

Reflecting on Identity Development for Community-Engaged Scholars: A Mini Case Study

Andrew Pearl, Daniela M. Susnara, Teairra Z. Evans, and Courtney Helfrecht

Abstract

In higher education, professional development for community engagement often focuses on developing the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively build and sustain engaged scholarship partnerships and programs. In this mini case study, two faculty members and two program facilitators provide brief vignettes through which they reflect on how community engagement-focused professional development programming impacted their identities as community-engaged scholars and enabled better integration and alignment of their values with the requirements of the academy. Through this article, we offer a model for how a new generation of engaged scholars can participate in community engagement-focused professional development programs that allow them to align their personal values with scholarly approaches and emphasize the impact of academic careers centered on community engagement.

Keywords: community engagement, professional development, identity development, vignettes

In higher education, community engagement is participatory by nature and involves a wide range of collaborators and contributors. As an example, Bringle et al. (2009) described the relationships between students, community organizations, faculty members, administrators, and community residents (SOFAR) in a way that is more nuanced and complete than the traditional framing of campus-community partnerships. As community engagement has become more established in higher education, the field itself has become more mature, with an increasing number of professional organizations (Berkey & Green, 2023), academic journals (Doberneck, 2021), and professional learning opportunities focused on developing the professional capacities of participants.

The work of community engagement is not limited to a particular professional role or career pathway. A community engagement professional (CEP) in higher education (Dostilio, 2017; Dostilio & Welch, 2019; McReynolds & Shields, 2015) has been described as a “professional staff whose primary job is to support and administer community-campus engagement” (Dostilio

& Perry, 2017, p. 1). CEPs often engage in the work of boundary spanning (Van Schyndel et al., 2019), a term that was first applied in a higher education community engagement context to describe individuals who represent the institution’s interests to the community and vice versa (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). As Purcell et al. (2024) pointed out, “everyone within an institution has the potential to function as a boundary spanner in a formal and/or informal capacity” (p. 8); therefore, it is important to consider varied approaches to training and developing CEPs and boundary spanners (Purcell et al., 2021).

Professional Development for Community Engagement

In higher education, professional development work can be broadly defined as activities or programming intended to help educators grow in their professional practice (McKee & Tew, 2013; Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2017). Professional development opportunities play a pivotal role in advancing the professionalization and institutionalization of community engagement by nurturing a community of committed scholars. Welch and Saltmarsh (2013) spoke to the increasing

professionalization and institutionalization of community engagement in higher education through campus-based centers that focus on supporting community engagement initiatives, often utilizing a competency-based approach (Axtell, 2012; Blanchard et al., 2009; Dostilio, 2017). Across institutions of higher education, campus-based centers for community engagement are known to house and provide faculty development programs for community engagement (Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2017). The critical role of professional development is further supported and recognized by the current framework for the Carnegie Foundation's Elective Community Engagement Classification (American Council on Education, n.d.).

Understandably, professional development programming for community engagement has traditionally focused on building skills necessary to successfully integrate community engagement into a scholarly agenda, building community-engaged learning courses and experiences, and developing authentic, mutually beneficial, and sustained community-university partnerships. These are the tools required to work effectively as engaged scholars and practitioners. It is less common, however, for professional development programming to intentionally focus on developing participants' engaged scholarly identities, which emerge at the intersection of one's personal, professional, and civic identities (Ward, 2010), and to emphasize "personal and community values over the narrow, academic-centric self-interests of traditional scholarship" (Dostilio et al., 2016, p. 118). Particularly in the presence of institutional barriers to community engagement for motivated scholars (Borkoski & Prosser, 2020), it is important to acknowledge and cultivate an engaged scholarly identity through professional development programming in order to shine a light on the pathways that run counter to the dominant narrative. This article will use two vignettes from program participants and two from program facilitators to emphasize the importance of intentionally focusing on identity development as a part of community engagement-focused professional development training in higher education.

