Scholarship Perceptions of Academic Department Heads: Implications for Promoting Faculty Community Engagement Scholarship

Patricia Sobrero and K. S. U. Jayaratne

Abstract

After North Carolina State University developed recommendations for departments and faculty to integrate learning, discovery, and engagement through the scholarship of engagement, the issue was raised: "What do department heads think, and how do they support engagement especially during promotion, tenure, and reappointment of engaged faculty?" This study found that 75% of departments say they value community-engagement scholarship when making promotion and tenure decisions, 73% of the departments include standards to reward community-engagement scholarship, and 20% of the departments have no expectations for faculty to be community-engagement scholars. When asked if community engaged participatory research was valued, it ranked between minimally valued and somewhat valued. Department heads reported that they are not likely to promote faculty who publish in peer reviewed community engagement journals. These journals were reported as only somewhat valued.

Introduction

Judith Ramaley *(2000)*, when president at Winona State University, stated:

> Unless the institution as a whole embraces the value as well as the validity of engagement as legitimate scholarly work and provides both moral support and concrete financial resources to sustain this work, engagement will remain individually defined by the interests of committed faculty and sporadic in nature. *(p. 9)*

A year later, in her study of community engagement scholarship in the promotion and tenure process, Baker *(2001)* concluded, "Faculty members are getting mixed messages about the importance of engagement scholarship from department heads that discourage untenured faculty from engagement activity and from

higher administrators who are encouraging it as a more balanced approach" *(p. 140)*.

These two quotes set the stage for a dialogue along with interviews with the North Carolina State University (N.C. State) department heads and faculty members and have resulted in this study. Several task force reports at N.C. State from 2009 to 2011 uncovered issues and barriers affecting faculty and staff who practice community engagement scholarship and publish the results in scholarly community engagement journals. Often these faculty members have not received scholarship credit for their work.

Setting the Stage for Study

In 2006 a task force of faculty, staff, administrators, and community volunteers from N.C. State University applied for and was honored to receive the engaged university designation from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. During the process we discovered that our campus needed to improve evaluation of engagement programs. We wanted to be confident that each engaged program would be able to provide evidence of outcomes for individuals, families, communities, and society as a result of education programs implemented with the community.

The Benchmarking Economic Development Impacts (BEDI) Task Force was formed in 2007, and had developed two more reports over three years. The first report identified ways community engagement can yield demonstrable monetary impact, and the second report included other resulting types of community capital, such as (1) improved infrastructure and built resources, (2) enhanced natural resources, (3) improved quality of life, and (4) human and social empowerment *(North Carolina State University, 2008, 2010a, p.14)*.

During this work with departments and colleges to develop program logic models and evaluation plans, we discovered that tenure track faculty members were reporting problems in gaining recognition for their scholarship of engagement programs. Others were not publishing about their engagement work because they felt departments would not recognize this scholarship. As a result, we decided it was time to study that subject separately.

In 2008 a task force was charged to look at this issue. Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement Through the Scholarship of Engagement *(North Carolina State University, 2010b)* was developed as a report to strengthen the way faculty document community engagement scholarship, to recommend institutional

performance indicators for engagement, and to improve reporting and research funding language that included credit for the integration of mission areas in funded grants or contracts. It was discovered that faculty may not always be supported by their department heads to pursue community engagement scholarship or to publish their engagement scholarship outcomes. The complete report may be found under The Scholarship of Engagement: Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement through the Scholarship of Engagement. Other community engagement scholarship presentations and resources used with faculty and staff are also displayed on this web page. See http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/scholarship_engagement/engagement.html.

The BEDI reports and the scholarship of engagement report brought this issue to the forefront. Faculty members believed that several department heads failed to support community engagement scholarship or to prepare re-appointment, tenure, and promotion committee members to recognize and reward the various types of scholarship recognized by Carnegie and N.C. State's six realms of scholarship. They also felt that some of their peers considered their community engagement scholarship second-class work.

Views of Other Department Heads and Administrators

The study by Baker *(2001)* found that department heads at Southeastern University expressed these values about engagement scholarship:

> Faculty felt that engagement scholarship was not highly valued by department heads and they were being evaluated by their research and publications. They believe that engagement was valued for public relations purposes, but not encouraged or reinforced. They felt to be a top 30 institution that engagement is devalued. *(p.82)*

Few of the respondents in the Baker *(2001)* study could explain the reciprocal nature of community engagement scholarship using democratic strategies and mutually beneficial partnership methods, and they failed to see the integration of teaching and research with community engagement scholarship. Respondents framed responses as either teaching, or research, or service, with each mission area in competition with the others.

Change in Culture to Support Community Engagement Scholarship

The culture of faculty, department heads, and administration has been changing at N.C. State since the mid-1990s. This change began after Boyer called for a broader view of scholarship in *Scholarship Reconsidered (1990)*. N.C. State, led by the faculty senate, developed and approved six realms of faculty responsibility for documenting scholarship beginning in 2000. The description of these realms was revised in 2003 and adopted by the administration in 2006. The realms include (1) teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students; (2) discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry; (3) creative artistry and literature; (4) technological and managerial innovation; (5) extension and engagement constituencies outside the university; and (6) service in professional societies, including service and engagement within the university *(North Carolina State University, 2010b, p. 28)*. These realms of scholarship are outlined in Regulation 05.20.20—Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Dossier Format Requirements *(North Carolina State University, 2012)*.

The six realms of scholarship influenced standards for reappointment, promotion, and tenure in many departments across the campus. Beginning in 2004 to 2005 all 64 departments revised their standards of re-appointment, promotion, and tenure. Since 2005, 63% of the departments have revised them again, 7% as recently as 2010.

Prior to launching the study at N.C. State, interviews were conducted with the campus department heads who attended group discussions during a department head seminar in 2010 and a forum in 2011. This group comprised 50% of the 64 department heads at N.C. State. Their perceptions informed the need to conduct this study. They referred us to the Administrative Advisory Committee on Academic Departments, which assisted in planning the Engaged Department 2011 forum, and also recommended developing the survey instrument. Five former department heads reviewed the draft survey questions in order to determine their relevance. The survey questions were finalized and submitted to the Institutional Review Board, and the study was approved.

