forms of work. The spaces for inserting such work are limited and suggestively categorized as less valuable, or less legitimate; nonetheless, these spaces do exist. A scholar might frame local and/or practitioner-oriented publications by quoting language from the guidelines. For instance, a tenure-track scholar with multiple practice or locally oriented products might write: "In serving all audiences connected to my career as a professor serving in a land-grant university, I have published essays that are relevant to regional, community-based organizations as well as state-oriented policy reports and national and, of course, peer-reviewed journals." In fact, Ellison and Eatman *(2008)* suggest that faculty who are engaged in multiple forms of scholarship provide names of practitioners who may have used their work or their services in some capacity. These practitioners could then provide additional letters or other evidence reflecting the scholar's contribution.

We have just discussed the prominence assigned to the research aspect of faculty work and how legitimacy is distributed to tenure-track professors based on scholarly dissemination practices. Given the preference for high impact publications evidenced in the tenure and promotion guidelines, it is informative and important to consider the work of Hart *(2006*) and Hart and Metcalfe *(2010)*. For instance, when they compared citation yields gathered from the

conventional and dominant ISI Web of Knowledge (*see Hart & Metcalfe, 2010, p. 146)* and Google Scholar search engine, which they argued is a much more inclusive source of scholarship, they found that "reliance upon the [conventional] citation indexes as tools to determine academic quality has the potential to further *marginalize feminists and likely, other nontraditional groups in the academy*" (*p. 157;* emphasis added*)*. Given Hart and Metcalfe's insights, we argue that the references to citation counts/impact rates as measures of quality and impact implicitly privilege conventional rather than critical scholarship. This, then, is a clear hindrance. Furthermore, drawing from other scholarship such as the work of Delgado Bernal and Villalpando *(2002)*, Carducci et.al, *(2011)*, Lather *(2004)*, and Urietta *(2008),* we suggest that critical inquirers and/or works that are intended to disrupt the status quo may not fare as well in "high impact" mainstream outlets. Thus, we see the utilization of impact rates as a potential hindrance to our conception of public good, especially the notion that works of the public good must not, in any way, be harmful.

Regarding teaching, the guidelines note, "teaching is the fundamental responsibility" *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 9)* of a faculty member. Moreover, the guidelines go on to expound the many elements of teaching, outlining that teaching also includes advising, mentoring, and improving one's pedagogical approach through professional development or perhaps action research and reflection. These are additional spaces or opportunities to outline the complexities involved in one's teaching work as a public good. Faculty would do well to take this language and refer to examples of each of the elements of teaching (advising, mentoring, professional development, etc.). By doing so, faculty might be able to elevate the development of their students through innovative practices and intense mentoring.

With regard to service, the guidelines define service as "non-compensated consultation, products developed for a variety of media/technology, performances/products/services for the arts, professional reviewing activities, in-service activities, service related grants and acquisition of resources" *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 12)*. This reference to service reflects our agreement that service should not be based on profit or compensation. Such service includes using one's research skills to conduct much needed research or using one's knowledge base to inform policy conversations. The entire conceptualization of service is broad enough to insert many efforts that fit our notion of public good.

Yet, it is important to note that when evaluating service contributions, the tenure and promotion guidelines also classify service as "competent," "achievement," and "achievement with distinction." Earning "achievement with distinction" in the area of service requires extensive and high-level involvement in national or international professional associations or at least holding the presidency of major state organizations and/or policy bodies. Meanwhile, "competent service" is defined as "contributions to committees in college, to area program of study; invited class presentations . . . attending local meeting . . . contributions to local program of work . . . contributions of professional expertise to the community" *(College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 2008, p. 12)*. It is evident that the most valued forms of service are described as those activities that faculty deploy at a national level, whereas the most locally oriented ones are viewed as competent. Despite the language that describes how faculty work in applied fields should be grounded in practical contexts, limited value seems to be assigned to service carried out at the local level, meaning that the kind of "unpacking" that James stressed is not as valuable as service given to the "profession."

Finally, unfortunately, there was little, if any, explicit reference to the role that faculty might play in building or serving democracy, civic responsibilities, or those features of the public good which we named. Perhaps the closest example of the social democratic potential in faculty work or roles was the following line: "[Our] tenure-track faculty members serve for the good of their respective programs to meet [our] land-grant mission in the state and region." Using this language, a faculty member interested and engaged in works of the public good, similar to our conceptualization, might advance his/her work by explaining, "Given the democratic and public service underpinnings of land-grant universities, I have served on the [insert specific example of task force or civic group, etc.]. In my role on this [task force], I use my research skills and transcribe notes to ensure. . . ."