Developing a Scholarly Identity

Multiple key influences contribute to a faculty member's identity and motivations for community-engaged scholarship,

including personal, institutional, and professional characteristics (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Demb & Wade, 2012; O'Meara, 2008; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward et al., 2024). Many community-engaged scholars, in particular, find their work deeply rooted in their personal identity and commitments to values like inclusion and justice, often stemming from childhood experiences, family values, race/ethnicity, faith, parenthood, or place of residence (Ward et al., 2024). Institutional factors can differ depending on the experiences of individual scholars, largely due to variations in disciplinary and departmental contexts, norms, and cultures, even for institutions that are broadly considered community-engaged. Finding alignment between personal values and institutional priorities is an important factor in scholars' decisions to stay at an institution. This is particularly true of community-engaged scholars, whose identities are strongly tied to principles and commitments consistent with community engagement (Plaxton-Moore, 2021; Ward, 2010). Problems can arise when scholars' expectations about institutional support for community-engaged work may not align with their actual experiences (Ward et al., 2024). The professional development programs described in this study were an effort to demonstrate an institutional commitment to community-engaged scholarship and, at the least, a tacit centralized approval for participants to lean into their values and identities as community-engaged scholars.

Vignettes From Community-Engaged Scholars and Professionals

The following participant vignettes illustrate the impact of these professional development programs on four individuals: two community-engaged scholar participants, with a particular focus on how their participation provided them with the tools and perspective to thrive in the academy in ways that aligned with their interests, values, and passions; and two community engagement professionals and scholars who served as cofacilitators of the programs. Following an approach similar to Kuban et al. (2020), the authors of these vignettes were purposefully selected and invited to reflect on their individual experiences, which are not intended to represent the experiences of all program participants or facilitators.

Our approach to knowledge generation and uncovering new learning was inspired by

Morley's (2008) concept of utilizing critical reflection as a research methodology and Heron's (1996) ideas around cooperative and collaborative ways of knowing. To prepare for this article, we began by meeting several times over video conference to discuss our experiences in the programs, and then each contributed a written, reflective vignette. Prior to writing the vignettes, the program participants read self-guided selections from Post et al.'s (2016a) book *Publicly Engaged Scholars*, and the two facilitators read the introductory chapter from Berkey et al.'s (2018) book *Reconceptualizing Faculty Development in Service-Learning/Community Engagement*. These two texts served as inspirations for our collaborative approach. The two vignettes contributed by the program participants were then discussed and thematically analyzed by the program facilitators, and the program facilitators' two vignettes were discussed and thematically analyzed by the program participants.

Program Participant Vignettes

Courtney Helfrecht

I am an assistant professor of anthropology, broadly investigating how ecocultural contexts affect child development across cultures. A desire to understand human evolution prompted my pursuit of a PhD, but equity in child health and development is what motivates my ongoing research. As my career has been built from research conducted with children facing a variety of challenges, I have long felt that reciprocal scholarship and a focus on amplifying community assets was necessary to my continued capacity for this work. As a graduate student, however, I had been told that such approaches were generally limited to senior scholars with well-established research programs. Further, I knew little about how to develop and conduct community-engaged research, particularly in a way that would be considered valid within the academy.

Shortly after joining the University of Alabama (UA), I learned of our professional development offerings around community-engaged teaching and research. I immediately applied to participate—first to the Community-Engaged Learning Fellows program, where I had the opportunity to develop a course that I'd been planning since graduate school. With guidance from experienced leaders in community-engaged teaching, I was able to create and offer a

course that is driven by the goal of sustainably addressing a community-identified challenge while using ethnography to better understand the community's needs. Its first iteration was built from my collaborations with UA faculty and, at the request of our community partners, allowed students to provide nutrition education programming for athletes at two Title I high schools. Its second iteration, again at the request of our community partners, will involve health education at a Title I elementary school. The Community-Engaged Learning Fellows program allowed us to meet a community-identified need while providing our students with the opportunity to apply their education in meaningful ways. Teaching is a requirement of my job, but being able to offer this course allows me to do so in a way that has value not just to my institution or students, but also to my broader community.