Department Standards Review

During this time (2010–2012) the re-appointment, tenure, and promotion standards were reviewed in each of the 64 departments at N.C. State. The department standards were reviewed again in

the fall of 2013 and there were no significant changes since 2010-12. Some of these departments were led by department leaders and directors who were not called department heads. There were 51 official department heads in 2011 and 53 in 2012. Sixty-four individuals were listed as department heads, interim department heads, directors, or leaders in departments that listed academic standards. Standards were analyzed to determine which of the six realms of scholarship were included for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

We discovered that 100% of the standards in the 64 departments included Realm 1, teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students; Realm 2, discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry; and Realm 6, service in professional societies, and service and engagement within the university itself. This was no surprise since these were the traditional criteria for performance prior to Boyer's *(1990)* influence.

Seventy-three percent of the standards included Realm 5, extension and engagement constituencies outside the university. The College of Management had no expectations for community engagement scholarship. Faculty members in the College of Management often consulted with companies, but this work was not considered community engagement scholarship for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Departments in the other nine colleges developed criteria for community engagement scholarship with communities outside the university. Out of 64 departments, 13 (20%) had no expectations for community engagement scholarship. These departments were in five of the 10 colleges: Agriculture and Life Sciences, Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, Management, and Physical and Mathematical Sciences.

Realm 3, creative artistry and literature, was selected by 16% of the departments. These departments were in six colleges: Design, Engineering, Humanities and Social Sciences, Natural Resources, Physical and Mathematical Sciences, and Textiles. Realm 4, technological and managerial innovation, was selected by 25% of the departments. These departments were in seven colleges: Agriculture and Life Sciences, Engineering, Humanities and Social Sciences, Natural Resources, Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Textiles, and Veterinary Medicine.

The gap between institutional support for community engagement scholarship and practice at the department level was described by Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara *(2008)* when they stated:

Although many institutions have revised tenure and promotion guidelines to align in some fashion with Boyer's categories of scholarship in *Scholarship Reconsidered (1990)*, the faculty who apply the guidelines have not internalized the criteria and standards for evaluating engaged scholarship, leaving the institutional culture unchanged. *(p. 47)*

The standards for re-appointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) in some N.C. State departments demonstrate the lack of internalization by department heads, RPT committees, and faculty. Ramaley *(2000)* reported a similar situation. She found that the major emphasis on research, teaching, and service demonstrated that the culture was slow to change in many departments, as these areas have existed since the university was established. Seifer, Wong, Gelmon, and Lederer *(2009)* reported that "there is a tendency of colleagues to classify work in the community as 'service' simply because of its venue, rather than looking at the many other factors that might qualify the work as 'scholarship'" *(p. 6)*. Even though the six realms of scholarship allowed for clear differentiation between service and engagement, there may have been a lack of understanding in many departments by RPT committees and mentors of new faculty. The findings for this review of departmental standards demonstrated improvement in the percentages of department heads who valued community engagement scholarship, but the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service remain dominant in departmental culture.

Beyond the Expert Model to Co-Learning and Co-Creation of Knowledge

There is a dichotomy in the way departments and administrators think about community engagement scholarship. This results in a gap between perceived institutional support and the criteria supported in department practice. N.C. State administrators and the strategic goals of the university support community engagement scholarship, but departmental culture across the campus does not, in many cases. Department heads reported that the RPT committees were not accepting of the metrics for community engagement scholarship because when they achieved tenure and were promoted they were reviewed based on traditional basic research metrics. Department heads reported it difficult for RPT faculty members to understand and reward metrics for other realms of scholarship.

A second type of gap exists between expert methods faculty practice and the collaborative methods and roles supported through authentic community engagement scholarship. Rice described it this way: "the scholarship of engagement requires going beyond the 'expert' model that both informs and gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration"*(p. 13)*. Saltmarsh *(2010)* gave this example:

> The implication of this shift from teaching and learning is that it relocates students and community partners as co-producers of knowledge, valuing the knowledge and experience they contribute to the educational process, sharing authority for the process of knowledge generation and pedagogy, and allowing them to practice and experiment with a public culture of democracy as part of higher education. *(p. 348)*

This type of community engagement scholarship can conflict with faculty identity. Rice *(2002)* stated that faculty roles and identities were tied to a department-centric culture that supported selected journals, literature, networks, and organizations. The multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of community engagement expands the former role, making it more inclusive, honoring partner roles, and recognizing that co-learning with community members is valuable to discovery and knowledge. Transdisciplinary initiatives include academic representatives from multiple departments and expert community members representing business, industry, nonprofits, government, and community members. This knowledge applies to application and community engagement discovery *(Holland, 2005b)*.

As a result of N.C. State symposiums, engagement councils, task forces, interviews, forums, surveys, and a review of the literature on community engagement scholarship, a study of perceptions for department heads concerning the scholarship of learning, discovery, and engagement was established in 2010 and continued through 2011.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this N.C. State study was to determine department heads' perceptions about the contribution of community engagement scholarship (engagement with constituents outside the university) in the faculty tenure and promotion process in a land-grant university. The study was expected to accomplish the

following objectives while benchmarking the status of scholarship based on the N.C. State six realms:

1. Determine the extent to which faculty members understand the importance of aligning their Statements of Mutual Expectations (SME) with the six realms of faculty responsibility when preparing their dossiers for promotion and tenure

2. Determine the level of priority given for extension and community engagement scholarship in making promotion and tenure decisions

3. Determine the level of faculty efforts in extension and community engagement scholarship

4. Determine the perceptions about the value of community engaged participatory research

Methods

This was a descriptive survey research study conducted online with the 64 department heads in North Carolina State University. The survey instrument was intended to determine the department heads' perceptions about the role of community engagement scholarship in the faculty promotion and tenure process in relation to the other five realms of scholarship. The instrument was developed as an online survey consisting of close-ended questions and few open-ended questions. There were 12 questions, including demographic questions. One demographic question ascertained the respondent's years of experience as a department head. Participants accessed the survey through a link to the online questionnaire.

