## *From the Editor…*

## Deepening and Evolving Community-Engaged Research Methodologies and Pedagogies

This last issue of volume 18 for the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* reflects a deepening in our understanding of community engagement through the use of more sophisticated research methodologies and more advanced, targeted practice strategies. Devorah Lieberman leads off in the featured Campus Compact presidential essay, asserting that for diverse college campuses, like the University of La Verne, which she heads, the "traditional approach to service-learning is inadequate because it is designed to separate those being served from those serving." Today, she points out, students cannot relate to that divide because their home communities are often those being served. To address "Who is Serving Whom," La Verne offers an enactment of the Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) asset-based community development model, where the university and its students add value to the assets the local communities already possess rather than "'fixing' something perceived as 'broken.'"

I am excited by the range of methodologies of inquiry employed in the articles in this issue. Using autoethnography, Darling, with Kerr, Thorp, and Chung, describes her learning as a Peace Corps Tanzanian village-based extension facilitator. In particular she reflects with keen candor on balancing community development effectiveness and cultural appropriateness. Her use of "crystallization" *(Richardson, 1997)* in discussing validity in her work is a useful way to consider getting at deeper, more complex understandings.

Utilizing content analysis of expert panelists and document analysis, Paton, Fitzgerald, Green, Raymond, and Borchardt present much-needed findings on how regional accrediting standards apply to the central role of community engagement in U.S. institutions of higher education. In a first-of-its kind examination, Jaeger, Tuchmayer, and Morin explore the extent to which community-engaged scholarship is conducted as dissertation research by doctoral students and the characteristics of their degree-granting institutions. To do so they developed inclusion and exclusion criteria through a literature search from which the three scholars performed coding and triangulation to arrive at the 129 dissertations from 90 separate institutions that served as their data set. What are

the perspectives and attitudes of community service organizations (CSOs) engaged with student-athletes from a high-profile, NCAA Division I athletic program? Using two rounds of carefully documented data coding and analysis from 15 local and national CSOs, Svensson, Huml, and Hancock found, interestingly, that in addition to the self-serving causes of increasing their volunteer capacity and benefiting from monetary or in-kind donations, partners took on the student-athletes to bring about a long-term impact on these volunteers by introducing them to a specific cause. In another study, the analytical lens of code-switching was used by de Oliveira, Arvelo Alicea, and Cortés Santiago to describe how faculty, graduate students, preservice teachers, and volunteers moved across languages and literacies in a community engagement event.

Latimore, Dreelin, and Pusateri Burroughs employed several strategies to assess a Michigan State University course preparing graduate students in natural resources not only to meet a graduate outreach and engagement program requirement, but, more importantly, to consider how they as scientists would engage and collaborate with stakeholders in tackling wicked environmental problems, work that entails balancing the often conflicting social and political values of stakeholders with the best available science. In their "program with promise," Glazier, Able, and Charpentier of University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill studied the impact of service-learning on preservice professionals' disposition toward diversity by reviewing student service-learning contact logs that were signed by community members or teachers at the school site and by sociolinguistic analysis of student focus group transcripts. How can service-learning be done virtually? In their mind-expanding article, Sandy and Franco assert "A sense of place has been an integral part of service-learning since the field's inception. . . . But practicing service-learning in online environments requires reconsidering the core value." To reconsider this core value, Sandy and Franco offer an excellent literature review (especially for those of us less familiar with the possible technologies) and introduce us to online collaborative mapping and virtual community projects, two examples from their teaching of cultivating a virtual sense of geographic place in online learning. They leave us with implications for "theorizing sense of place for both online and face-to-face service-learning in the digital age."

In deepening our understanding of reciprocity in community–university partnerships, Dostillio provides an overview of her International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement award-winning dissertation, an

explanatory case study that gathered evidence of the ways that three determinants (conditions, partnership learning interactions, and stakeholder attributes) reciprocally interacted to explain the adoption of democratic processes and roles within a community–university partnership. For anyone contemplating social economy research or community research partnerships, consider Tom Buchanan's review of one of three new e-books from the Canadian Social Economic Hub called *Community–University Research Partnerships: Reflections on the Canadian Social Economy Experience*, edited by Hall and MacPherson. Tami Moore offers a review of Hodges and Dubb's *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads*, a book that goes beyond the study of individual partnerships to report on a study of 10 anchor institutions' roles and practices across their many functions, including purchasing, hiring, investing, and real estate development, to improve the overall and long-term quality of the local community. Lastly, Susan Harden reviews *Deepening Community Engagement in Higher Education: Forging New Pathways*, edited by Hoy and Johnson, the rich story about research and lessons learned from 13 higher-education-based Bonner programs. Ultimately the book and its review raise the question of what "deep" relationships are and whether we have gone, as Hodges and Dubb might say, only a "road half traveled" if the depth and pervasiveness of our partnerships do not reach transformational status for the institution or the community.

The depth and pervasiveness of the content of this issue and the others in this volume year have only been possible with the input of many—including the authors themselves, the peer reviewers who are listed at the end of this issue and who are distinguished by providing extensive feedback, the committed JHEOE editorial board (who also serve as reviewers), the hard-working associate editors, and the good-humored, dedicated editorial management and production staff. For all the contributions, we are grateful, and we look forward to a volume year 19 of even greater depth in advancing community engagement's knowledge, theory, and practice.

With best regards,
*Lorilee R. Sandmann*
Editor

# References

Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets.* Chicago, IL: ACTA.

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.