Wanting to learn more about how this approach could be applied in my research, I next applied for the Emerging Community Engagement Scholars program. This offering has been particularly important to my professional development as a junior scholar. During the pandemic, I saw how valuable community is to our shared health and well-being, and I began building relationships across the university and within local schools. With colleagues, I sought opportunities to offer collaborative, multidisciplinary programming. Initially, this programming included anthropology, voice, and dance training at a local Title I high school; later it was extended to brain health and the impacts of participation in athletics on holistic measures of child health and well-being among adolescents attending Title I high schools around the state. This latter area of research included the nutrition programming referenced above. Although we did not initiate this offering as a research study, its success in the eyes of our collaborators prompted us to evaluate its impact in a more formal manner, and we are now preparing multiple manuscripts as a result. Expanding our efforts toward publication allows us to meet the scholarship requirements of academia while still working on issues of health equity. Further, this collaboration has allowed me to extend my research agenda. I applied for—and won—an internal grant with another collaborator in biological and chemical engineering to explore whether water contaminants are playing a role in excess adiposity among adolescents in Alabama.

I last applied for and participated in the Public Engagement Learning Community. Through this program, I learned how to best share our findings via both academic and public-facing channels. More than ever, collaboration with communities and accessible sharing of research results is fundamental to successful research on healthy child development, and I am actively expanding from my traditional approaches to data sharing. My new approaches include leading graduate and undergraduate students in my department's Anthropology Is Elemental program, which involves teaching the four fields of anthropology to students at a local elementary school (at the request of the school) while allowing UA students to foster their skills of translating scientific research to broad audiences using accessible and hands-on programming.

Each of these programs has individually had substantial impact on my identity as a teacher-scholar, but cumulatively, they have led to new collaborations—within UA, across my state, and internationally—that have fostered and supported my growth. Working in academia is incredibly rewarding but also stressful. Participating in these trainings has empowered me to move my research in a direction that feels much more meaningful, inclusive, and sustainable.

Teairra Evans

I am Teairra Evans, an assistant professor of psychology and African and African American studies at Louisiana State University. Broadly, my research focuses on how social and cognitive factors influence decision-making across the lifespan. During my graduate school journey, I became restless with the way information was hoarded among scholars. Too often we fail to consider the community in the research process, which made me feel as though I was in one big book club with other scholars. This dissatisfaction motivated me to explore avenues to share my findings with the community in accessible ways while also actively involving them in the research process.

Being raised in a tight-knit rural community shaped my commitment to community-engaged scholarship by teaching me the value of shared responsibility. Growing up in the Black Belt of Alabama, resources were limited, which caused members of the community to rely heavily on one another. Sharing resources and information

through more informal ways and through the generations was essential. These experiences now guide how I approach scholarship and why I believe in cocreations that reflect the strengths and needs of the people I work with.

Discovering the Emerging Community Engagement Scholars program, I saw an opportunity to deepen my understanding of community-focused research. Too often in my field we enter communities seeking to address what we believe as scholars to be the issue without consulting those with lived experience. I knew that if I was going to continue a career within the academy, I needed to learn skills to center my work in this way. The training that I received prepared me to land a position at a university that truly values community engagement. It gave me the language, tools, and confidence to articulate why centering community voices matters, not just in theory but in practice. More importantly, it pushed me to think critically about how to build authentic, reciprocal partnerships and integrate those values into my research and teaching. When I entered the job market, I was able to clearly demonstrate how my scholarship aligned with the university's mission, and I know that this training played a key role in helping me secure the position.

At the beginning of the program, I was a timid PhD student with an idea, longing for a reprieve from the traditional view of scholarship. By the end of the program, I emerged with an articulate research agenda, allowing me to confidently pursue more opportunities. The curriculum, guest lecturers, and discussions with my cohort equipped me with knowledge and language, enabling me to not only present myself as a community-engaged scholar but also to illustrate the essential nature of this approach. This program has positioned me to navigate my academic career with purpose and impact.