Validity and Reliability

Content validity was established by using a panel of experts in extension and engagement. The members of the panel of former department heads and administrators were given copies of the instrument and were asked to comment on its contents. Their comments and suggestions were incorporated into the final instrument. The instrument was then pilot tested with 12 extension and engagement administrators and past department heads. The purpose of the pilot test was to identify face validity and determine the reliability of the competency recording scale. Changes were made according to the pilot study participants' suggestions to ensure that the questions were clear and meaningful. Data from the pilot test were analyzed to assess the reliability of the instrument, and it was

determined that the Cronbach alpha was .79 for the department heads' perception recording instrument.

Data Collection and Analysis

In summer 2010, data were collected using an online survey. First, an e-mail was sent to the N.C. State department heads in the study population explaining the purpose of the study. This communication included a consent form and the survey link. Participants were given two weeks to respond. After two weeks, a follow-up e-mail was sent with the survey link asking department heads to respond to the survey within a week. The respondents and non-respondents were not identified by the researchers in order to maintain the respondents' anonymity. However, the online survey software permitted sending follow-up e-mails only to non-responding participants in the study population after the first deadline for submission. The survey received 52 responses, or a 77.6% response rate. Early and late respondents were compared to address non-response error as recommended by Lindner, Murphy, and Briers *(2001)*. No significant difference was found between early and late respondents, indicating that results can be generalized for the study population.

The data were analyzed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 program.. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize findings. The data obtained from the open-ended questions were summarized by using content analysis.

Findings and Discussion

Demographics of Respondents

Nearly 69% of the respondents had less than 7 years of experience as department heads, as summarized in Table 1. Five (9.6%) of the 52 respondents had 10 years or more of experience as department heads. These findings demonstrate a change in tenure of department heads when compared to Hecht's finding in 2007 that half of department heads had been at the institution for more than 10 years. In 2011 the NCSU Department of University Planning and Analysis reported that more than 68% of the department heads had 6 or fewer years of experience. This compared with the actual percentage of N.C. State department heads each year since 2000. These data show that in 2000, 45% had 10 or more years of experience as department heads. By 2011 there were 22% with 10 years or more experience, and in 2012, the number diminished to 19%.

This present study surveyed department heads with less experience than those in previous studies, as documented by Cipriano & Riccardi *(2012),* Hecht *(2007),* and O'Meara *(2005).*

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Years of Experience as a Department Head

Years of Experience	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
0-3 years	18	35.3%
4-6 years	17	33.3%
7-9 years	11	21.6%
10 or more years	5	9.8%

The majority of the respondents had experience in holding various positions of responsibility in the RPT process, as summarized in Table 2. Seventy-five percent of the respondents had experience as departmental voting faculty members. It was found that 17 (32.7%) of the respondents had experience as members of a college RPT review committee. Overall, 94% had experience with RPT as a department head. This figure likely fell short of 100% because three department heads may have been interim or newly hired from faculty ranks and had not yet gone through the RPT process.

Table 2. Distribution of Department Heads' Experience of Various Responsibilities in RPT Process

Type of Responsibility	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
As a candidate	39	75.0%
As a departmental voting faculty member	39	75.0%
As a department head	49	94.2%
As a member of college RPT review committee	17	32.7%
As a member of the university RPT review committee	3	5.8%

Lack of experience as department head at the institutional level with RPT committees and also in job experience could be a contributing factor to lack of knowledge and understanding of community engagement scholarship metrics, standards, and processes. This could also be a factor reinforcing the single-discipline approach to scholarship reported by community-engaged faculty, as opposed to a multidisciplinary and community-based transdisciplinary approach. Comparing the responses of the 52 department heads who completed the survey to the entire faculty of NCSU revealed a

steady decline in years of experience as department head. In 2000, 22% of the department heads had 6 years or less of experience. By 2012, 64% had 6 years or less of experience. This was an increase of 8% since the previous year, 2011.

Sandmann et al., reported after the 2008 Wingspread conference that new doctoral students prepared by community engagement scholars for faculty positions may find that their "institutional homes . . . have not yet changed their evaluation systems in ways that welcome, as opposed to simply tolerate, engaged scholarship" *(p. 50)*. This poses the question of whether community engagement scholarship is challenging the department and institutional culture, or is being institutionalized so that the dominant culture remains the same. In 2009, Seifer et al. reported, "Unfortunately, few faculty development programs explicitly support community-engaged faculty and even fewer incorporate characteristics of successful faculty development: sustained, longitudinal, multi-disciplinary, experiential and competency-based best practices" *(p.13)*.

Faculty Knowledge About RPT Process

Nearly 55% of the responding department heads perceived that their faculty members understood the importance of aligning the statement of mutual expectations (SME) with the six realms of faculty responsibilities (that is, the six realms of scholarship previously described) *very well*. (see Table 3). However, nearly 6% felt that their faculty members failed to understand the importance of aligning the SME and the six realms of faculty responsibilities when preparing their RPT dossier.

Table 3. How Well Do Faculty Understand the Importance of Aligning Their (SME) and the Six Scholarship Realms of Faculty Responsibility When Preparing Their Dossiers?

Response Options	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Not at all	1	2.0%
Not very well	2	3.9%
Fairly well	20	39.2%
Very well	28	54.9%

This level of understanding of the six realms of scholarship is a positive change for faculty and department heads since 2000. These last two tables may also illustrate why some departments lack an adequate understanding of collaborative teaching, learning,

research, and engagement models. Nearly 46% of the faculty members who are evaluating peer faculty practicing community engagement scholarship may have an inadequate understanding of the metrics and standards for community engagement scholarship and therefore they may be highly critical of scholarship that does not look like their own. Calleson, Jordan, and Seifer *(2005)* reported that departmental barriers made faculty members hesitant to work in community engagement scholarship when rewards were risky and they were, at the time, untenured. Driscoll and Sandmann (2001)also discussed the frustration assistant professors experienced when promotion and tenure committees failed to understand and reward their community-based engagement scholarship. They used the case study of a faculty member who was encouraged by the community to be engaged with them, but was discouraged by her faculty peers.