Clearly, faculty must work to insert and assert the importance of work that speaks to our multidimensional notion of public good, but it is possible to negotiate the evaluative process by leveraging particular language from the evaluation guidelines. We see this as a viable space and opportunity for agency and resistance as did hooks *(1990)* and Córdova *(1992)*.

Conclusion

In this essay, we displayed our dialogue and related notes, as we worked to clarify our notion of the public good. We showed the complexities, convergences, and divergences that we ran into within our own conversation. Ultimately, we developed a conception of the public good that resonated with both of us, and then we compared it with our tenure and promotion guidelines to think through ways that we and others might negotiate their evaluative context in order to frame their works of public good.

We argue that faculty must attempt to frame their works in ways that speak to a broader public good. On the one hand, this is a response to the critiques and commentaries we first described in our essay. As we noted, faculty must take a more active role in shaping the perception and discourses around their roles and contributions. On the other hand, we recognize that faculty members often face complex constraints related to the profession and the field itself. We wanted to provide an example of the ways that faculty might think through their own conception of the public good, how they might read the evaluative documents that govern their own work carefully, and then exploit potential spaces for public good by using these spaces as frames of legitimacy.

Of course, as with any study, our project has its limitations. We did not seek multiple sets of tenure and promotion guidelines to "test" our conception of serving and how it might fit (or not) in other places. This is because our work is a project stemming from critical epistemological and ontological paradigms, narrative and dialogical inquiry, meaning that it is valuable precisely because it is framed by our particular situated experiences and that our ultimate hope is to resonate with others through our explicit reflexive practices and the steps we took to provide contextual details alongside scholarly sources *(Carducci et al., 2011; Pasque et al., 2011)*.

Thus, we offer up our narrative as well as our analysis of the tenure and promotion guidelines for others to consider—hoping that this work might lead readers to see the possibilities that lie within the strictures of accountability, prestige maxim models, and narrow forms of legitimacy that faculty simultaneously face. In other words, rather than simply conform or "give up" on aspirations to serve the public good, we hope that others will see that there are ways to serve and to frame one's work by strategically reading and utilizing spaces provided in evaluative policies themselves.

This is but our first step on what we believe to be an important and potentially fruitful line of inquiry. Other than a few pieces

that examine organizational documents *(Gaffikin & Perry, 2009; Wangenge-Ouma & Langa, 2010*), we are unaware of other scholarship that has sought to inspect tenure and promotion policies so carefully with the intent of seeking out spaces to insert works of public good. On that note, we believe that our conception of the public good can be juxtaposed and refined by joining it to other scholarship, such as Pasque's *(2010)* extensive report on the ways that the public good is conceptualized in higher education, as well as other personal narratives and experiences. We understand and see the notion of "serving the public good" as fluid and hope others take a moment to talk out loud and reflexively narrate the possibilities.

References

Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 56*, 241–281.

Archer, L. (2009). The neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics' constructions of professional identity. *Journal of Educational Policy, 23*(3), 265–285.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown, G. I. (1971). Human is as confluent does. T*heory Into Practice, 10(*3), 191–195.

Carducci, R., Kuntz, A. K., Gildersleeve, R. E., & Pasque, P. (2011). The disruptive dialogue project: Crafting critical space in higher education. *InterActions, 7*(2), 1–20.

Clark, B. (1978). Differentiation in national systems of higher education. *Comparative Education Review, 22*(2), 242–258.

College of Health, Education, and Human Development at Clemson University. (2008). *College of Health Education and Human Development – Leadership, Counseling Organizational Development Tenure and Review Promotion Guidelines*. Clemson, SC: Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Córdova, T. (1992). Power and knowledge: Colonialism in the academy. In C. M. Trujillo (Ed.), Living Chicana theory (pp. 17-45). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Delgado Bernal, D. (2008). La trenza de identidades: Weaving together my personal, professional, and communal identities. In K. González & R. Padilla (Eds.), *Doing the public good: Latina/o scholars engage civic participation* (pp. 135–148). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 169–180.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2001). From maverick to mainstream: The scholarship of engagement. J*ournal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(2), 9–19.

Ellison, P., & Eatman, T. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). F*aculty work and the public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the value of rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. T*he Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 410–422.

Fairweather, J. S., & Rhoads, R. A. (1995). Teaching and the faculty role: Enhancing the commitment to instruction in American colleges and universities. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17*(2), 179–194.

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gaffikin, F., & Perry, D. C. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The U.S. research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(1), 115–144.

Gildersleeve, R. E., Kuntz, A. M., Pasque, P. A., & Carducci, R. (2010). The role of critical inquiry in (re)constructing the public agenda for higher education: Confronting the conservative modernization of the academy. *The Review of Higher Education, 34*(1), 85–121.