Program Facilitator Vignettes

Daniela Susnara

As I have become more deeply involved in community-engaged scholarship, I often pause to reflect on what first drew me to this work and what has sustained my commitment. Unlike many of my peers in the academy, my connection to this field was not linear or required by my position. My formal job descriptions have consistently focused on designing and implementing

partnerships between local and state communities and higher education, not publishing scholarship. Yet I have found myself compelled to research, write, and publish on community engagement both in engagement-specific venues and within disciplinary journals. For me, the significance of scholarship lies in its potential to extend far beyond the academy, carrying insights into communities where the ideas might be used, reshaped, and lived out.

During graduate school, I became fascinated with the role of relationships in shaping communities—whether in athletics, nonprofits, or education. What emerged across these settings was a realization that I wanted a career rooted in the transformative power of human connection. Toward the end of my master's program, I discovered the world of community-engaged scholarship and began to connect with faculty across disciplines who were incorporating engagement into their research. These encounters highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration in building durable partnerships. With the hope of broadening my understanding, I pursued doctoral study and worked as a research assistant with a university-community program, immersing myself in both theory and practice.

My doctoral experience was formative in ways I could not have anticipated. I learned practical strategies for building community partnerships, but I also encountered the systemic barriers that engagement scholars often face: the lack of recognition for faculty whose work is rooted in communities, the challenge of aligning student learning with stakeholder needs, and the professional risks of anchoring a scholarly identity in engagement. I wrestled with the fear that a faculty career grounded in community-engaged scholarship would make achieving promotion and tenure more difficult, while also pulling me away from the direct relationships with partners that I most valued.

It was in this space of tension, and through a series of what I now see as fortunate accidents, that I accepted a staff position as director of assessment and planning for community engagement. In this role, I was able to claim a kind of authenticity that had eluded me as a graduate student. I could balance practice and scholarship, working alongside faculty who were brave enough to embed community engagement in their teaching and research through programs

like the Community-Engaged Learning Fellows (CELf), Emerging Community Engagement Scholars (ECES), and Public Engagement Learning Community (PELC) programs. Supporting them became one of the most meaningful parts of my work, because I witnessed firsthand how scholars can navigate the blurred boundaries between campus and community when they are intentional, reflective, and willing to step outside disciplinary norms.

Looking back, I see my path less as a straight trajectory and more as a winding one shaped by relationships, chance opportunities, and the spaces I found or created where engagement could thrive. I did not have a mentor in graduate school who modeled this kind of career, nor did I initially see myself in the academy's definitions of scholarship. My identity as an engaged scholar has instead been cultivated through practice, through missteps, and through the discovery of professional spaces where authenticity, honoring both community and academic commitments, could be possible. Had I encountered someone like me earlier, perhaps my journey would have looked different. Still, the mosaic of my experiences has shown me that scholarly identities are not fixed from the start, but evolve across moments of uncertainty, chance encounters, and the pursuit of meaningful relationships that bridge communities and universities.

Drew Pearl

In the landscape of higher education, it's not unusual to be asked to describe ourselves and our work in discrete categories: "Are you a faculty member? Staff member? Administrator?" "What is your home department or unit?" Similarly, our professional activities are often slotted into distinct boxes: "Are you working on your research? Teaching? Service?" In the academy, we've gotten really good at building silos. It's often how we're evaluated and rewarded, but many of us, particularly those of us whose work is community engaged, can struggle with trying to make these distinctions. By its nature, community engagement transcends traditional academic disciplines, blurs the line between research and practice, and tends toward integrating teaching, research, and service rather than distinguishing them. The categorization of our work can also feel overly competitive and transactional, which runs counter to the collective and collaborative spirit of community engagement.

The tension that's created when we try to fit community engagement work into traditional academic boxes can make it feel like we're doing our academic work "wrong," which is often an explicit message we get from mentors, senior scholars, or supervisors. I've lost count of the number of conversations I've had with colleagues who have been told in no uncertain terms that their community engagement can wait until they're more established or have gotten tenure, or that it's something they should just do in their "spare" time. This narrative has become so common that it's almost a cliché, and something we take for granted. When we don't feel that our community engagement work is supported, it's easy to feel isolated and demoralized.