The lack of attention to the link between expectations in scholarship realms and the results reported on dossiers can be a serious problem to reviewers and a career-changing issue for the faculty member being reviewed. In her study of campuses establishing reforms that honor multiple forms of scholarship, O'Meara *(2005)* reported that the award of promotion and tenure for teaching and/or engagement scholarship demonstrated "an increase in congruence between faculty priorities and institutional mission."

Statement of Mutual Expectation (SME)

N.C. State uses a (SME) as the agreement between the University and the faculty member to plan, report, and communicate the expectation of faculty scholarship in the six realms of university responsibilities and scholarship. Department heads' belief about when SMEs should be revised was recorded on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(strongly disagree)* to 4 *(strongly agree)*. The highest mean value (3.7) was reported for the stage when the scope of the faculty member's work responsibility changed. This indicates that it was the most common stage, as summarized in Table 4. The second-highest mean (3.0) was reported for the stage when the faculty member received a promotion, indicating that it was the second most commonly perceived stage of changing SMEs. The smallest mean (2.5) was reported during a faculty member's annual review.

Table 4. Department Heads' Perceptions of the Stages of Revising Faculty Members' SME

Revising Stages	*n*	*M*	*SD*
During their annual review process	45	2.5	.843
Upon reapointment	46	2.8	.947
Upon promotion	47	3.0	.885
When the scope of their work changes	49	3.7	.466

Note. Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

However, if the agreement of faculty work fails to be revisited annually, the SME may become outdated and thus irrelevant. This issue needs further study.

Values Placed on Six Realms of Faculty Responsibilities in the RPT Process

N.C. State began recognizing the scholarship of extension and engagement in 2001. The same year, Hollander, Saltmarsh, and Zoltowski *(2001)* stated:

> No matter how genuine a school's commitment to engagement as articulated by its mission, that commitment will probably amount to little, at least in the long run, if the school is unwilling to address the specific ways in which it formally recognizes a faculty member's contribution to that commitment *(p.15)*.

In this N.C. State study, more than 90% of the department heads indicated that they use (1) teaching and mentoring students, (2) discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry, and (3) service in professional societies, and service and engagement within the university, as important faculty responsibilities when making RPT decisions, as summarized in Table 5.

Teaching is the most commonly used faculty responsibility for making RPT decisions, followed by discovery of knowledge and service in professional societies and within the university. Seventy-five percent of the department heads indicated that they used extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university as a faculty responsibility when making RPT decisions.

This finding shows that the traditional scholarship realms remain valued and unchanged in practice, even though the university adopted six realms for documenting scholarship. However, the six realms of scholarship appear to be understood by most faculty members. The emerging realm of scholarship being used in RPT decisions is community engagement scholarship. This is a significant positive change since 2000. Baker's *(2001)* findings at Southeastern University showed that faculty members were receiving mixed messages in that department heads encouraged basic research, while university administration encouraged a balanced approach with engagement scholarship. This type of inconsistent messaging was also reported by Calleson et al. *(2005),* Cantor *(2006)*, and Foster *(2010)*.

Table 5. Distribution of the Use of Six Realms of Faculty Responsibilities When Making Decisions About Reappointment, Promotion , and Tenure

Six Realms of Faculty Responsibilities	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students	51	98.1%
Discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry	49	94.2%
Service in professional societies and service and engage-ment within the university itself	48	92.3%
Extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university	39	75.0%
Technical and managerial innovation	19	36.5%
Creative artistry and literature	7	13.5%

Note. Scale 1= Not valued, 2 = Minimally valued, 3 = Somewhat valued, 4 = Highly valued.

In many departments service continues to be confused with community engagement scholarship, according to pre-survey interviews conducted with department heads. Several authors believe this may be due to lack of administrative leadership education of department heads in all realms of scholarship. Current department head training across the United States appears to focus on department management processes and required reports needed, so that training in metrics for various realms of scholarship is often missing *(Burkhardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004; Carroll & Wolverton, 2004; Cipriano & Riccardi, 2012; Sirkis, 2011)*. Because of the confusion between service and engagement, Ramaley *(2011)* recommended that "universities retire the term service from use except for work on committees or governance". (*p. 360)*

N.C. State clarified each realm by defining each of the six realms of scholarship, but confusion remains about how to report scholarship of engagement. Seifer et al. *(2009)* attributed this to "a tendency of colleagues to classify work in the community as 'service' simply because of its venue, rather than looking at the many other factors that might qualify the work as 'scholarship' *(p. 6)*. This was verified by department heads in narrative responses and comments prior to the design of the study.

Department heads were asked to rate the general distribution of faculty efforts on the six realms of faculty responsibilities in faculty SMEs on an 11-point scale (1 = 0%, 2 = 1–9%, 3 = 10–19%, 4 = 20–29%, 5 = 30–39%, 6 = 40–49%, 7 = 50–59%, 8 = 60–69%, 9 = 70–79%, 10 = 80–89%, 11 = 90–100%). Discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry was the highest-ranked faculty effort, with a mean value of 6 (40–49% effort), followed by teaching

and mentoring students, with a mean value of 5.7 (about 30–49% effort), as summarized in Table 6. Extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university was rated third most important, with a mean value of 3.2 (about 10–20% effort). The large standard deviation indicates wide variation among the department heads about the allocation of faculty efforts on extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university.

Table 6. General Distribution of the Six Realms of Faculty Responsibilities on Faculty Members' Statements of Mutual Expectations

Six Realms of Faculty Responsibilities	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry	50	6.0	1.78
Teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students	51	5.7	1.53
Extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university	45	3.2	2.05
Service in professional societies, and service and engagement within the university itself	51	3.1	1.58
Technological and managerial innovation	33	2.2	1.25
Creative artistry and literature	28	2.0	2.21

Note. Scale: 1 = 0%, 2 = 1-9%, 3 = 10-19%, 4 = 20-29%, 5 = 30-39%, 6=40-49%, 7 = 50-59%, 8 = 60-69% 9 = 70-79%, 10 = 80-89%, 11 = 90-100%.

