

From the Editor...

Shannon O. Brooks



As we say goodbye to 2022, the last issue of the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* (JHEOE) presents a diverse line-up of scholarship featuring 13 articles covering a wide range of topics and methodologies, and a book review of recently published scholarship of interest to the higher education engagement community. Within these pages is a substantial representation of the diversity of thought, scholarship, and perspective that has come to define the community engagement field.

A robust collection of Research Articles is featured in this issue of JHEOE, examining questions and topics ranging from new knowledge on service-learning research on faculty development and student learning outcomes, to the impact of outreach participation on graduate students. Leading off, Derreth et al. provide an interesting addition to the literature on faculty development in service-learning. Through a longitudinal quantitative analysis, the authors examine the importance of cognitive and social-emotional development of faculty for building confidence to engage in service-learning courses and community partnerships. This study provides a practical model for applying sociocultural theory in service-learning faculty development programs. In contrast to the faculty perspective, Whitfield and Ball's study "Assessing Tolerance of Ambiguity and Locus of Control in a Service-Learning Course," adds to our understanding of the impact of service-learning on student learning outcomes through research with students in an organizational communications course. The authors examine a key issue in service-learning course design and implementation—providing a clear and structured plan for students as they complete service-learning projects. Student often struggle with the ambiguity, lack of clarity on outcomes from partners and faculty alike, and subsequent loss of control when participating in community-based projects. Findings can help faculty better prepare students for such "foggy" situations that may occur in service-learning projects.

The authors also discuss additional considerations for how grading may be better employed when projects change or evolve to reduce student focus on grades as the sole priority and reward. In another study of student learning outcomes in service-learning courses, Culcasi et al. build upon the existing literature on e-service-learning with a first-of-its-kind study of the impact of e-service-learning experiences with a hybrid approach (i.e., Hybrid Type II e-SL developed by Waldner et al., 2012) on soft skill development such as leadership, self-evaluation, and digital skills.

Switching gears, Matthews et al. consider the affect of participation in a K-12 outreach program on identity and self-efficacy of STEM graduate students. Findings indicate positive benefits through involvement with outreach for the preparation of graduate students as teachers and in developing their identity as scientists. In our final research article, Ornelas et al. analyze interviews with students and faculty across major health professions to investigate how experiential learning may be implemented to increase understanding of health equity and social determinants of health for health profession students. In addition, authors examine how accreditation and curricular standards influence the form and structure of these experiences. In their findings, the authors also emphasize the need for faculty training in diversity, equity, and inclusion, and the need for more investment in the infrastructure to support service-learning and experiential learning programs.

The Projects with Promise section features early to midpoint scholarship of community-engaged projects, or projects with promising potential for demonstrating impact or addressing gaps in the engagement literature. First up, Jones and Giles examine an understudied element of higher education engagement—student organizations involved in service. This mixed methods study examined questions such as challenges with collaboration between student organizations and partners, what makes these partner-

ships successful, and the leadership capacity of students involved in student organizations. This study provides unique insight into how these activities are coordinated, addresses the frequent lack of student understanding for nonprofit concerns, and the importance of student preparation for these experiences.

Next, Minnick et al.'s study of developing a community-academic partnership (CAP) for addressing substance misuse, is an issue with unfortunate relevance for every community. This study provides a model for creating and administering CAP activities, and the potential outcomes of these partnerships. In particular, the authors presents CAPs as a framework for university-community collaboration to address a wide range of activities and issues, and for engaging faculty and students in partnership work that is designed around achieving positive outcomes for issues of grave importance to local communities.

Reflective Essays provide thought-provoking and forward-looking examinations and analyses of a wide range of topics affecting the field of community engagement, and higher education's role in promoting and institutionalizing engagement. Sdvizhkov et al.'s synthesis and literature review of community engaged scholarship and public engagement related to appointment, tenure, and promotion, identifies three areas where institutional reforms are needed. In this essay, they outline a framework for interventions to advance support for reforming the reward and promotion processes for engaged scholars. In addition, the authors theorize that these proposed reforms could also lead to the success of other higher education priorities such as promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In "Theorizing Relationship in Critical Community Engaged Research," O'Brien et al. contrast neoliberal ideology that has shaped higher education in recent years with the aims and purposes of university-community partnerships using three paradigms of partnership: extraction, service, and solidarity. In particular, the authors draw from their own experience and practice, the community engagement literature, and evidence of the impact of neoliberalism in higher education to propose recommendations for centering relationship building for critical community-engaged research. Additionally, they call for a shift to justice-oriented collaborations. Adding another

dimension to this dialogue on strengthening community-university partnerships, Sugawara proposes a framework with three pillars for developing, analyzing, and measuring the impact of university programs on local capacity for community development.

In a thought-provoking essay focused on graduate student involvement in engaged research, Cloutier et al. employee Doberneck and Dann's (2019) abacus for collaboration tool in the context of the experiences of community psychology doctoral students. Using this tool, the authors provide recommendations that may be useful to campuses seeking to support future engaged scholarship by graduate students, and also provide helpful best practices for mentors.

In "A Visual Model for Critical Service-Learning Project Design," Wollschleger draws from Stith et al.'s (2018) Critical Service-Learning Conversations to develop a visual model for analyzing projects across important themes in critical service-learning. Finally, Gendle and Tapler's essay adds to the conversation on ethical concerns and suggested strategies for best practices in global learning programs.

Closing out this issue, Martin reviews Hoffman's (2021) *The Engaged Scholar* through the lens of the reviewer's own experience transitioning from a career outside of academia to an academic position focused on engaged and applied research and public scholarship. Martin evaluates the central premise of the book, which challenges scholars to consider why they chose an academic path, and what sort of academic they want to be. Martin also highlights how Hoffman explores ways that academic leaders can promote public scholarship as well as affirm and support those faculty who choose this difficult but fulfilling pathway, seeking broader engagement, dialogue, and impact for their work.

As you can see, there is much to explore in this issue of the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. Once again, we thank our associate and managing editors, reviewers, and authors who made this issue possible. Thank you also, dear reader, for your support of academic publishing focused on university-community engagement. We hope you will be sufficiently inspired by the scholarship in these pages to consider contributing a manuscript to the journal and becoming a reviewer for future issues.



References

- Doberneck, D. M., & Dann, S. L. (2019). The degree of collaboration abacus tool. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 23(2), 93–107. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1453>
- Stith, M., Emmerling, D., & Malone, D. (2018). *Critical service-learning conversations tool: A self-assessment and resource tool to help faculty implement critical, justice-oriented service-learning*. Duke Service-Learning. <https://servicelearning.duke.edu/sites/servicelearning.duke.edu/files/documents/Critical%20Conversations%20Tool.pdf>
- Waldner, L., McGorry, S., & Widener, M. (2012). E-service-learning: The evolution of service-learning to engage a growing online student population. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(2), 123–149. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/936>