In my dissertation research, I wanted to explore this narrative further, and ended up finding some fairly compelling evidence that community-engaged faculty members were just as productive (in terms of publications, etc.) as their more traditional counterparts and showed high levels of career satisfaction. A different story emerged for faculty members who expressed interest in community engagement but stuck to more traditional areas of research and scholarship. This group expressed high levels of dissatisfaction in their careers. Of course, this makes sense—not being able to act upon your interests and motivations can be demoralizing. It's this group that inspires a lot of the work that I do around professional development for community engagement.

When we developed the programs discussed in this essay, one of the major motivators was simply to bring people together. Of course, we wanted to talk about strategies for building partnerships, creating transformational learning opportunities for students, and making connections for public impact. In addition, one of the unstated but intentional outcomes was to help participants realize that they weren't alone and could lean on a supportive community when needed. The programs' cohorts were made up of students, staff members, and faculty members, but regardless of our formal designations, many of us saw ourselves as boundary spanners, community engagement professionals, practitioner-scholars, and/or third space professionals who don't fit neatly into any official role. Our drive to ask cross-cutting questions about complex challenges requires us to think and act outside our silos.

Through these programs, we worked to provide participants with meaningful connections to like-minded colleagues and introduced them to models for professional success that align with their values and motivations. Implicitly and explicitly, we wanted participants to see and understand that it is okay to be a community-engaged scholar and/or practitioner, and that by making these programs available, the institution valued this work, too. Of course, these programs weren't a magic salve that completely changed academic culture, but we do hope that they served to incrementally reduce the friction for participants as they navigated their educational and professional careers.

Common Themes

Through their vignettes, both Courtney and Teairra articulate shifts in their scholarly identities and describe how they felt more closely connected to or invested in the academy after they were able to identify pathways for success through community-engaged approaches. Both expressed dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches to and measures of success in academe. They also indicated that approaches that can be exclusionary to communities are limiting and not reflective of their motivations and interests. Especially as early-career scholars, they were receiving implicit or explicit messaging from their peers and mentors that an engaged approach would not be considered rigorous enough for academic standards. Both Courtney and Teairra expressed commitments to values like reciprocity, co-creation, and community-centered change, which led them both to seek outlets to express their values. The traditional "hoarding" model that Teairra mentions is reflective of an insular academic "book club" that did not feel authentic to either scholar. However, traditional academic training in higher education does not always provide clear examples or models of what it means to have a successful career that centers on community engagement. Courtney and Teairra each benefited from the collaborative, interdisciplinary approach to designing UA's community engagement professional development programming that provided participants with the tools necessary to build sustaining careers in higher education. In addition to the skill and knowledge development, the communal aspect of the programs was also valuable, and also reflective of the principles associated with

community engagement. It became easier to focus on developing their own identities as community-engaged scholars when they were able to go through the process with other participants who were on similar career journeys.

Three major themes emerge from Drew and Daniela's vignettes: identity, connection, and validation. The journey to community-engaged scholarship varies for everyone and is rarely a straight path, likely because of a sense that community-engaged work is not academic work. As noted by Drew, this approach is often not recognized as valid by the academy, leaving many academics unsure whether this work "counts" and struggling with their identity as researchers, as well as where and how they fit into an institution. Further, it can be hard to define such scholarship within the traditional categories of research, teaching, and service—as it spans these areas and extends our work into novel ones, often through the strong connections and collaborations community-engaged work generates. These connections lead not only to improved research but also greater satisfaction among scholars who may find traditional approaches or categories unfulfilling. The willingness to work in the "blurred boundaries" noted by Daniela requires assistance from the programming that Drew and Daniela have developed. These programs provided mentorship and support to those of us beginning our community-engaged journeys. Offering academy-sponsored programming provides clear validation to this form of scholarship. When the value of community-engaged research is recognized by our institution, scholars feel a greater sense of career satisfaction, authenticity in our work, and belonging in the academy.