Tables 5 and 6 reflect the 13 departments (20.3% of departments) that failed to recognize community engagement scholarship with constituencies outside the university in their standards for RPE. This factor accounted for part of the 25% of departments that failed to recognize community engagement scholarship. The faculty members in each department also had different percentages of assignment across the six realms of scholarship recorded in their SME. However, in these thirteen departments no faculty member can be given credit for community engagement scholarship, nor expect any recognition or reward for such efforts. Members of these departments were unlikely to connect with any North Carolina communities while practicing mutually beneficial partnerships. However, they may have been earning personal consulting fees for after-hours consulting jobs.

This problem was addressed in the Wingspread Statement of 2004 *(Burkhardt et al.)*. This report stated:

> . . .few institutions have made the significant, sustainable structural reforms that will result in an academic culture that values community engagement as a core

function of the institution. . . . We propose, instead, a couplet—engaged teaching and learning, and engaged discovery and research scholarship. . . . It values all scholarship but particularly that within a context of contemporary need. *(p. 5)*

The demarcation of types of scholarship continues to further separate faculty. Colbeck and Wharton-Michael *(2006)* recommended that "Rather than subdividing teaching, research, and ervice, colleges and universities should integrate all forms of intellectual activity into public scholarship" *(p 18)*. This is consistent with the report of 2010 developed by the faculty of N.C. State that focused on Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement through the Scholarship of Engagement *(North Carolina State University, 2010b)*. As Holland *(2005)* described it, "Engagement, as an integrative and collaborative mode of scholarly work, is proving effective in creating institutional clarity and focus that collectively ensures a strong higher education system working in the public interest" *(p. 31)*. This is very different from the current N.C. State culture, where faculty must choose which mission area receives credit for grants, contracts, and donor funding. There is no option for choosing integration of mission and scholarship realms. The current process drives division across scholarship realms rather than encouraging integration.

Types of Research Value in the RPT Process

The department heads were asked to rate the value they place on different types of research when making RPT decisions on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(not valued)* to 4 *(highly valued)*. The highest mean on this scale was reported for basic research, followed by applied research. The lowest mean was reported for community engaged participatory research, as summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Perceptions of Department Heads About the Value of Different Types of Research When Making RPT Decisions

Types of Research	n	M	SD
Basic research	52	3.8	.605
Applied research	51	3.7	.666
Community-engaged participatory research	50	2.8	.938

Note. Scale: 1 = Not valued, 2 = Minimally valued, 3 = Somewhat valued, 4 = Highly valued.

The rating of community-engaged participatory research as "participatory research as *minimally valued* to s*omewhat valued* indicates" a major issue for champions of service-learning, civic engagement, extension in communities, and community engaged researchers. This also begins to show where inconsistencies exist within departmental cultures. Stanton *(2008)*observed that a major

> …challenge to expanding engaged research is a perception held by many faculty members that it is not valued in promotion and tenure processes. Without academic recognition and reward, scholars are unlikely to carry out community-engaged inquiry in great numbers or over long periods of time. *(p. 24)*

Holland and Ramaley *(2008)* described how Boyer *(1990)*established integration of the separate mission areas and realms of scholarship. Boyer's view of integration established a holistic higher education image uniting the past separate functions within universities of research discovery, interpretation through teaching, and application through service. By 1996, he reinterpreted this integration as "engagement" *(p. 39)*.

Perception of Acceptable Journals

The extent to which the department heads agree with the value of publishing in different types of journals was recorded on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(strongly disagree)* to 4 *(strongly agree)*. The highest mean reported on this scale (3.7) was for publishing in peer-reviewed research journals, followed by publishing in peer-reviewed teaching journals. The department heads perceived publishing in peer-reviewed community engagement journals as the least valued scholarly work to be considered when making RPT decisions, as summarized in Table 8. Currently, there are 38 discipline-based, multidisciplinary, or transdisciplinary community engagement scholarship academic journals as identified by Sandmann *(2012)*.

Table 8. Perceptions of Department Heads About the RPT Value of Publishing in Different Journals

Perception about publishing	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Faculty who publish in peer-reviewed research journals are likely to succeed in the RPT process	52	3.7	0.612
Faculty who publish in peer-reviewed teaching journals are likely to succeed in the RPT process.	52	2.7	1.024
Faculty who publish in peer-reviewed community engagement journals are likely to succeed in the RPT process.	39	2.4	.940
Faculty who publish in more than one of the above types of journals are likely to succeed i the RPT process.	51	3.4	0.799

Note. Scale: 1 *= Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree.*

Rice *(2002)* reported on the importance of department culture, including journals recognized and supported for tenure and promotion. He stated that "most faculty members have their identities imbedded in their disciplines and align themselves institutionally with their departments" *(p. 10)*. According to comments provided in interviews with department heads, engagement journals are often unknown to the department members, and their acceptance rates and impact are not compared to the tier one journals accepted for scholarship in their department. Even more problematic, when these transdisciplinary and multidisciplinary engagement journals become known to faculty members, their transdisciplinary nature does not fit with the single-discipline culture valued in the department. Seifer et al. *(2009)* reported that academic journal articles are rarely beneficial to partnering community members. "They do little, for example, to reach community members, practitioners, policymakers, and other key audiences" *(p. 13)*. These scholars recommended the use of diverse materials and products such as presentations, local media articles, web-based articles and reports, and public testimony. In addition, many of the effective community-based reporting products were not peer reviewed; therefore, the academy devalued these when making RPT decisions. The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health addressed this challenge and now provides peer review for products that were effective with communities during community engagement. This enables departments to adjust their culture and include these effective community engagement scholarship products *(Jordan, Seifer, Sandmann & Gilmon, 2009)*.

Ramaley *(2001)* supported Holland's idea *(2005)* that the boundaries in disciplines and departments are naturally crossed when practicing mutually beneficial community engagement scholarship. Boundary spanning often challenges the traditional research, teaching, and service department culture of selected discipline-based departmentally approved journals. Ramaley *(2011)* also introduced the idea of interpretation as an "aspect of scholarly work" that she included as "discovery, integration, interpretation, and application" *(p. 356)*. Several department heads noted that some of their journals were now adding engagement sections, but these individuals said that they still would not support scholarship published only in engagement journals.