Gonzales, L. D. (2010). *Faculty inside a changing university: Constructing roles, making spaces*. Retrieved from Pro Quest Dissertations (UMI 3426847).

Gonzales, L. D. (2013). Faculty sense-making and mission creep: Interrogating institutionalized ways of knowing and doing legitimacy. *The Review of Higher Education, 36(*2), 179–209.

Gonzales, L. D., & Rincones, R. (2011). Interdisciplinary scholars: Negotiating legitimacy at the core and from the margins. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 36*(4), 495-518. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2011.643772

González, K. P. (2008). In search of praxis: Legacy making in the aggregate. In K. González & R. Padilla (Eds.), *Doing the public good: Latina/o scholars engage civic participation* (pp. 125-134). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

González, K., & Padilla, R. (2008). *Doing the public good: Latina/o scholars engage civic participation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hart, J. (2006). Women and feminism in higher education scholarship: An analysis of three core journals. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77,* 40–61.

Hart, J., & Metcalfe, A. (2010). Whose Web of Knowledge™ is it anyway? Citing feminist research in the field of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 81*(2), 140–163.

Hearn, J. C. (1992). The teaching role in contemporary American higher education: Popular imagery and organizational reality. In W. E. Becker & D. R. Lewis (Eds.), *The economics of higher education* (pp. 17–68). Boston, MA: Kluwer.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Huckaby, F. (2008). Making use of Foucault in a study of specific parrhesiastic scholars. *Educational Philosophy & Theory, 40*(6), 770–787.

Iannaccone, L. (1975). *Education policy systems: A study guide for educational administrators.* Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University Press.

Jaeger, A., & Thornton, C. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy, 20*(2), 345–366.

Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution.* New York, NY: Transaction Publishers.

Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429–459.

Lather, P. (2004). This IS your father's paradigm: Governmental intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(1), 15–34.

Lewis, L. (1996). *Marginal worth*. Portland, OR: Transaction.

Melguizo, T., & Strober, M. H. (2007). Faculty salaries and the maximization of prestige. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(6), 633–668.

Mendoza, P. (2007). Academic capitalism and doctoral student socialization: A case study. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(1), 71-96.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

O'Donnell, R. (2011). *Higher education's faculty productivity gap: The cost to students, parents & taxpayers.* Retrieved September 2011 from http://www.texastribune.org/search/?q=Rick%20O%27Donnell

Olivas, M. (2004). *The rise of non-legal legal influences in higher education.* In R. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Governing academia* (pp. 258-275). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

O'Meara, K. A. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57–80.

O'Meara, K. A. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement, 12*(1), 7–29.

O'Meara, K.A. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart and M. B. Paulsen (Eds.) *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 161-220). Springer, Netherlands.

O'Meara, K., Rice, E., & Edgerton, R. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pasque, P. A., Carducci, R., Kuntz, A., & Gildersleeve, R. (2011). Qualitative inquiry for equity in higher education: Methodological innovations, implications, and interventions. *Association for the Study of Higher Education Higher Education Report, 37*(6).

Pasque, P. A. (2010). A*merican higher education, leadership, and policy: Critical issues and the public good*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 276–323). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Riley, N. S. (2011). *The faculty lounges: And other reasons why you won't get the college education you pay for.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K. A. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. J*ournal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47–64.

Sauder, P., & Epseland, W. (2009). The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review, 74*, 63–82.

Schön, D. A. (1995, November/December). Knowing in action: The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change,* pp. 27–34.

Shrecker, E. (2010). *The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Slaughter, S., Archerd, C. J., & Campbell, T. (2004). Boundaries and quandaries: How professors negotiate market relations. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(1), 129–165.

Tuchman, G. (2010). *Wannabe U: Inside the corporate university.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Urrieta, L., Jr. (2008). Agency and the game of change: Contradictions, conciencia, and self-reflection. In K. González & R. Padilla (Eds.), *Doing the public good: Latina/o scholars engage civic participation* (pp. 83-96). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Wangenge-Ouma, G., & Langa, P. (2010). Universities and the mobilization of claims of excellence for competitive advantage. *Higher Education, 59*, 749–764.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.

About the Authors

Leslie D. Gonzales is an assistant professor of higher education at Clemson University. Her research interests focus on faculty careers, legitimacy in academia, and organizational change. She earned a bachelor's in political science from New Mexico Highlands University, a master's in political science from the University of Texas at El Paso, and a doctorate from the University of Texas at El Paso.

James Satterfield is an assistant professor of higher education at Clemson University. His research interests focus on the institu-

tionalization of norms and practices, which shape faculty perspectives on collegiate athletes and athletics. He earned a bachelor's in kinesiology from Norfolk State University, a master's in special education from Norfolk State University, and a doctorate from Eastern Michigan University.