The professional development programs discussed in this article were designed to intentionally demonstrate how the values of reciprocity and mutually beneficial relationships can complement, and even enhance, scholarly inquiry. This relationship is especially important because the ability to align personal values with professional, scholarly approaches can lead to successful, satisfying careers in higher education (Pearl, 2015). Referencing bell hooks (1994), Saltmarsh (2020) reminded us that scholars who are drawn toward community engagement will be "exhausted by their institutions" (p. 155) unless there is purposeful investment and support to avoid burnout, and seeking out

areas of alignment between scholars' identities and their institutions' priorities (Ward et al., 2024). This emphasis on developing resilient careers for community-engaged scholars mirrors the importance of building resilient community-university partnerships and programs. Without an intentional focus on the long-term professional success of community-engaged scholars, it will be difficult to maintain a larger institutional commitment to authentic community-university engagement. As program participants, Courtney and Teairra have illustrated through their vignettes that they embody what it means to be engaged scholars, and their abilities to navigate the complexities of higher education were improved through their participation in UA's community engagement-focused professional development programming.

Conclusion

As public colleges and universities across the United States make commitments to enhance, improve, and support the public good, it is critical that scholars are educated and empowered with the appropriate engagement skills to successfully do so. The nature of the academic workforce is changing so that academics are becoming "increasingly public in their identities and are developing new patterns of engagement that are changing the nature of teaching, learning, and knowledge generation" (Post et al., 2016b, p. 1). Offering this new generation of engaged scholars opportunities to participate in community engagement-focused professional development programs allows them to align their personal values with scholarly approaches and emphasizes the impact of academic careers centered on community engagement. As is evident in Berkey et al. (2018), there are myriad approaches to supporting the work of established and emerging community-engaged scholars. Because context is so essential to the work of community engagement, we want to emphasize the importance of developing programming that meets the particular needs of individual campus communities. Community engagement leaders should consider ways to codesign professional development programming to meet the diverse and unique needs of their campus, participants, and community partners. Focusing on the long-term professional success of community-engaged scholars by providing opportunities that lead to alignment between their identities

and values allows institutions like UA to to authentic community engagement and build a community of scholars committed advancing the public good.



About the Authors

Andrew (Drew) Pearl is an assistant professor of leadership and community-engaged learning at Kansas State University's Staley School of Leadership. His research focuses on how institutions of higher education create the conditions that make public and community engagement possible. He earned his PhD from the McBee Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia.

Daniela M. Susnara is the director of academic programs for the Shelby Institute for Policy and Leadership at the University of Alabama. Her work focuses on developing interdisciplinary academic programs and cultivating student leadership and community engagement opportunities. In her role, she collaborates with faculty, administrators, and campus partners across the university to design curriculum, lead strategic initiatives, and strengthen institutional efforts that prepare students for leadership and public service. She received her PhD from the University of Alabama and her MPA from Syracuse University.

Teairra Z. Evans is an assistant professor of psychology and African and African American studies at Louisiana State University. Her research examines decision-making across the lifespan and uses community-engaged approaches to study health and social outcomes. She received her PhD in experimental psychology from the University of Alabama.

Courtney Helfrecht is an assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Alabama. Her research focuses on how stressors from the social and physical environments shape health, nutritional status, and developmental trajectories among children in Ethiopia and Alabama. She received her PhD from Washington State University.