The Work Value in RPT Process

Department heads were asked to rate what they valued when they made RPT decisions about faculty using a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(not valued)* to 4 *(highly valued)*. The highest mean (3.9) on this scale was reported for teaching and discovery of knowledge, indicating that these department heads valued teaching and research as the most important work in making RPT decisions about their faculty. The next highest means (3.2) were reported for extension and engagement with constituents outside the university and service in professional societies and service and engagement within the university, as summarized in Table 9. However, extension and engagement with constituents outside the university had a slightly larger standard deviation, indicating that there was a wider variation of opinions among the department heads about the value of this factor in making RPT decisions.

Table 9. What Department Heads Value When Making RPT Decisions

Types of Faculty Activities	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Teaching & mentoring of students	51	3.9	0.300
Discovery of knowledge through discipline-guided inquiry	51	3.9	0.431
Service in professional societies and service and engagement within the university	51	3.2	0.566
Extension and engagement with constituents outside the university	49	3.2	0.816
Technological and managerial innovation	41	2.6	0.948
Creative artistry and literature	40	1.9	1.047

Note. Scale: 1 = Not valued, 2 = Minimally valued, 3 = Somewhat valued, 4 = Highly valued.

In comments on the narrative section of the survey, N.C. State department heads reported that even though many of them supported community engagement scholarship, their RPT faculty committees did not. This was also cited in interviews prior to developing the survey and comments in narrative responses on the survey. The department heads reported that it is very difficult for them to influence these faculty members to be more inclusive. They also reported a dearth of meetings and networks among N.C. State department heads. Instead, they described a loose network that is ineffective for the most part. They also reported not knowing many department heads outside their college.

Previous studies reported that it is the norm for department heads to receive very little training on how to document and evaluate multiple realms of scholarship. Although department heads have been invited to annual engagement symposiums and forums, many chose not to attend. The types of training often reported by department heads primarily focused on management of the RPT process. This was reported during interviews to be the case at N.C. State; therefore department heads may not have knowledge of scholarship metrics for each area of scholarship identified in the six realms. For department heads who were trained on management of the department scholarship process, Jones'*(2011)* study identified 20 important competencies. Only two of the 20 related to management. The remaining 18 were leadership competencies. Working with faculty to document each realm of their scholarship, and adopting evaluation metrics for each realm that are appropriate for the department, would be a leadership competency.

Department heads' perceived value of different categories of engagement work of faculty when making RPT decisions about them were recorded on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *(not valued)* to 4 *(highly valued)*. The highest mean (3.8) on this scale was reported for knowledge creation and transfer, followed by curricular engagement in classes, as summarized in Table 10. The lowest mean (1.8) was reported for the clinical and diagnostic testing services.

Table 10. Department Heads' Perceived Value of Different Categories of Engagement for Making RPT Decisions

Types of Engagement Work	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Knowledge creation and transfer	51	3.8	0.541
Curricular engagement in classes	48	3.1	0.799
University and industry cooperative partnership	45	3.0	0.965
Public events and understanding	48	2.8	0.668
Technical and expert assistance	48	2.8	0.751
Technology transfer and communications	48	2.7	1.011
Co-curricular service-learning	48	2.4	0.796
Clinical & diagnostic testing services	48	1.8	0.905

Note. Scale: 1 = Not valued, 2 = Minimally valued, 3 = Somewhat valued, 4 = Highly valued.

The eight categories of work listed in Table 10 were identified by a team of faculty studying how community engagement faculty can benchmark economic benefits of their accomplishments with communities in the state *(N.C. State, 2008, p. 6-7)*. Some of these eight categories may not be among favored approaches for dem-

onstration of scholarship, and some of them may not have peer-reviewed reports, or be products that easily match research scholarship criteria. This is why Community-Compass Partnership for Health developed a peer review process for products that were not journal articles *(Jordon et al., 2009)* Calleson et al. *(2005)* developed an inclusive list of community peer-reviewed publications that are effective and should be considered. CES (community engaged scholarship) requires diverse pathways and products for dissemination, including those that communities value most. These include applied products such as training materials and resource guides as well as community dissemination products such as newspaper articles and editorials, websites, and public testimony.

Conclusions

This study provides evidence that the number of departments supporting community engagement scholarship has increased since 2000. Seventy-five percent of departments reward extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university (Realm 5), and department heads value this realm with a score of 3.2 out of 4. This represents outstanding progress over the past 12 years. Although awareness and support of Realm 5 have increased more than 20% of the departments do not yet have departmental standards that will support or reward community engagement scholarship. Below are factors that have influenced positive changes and issues that require additional work to achieve equal status of community engagement scholarship with other realms.

North Carolina State University has developed significant institutional procedures and policies to support community engagement scholarship. In addition, many of the recommendations from Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement Through the Scholarship of Engagement *(North Carolina State University, 2010b)* have been implemented as procedures for developing dossiers for RPT at the university policy and procedures level. This includes incorporating the definition for community engagement scholarship, as well as the standards and processes for reporting community engagement scholarship. However, as this study shows, even with great progress, the implementation of these policies is not complete and lacks broad understanding. When reviewing the department standards, many departments still use the terminology of research, teaching, and service and classify only research outputs as scholarship. Many departments also report faculty percentages of responsibility by these three mission areas, even when

they say they include Realm 5, extension and engagement with constituencies outside the university.

This occurs even though in 2004, the Faculty Senate introduced six realms of scholarship in evaluating faculty for RPT, and the university policy included the six realms of scholarship in practice by 2004, and officially in 2006. Department heads continue to perceive research, teaching, and service to professional associations as the three areas of scholarly work that count most when making RPT decisions in their departments. These were the traditional areas of scholarship rewarded prior to 2006, when the six realms were approved, and N.C. State was awarded the Carnegie designation as an engaged university. Department heads agree that significant effort must continue in order to change the department culture so that community engagement scholarship is valued for tenured and non-tenured faculty. However, none of the department heads reported that an integrative model of scholarship exists in their department when making comments in narrative responses.

One major change with department heads is that the majority are relatively new to their job. This seems to follow a national trend. Most of the department heads perceived that the faculty members were well aware of the significance of aligning their SME with the six realms of scholarship when preparing their RPT dossiers. However, preparation of the dossier is guided by the dominant culture and coaching by senior professors in the department. This is an issue for department heads to address, and several mentioned this in their comments. In addition, conducting scholarly community engagement and publishing findings in community engagement scholarship journals may have little or no value in making RPT decisions, unless the faculty member also publishes in discipline-based research journals valued by the department. This is a topic for a future study.

A contributing factor, as this study shows, is that department heads do not consider participatory research to be as important as basic or applied research. Since community engagement scholarship projects use multiple methods of evaluation, work with many variables, and use mixed methods of research, community participatory research is often the preferred choice for project evaluation with community members. This gap in departmental values related to varying types of research is also a factor in recognizing the value of community engagement scholarship.

Department heads have indicated that department cultures are beginning to reflect more awareness of standards and metrics

for documenting community engagement scholarship, but RPT committees often are less accepting. These comments were made in the narrative sections of the survey. Only a few respondents mentioned this factor; however, they believe it is an issue that must be addressed at several levels across the university. The complex picture of why community engagement scholarship lacks equitable footing with teaching and research requires further study.

Recommendations and Implications

Recommendations are based on the many gains of the past 12 years in providing support for faculty who demonstrate community engagement scholarship; however, new issues should be addressed in the future based on the results of this study. N.C. State and other institutions with an engagement mission should continue to provide equitable administrative leadership and funding support for engagement through the president's or chancellor's office, just as the university supports the mission areas of research and teaching. Individuals at this level of leadership should focus on integrating learning, discovery, and engagement through the scholarship of engagement. They also should work to ensure that tenured and non-tenured faculty and staff receive recognition and rewards for their scholarship. The faculty senate should support this matter and call for action of the president, chancellor, and provost when support wanes.

There remains a critical need to develop an integrative model that will influence department culture, affect grant and contract application designations, support collaboration across disciplines, and recognize excellence, while rewarding community engagement scholarship faculty during the RPT process. The faculty members who demonstrate community engagement scholarship currently lack collaborative mechanisms for reporting the integrated nature of community engagement scholarship. The university, led by the chancellor and provost, should model and reward the integration of learning, discovery, and engagement and include faculty support along with significant financial and leadership support for all the land-grant mission areas of learning, discovery, and engagement equally.

It is critical to expand the education and training of faculty, department heads, and RPT committee members so they will embrace community engagement scholarship as a valuable component of RPT and apply the tools, metrics, and scholarship standards for each of the six realms of scholarship. The provost is responsible

for leading deans to make this happen. Deans and department heads will then be responsible for directing RPT committees. This should be a continuous process so that all realms of scholarship become integral to the academy's culture in departments, units, and colleges.

N.C. State should continue to monitor the status of community engagement scholarship for faculty, community partners, and beneficiaries of the partnership through University Planning and Analysis. Many reports already focus on extramural expenditures and teaching outcomes; in addition, statistics showing outcomes of community engagement scholarship should be included in university reports by the chancellor and provost. The outcomes of community engagement should reflect integration of community engagement into teaching, learning, and research across the state.

Support for faculty should include mentoring of engagement faculty members from various disciplines so they can be coached on documentation of their community engagement scholarship in alignment with N.C. State University institutional guidance. Deans and department heads can initiate cross-discipline mentoring to strengthen multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches. It is critical to select experienced mentors who can assist faculty in designing and documenting each realm of scholarship, including community engagement scholarship. These mentors need to be trained and willing to work with other faculty in their departments and across disciplines, colleges, and units.

Community engagement scholarship is taking place across many departments and units, but it is not reported accurately by faculty and departments because it is perceived as not valued. This makes community engagement, outcomes achieved, learners taught, and societal outcomes invisible to other academians as well as to external stakeholders. This silence is a disservice to community engagement scholarship faculty members who partner with communities to measure these outcomes, and to the public who wants to know how we are engaged with the people of North Carolina. N.C. State, through the chancellor's administration, should devise a reporting system that includes the accomplishments of all mission areas of the university so that community engagement scholarship is reported to stakeholders internally and externally.

Departments' failure to give credit for this type of scholarship, and lack of acceptance of engagement journals, has led to a lack of published peer-reviewed community engagement scholarship. As a result, community engagement scholarship programs, projects,

and accomplishments have not become part of the academic record of the university or its faculty. Department heads should update the department standards to include cross-discipline and trans-disciplinary journals. Because of the current dearth of publishing, the state, nation, and world have no way to build on this excellent engagement scholarship work, or to accept or challenge its findings. Community engagement scholarship must become more than the work of individual faculty members who persist in the face of a tradition-dominant culture, often with little support. All aspects of N.C. State University's community engagement should be visible, publishable through a variety of methods, and known to the world. Regional, national, and global partnerships can be built with insti-tutional and departmental support. The faculty and community partners of N.C. State University can become known globally for their significant community engagement that integrates learning, discovery, and engagement and results in scholarship.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This study established a benchmark for understanding department head perceptions and comparing them to approved department standards. All of the standards were evaluated, but not all of the department leaders, directors, and heads responded to the survey. This study evaluated perceived department culture; however, actual practices were not verified with faculty members in the departments. Future research should be conducted to close this loop. These issues should be continuously assessed and monitored in order to improve department culture, practices, and acceptance of all six realms of scholarship at N.C. State.

This study did not document extramural funding that supports community engagement and scholarship. The office of sponsored programs could provide such documentation for comparison to changes in new extramural funding and published documentation of community engagement scholarship. This will be possible if all faculty members have the opportunity to select the integration of their learning, discovery, and engagement using percentages, instead of designating projects as 100% research. The percent of indirect costs for research is higher for the university (51.5%) than that of public service (33.6%). The incentive for the university is to classify integrated community engagement projects as research benefits the university as a result. Future extramural funding reports should compare universities that track the integration of mission areas with those using the traditional method of forced choice among mission areas.

Future research to discover the degree to which journal-rating services include community engagement scholarship journals would indicate whether these journals are even included in the analysis. It would also be valuable to study the inclusion of engagement and practice sections in current single-discipline journals to determine the integration of community engagement scholarship in typical department-centric journals.

References

Baker, D. A. (2001). *The evaluation of university-community engagement scholarship within the college level promotion and tenure process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05102001-213726/

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

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49(7), 18–33. Retrieved from http://www.ithaca.edu/cfe/docs/Resources/TenPrepResources/Boyer_SchEngage.pdf

Burkhardt, M. J., Holland, B., Percy, S. L., & Zimpher, N. (2004). *Calling the question: Is higher education really ready to commit to community engagement? A wingspread statement.* Milwaukee Idea Office, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. Retrieved from http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/6108

Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 80*(4), 317–321.

Cantor, N. (2006). *Taking public scholarship seriously.* Office of the Chancellor, Syracuse University. Retrieved from http://surface.syr.edu/chancellor/34

Carroll, J. B., & Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? *New Directions for Higher Education, 126*, 3–10. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ 760446)

Cipriano, R. E., & Riccardi, R. (2012). Competencies, challenges, and collegiality: A four-year study of department chairs. *The Department Chair, 22*(4), 14–17. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/dch.20046/abstract

Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 105*. doi:10.1002/tl.220

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2001). From maverick to mainstream: The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(2), 9–19. Retrieved from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/viewArticle/241

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

and Scholarship, 3(2), 20–30. Retrieved from http://jces.ua.edu/taking-a-stand-community-engaged-scholarship-on-the-tenure-track/

Hecht, I.W.D. (2007). Chairing departments: The changing scenery. *The Department Head: A Resource for Academic Administrators, 17*(4), 3–5. Retrieved from http://media.wiley.com/assets/1308/42/DepartmentChairSample051507.pdf

Holland, B. A. (2005a). Real change in higher education: Understanding differences in institutional commitment to engagement. In A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, J. C. Burkhardt, & Associates (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 235–259). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, B. A. (2005b). Scholarship and mission in the 21st century university: The role of engagement. *AUQA Occasional Publication Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2005* (pp. 25–31). Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/AUQA_paper_final_05.pdf

Holland, B. A., & Ramaley, J. A. (2008). Creating a supportive environment for community-university engagement: Conceptual frameworks. In Engaging communities, *Proceedings of the 31st HERDSA Annual Conference, Rotorua, 1–4 July 2008* (pp. 11–25). Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2008/papers/Holland%20&%20Ramaley.pdf

Hollander, E. L., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Indicators of engagement. In L. A. Simon, M. Kenny, K. Brabeck, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning.* Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/n6872427322mgu48/

Jones, F. R. (2011). *The future competencies of department chairs: A human resource perspective* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/3461

Jordan, C., Seifer, S., Sandmann, L. R., & Gelmon. S. (2009). CES4Health. info: Development of peer-reviewed mechanism for dissemination of innovative products of health-related community-engaged scholarship. *International Journal of Prevention Practice and Research, 1*(1), 21-28.

Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. H. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 42*(4), 43–53.

North Carolina State University. (2008). *BEDI report I—impact!* Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University Office of Extension, Engagement, & Economic Development. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/BEDI.html

North Carolina State University. (2010a). *BEDI report II—impact*: *What counts is what's counted.* Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University Office of Extension, Engagement, & Economic Development. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/BEDI.html

North Carolina State University. (2010b). *Integrating learning, discovery, and engagement through the scholarship of engagement: Report of the Scholarship of Engagement Task Force.* North Carolina State University Office of Extension, Engagement, & Economic Development. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/documents/SET2010.pdf

North Carolina State University. (2012). REG 05.20.20—Reappointment, promotion, and tenure dossier format requirements. In *N.C. State University*

policies, regulations and rules. Retrieved from http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-20

O'Meara, K. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(5), 479–510. Retrieved from http://www.ccas.net/files/ADVANCE/Encouraging%20Multiple.pdf

Ramaley, J. A. (2000). Embracing civic responsibility. *AAHE Bulletin*, 9. Retrieved from http://www.aahea.org/articles/march00f2.htm

Ramaley, J. A. (2011). Students as scholars: Integrating research, education, and professional practice. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1. Institutional change* (pp. 353–368). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Rice, R. E. (2002). Beyond scholarship reconsidered: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members. N*ew Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2002*, 7–17. doi:10.1002/tl.51

Saltmarsh, J. (2010). Changing pedagogies. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1. Institutional change* (pp. 331–352). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Sandmann, L. R. (2012). Community engagement publication outlets. Retrieved from https://www.uidaho.edu/~/media/Files/orgs/Outreach/Office%20of%20Community%20Partnerships/community_engagement_pubs%208.22.12.ashx

Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K.A. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47–64. Retrieved from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/125

Seifer, S. D., Wong, K., Gelmon, S. B., & Lederer, M. (2009). The Community-engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: A national change initiative focused on faculty roles and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities, 20*(2), 5-21. Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ 866771)

Sirkis, J. E. (2011). Development of leadership skills in community college department chairs. *Community College Enterprise, 17*(2), 46–61. Retrieved from http://www.schoolcraft.edu/pdfs/cce/17.2.46-61.pdf

Stanton, T. K. (2008). New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 3*(19), 21–42. Retrieved from http://esj.sagepub.com/content/3/1/19.refs.html

About the Authors

Patricia M. Sobrero, is a professor and Extension education specialist in Agricultural and Extension Education, and former associate vice chancellor, extension, engagement and economic development, at North Carolina State University. She helped

establish the Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship (ACES), and currently she is the president of the ACES board of directors. Dr. Sobrero received an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, Teaching and Learning from George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Jay Jayaratne is as an associate professor and state leader for Extension program evaluation at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. He has more than 25 years of experience in extension program development, delivery, and evaluation including extension experience in Shri Lanka. He earned his Ph. D. from Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.