References

- American Council on Education. (n.d.). *The Elective Classification for Community Engagement. Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/elective-classifications/community-engagement/>
- Axtell, S. (2012). *Creating a community-engaged scholarship (CES) faculty development program*. University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy. <https://hdl.handle.net/11299/213716>
- Berkey, B., & Green, P. M. (2023). Exploring new lines of inquiry: A practitioner-scholar inquiry of how professional organizations have evolved and continue to shape the community engagement field. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.91721>
- Berkey, B., Meixner, C., Green, P. M., & Eddins, E. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice*. Stylus.
- Blanchard, L. W., Belliard, J. C., Krichbaum, K., Waters, E., & Seifer, S. D. (2009). Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 47-65. <https://journals.indianapolis.iu.edu/index.php/muj/article/view/20390>
- Borkoski, C., & Prosser, S. K. (2020). Developing faculty identity as a community engaged scholar: An unexamined barrier to promoting the public mission. In A. Papadimitriou & M. Boboc (Eds.), *Re-envisioning higher education's public mission: Global perspectives* (pp. 77-95). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55716-4_5
- Bringle, R. C., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 1(1). <https://www.digitalgreensboro.org/record/601503>
- Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2006(105), 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.221>
- Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach & engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 337-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777247>
- Doberneck, D. M. (2021, May 3). *Publishing engaged scholarship*. Campus Compact. <https://compact.org/resources/publishing-engaged-scholarship>
- Dostilio, L. D. (Ed.). (2017). *The community engagement professional in higher education: A competency model for an emerging field*. Stylus Publishing.
- Dostilio, L. D., Janke, E. M., Miller, A., Post, M. A., & Ward, E. (2016). Disrupting role dichotomies: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars* (pp. 117-129). Routledge.
- Dostilio, L. D., & Perry, L. G. (2017). An explanation of community engagement professionals as professionals and leaders. In L. D. Dostilio (Ed.), *The community engagement professional in higher education: A competency model for an emerging field* (pp. 1-26). Stylus.
- Dostilio, L. D., & Welch, M. (2019). *The community engagement professional's guidebook: A companion to The community engagement professional in higher education*. Campus Compact.
- Giulioni, J., & Voloshin, K. (2014). A case for the mini case study. *Talent Development*, 68(11), 27-29.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the human condition*. Sage Publications.
- hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203700280>
- Kuban, A. J., Purcell, J. W., & Jones, B. D. (2020). Leveraging reflective practice to advance

- the field and enhance impact: Learning from failure and missteps in community-engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 24(3), 125–144. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1593>
- McKee, C. W., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Setting the stage for teaching and learning in American higher education: Making the case for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2013(133), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20041>
- McReynolds, M., & Shields, E. (2015). *Diving deep in community engagement: A model for professional development*. Campus Compact.
- Morley, C. (2008). Critical reflection as research methodology. In J. Rumbold & P. Liangputtong (Eds.), *Knowing differently: Arts-based and collaborative research methods* (pp. 265–280). Nova Science Publishers.
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7–30. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/518>
- Pearl, A. (2015). *Community-engaged scholarship in the professoriate: A mixed-methods exploration of faculty motivations, satisfaction, and productivity* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia]. UGA Open Scholar. http://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/pearl_andrew_j_201505_phd.pdf
- Plaxton-Moore, P. (2021). *Engaging feminism, transforming institutions: How community engagement professionals employ critical feminist praxis to re-imagine and re-shape the public purpose of higher education* [Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco]. University of San Francisco Scholarship Repository. <https://repository.usfca.edu/diss/583>
- Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. A. (Eds.). (2016a). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Stylus Publishing.
- Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. (2016b). Introducing next-generation engagement. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education* (pp. 1–11). Stylus Publishing.
- Purcell, J. W., Pearl, A., & Van Schyndel, T. (2021). Boundary spanning leadership among community-engaged faculty: An exploratory study of faculty participating in higher education community engagement. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning*, 6(2), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.15402/esj.v6i2.69398>
- Purcell, J. W., Rodriguez, D. X., Doberneck, D. M., & McDonald, J. (2024). Introduction to the Special Issue on Community-Engaged Scholars, Practitioners, and Boundary Spanners: Identity, Well-Being, and Career Development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 28(3), 7–21. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/4122>
- Saltmarsh, J. (2020). Afterword: Up against the institution. In C. N. Cann & E. J. DeMeulenaere, *The activist academic: Engaged scholarship for resistance, hope and social change* (pp. 148–155). Myers Education Press.
- Van Schyndel, T., Pearl, A. J., & Purcell, J. W. (2019). Extending our conceptualization of boundary-spanning leadership for community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 23(2), 63–78. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1451>
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5–16. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.201>
- Ward, E. (2010). *Women's ways of engagement: An exploration of gender, the scholarship of engagement and institutional rewards policy and practice* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Boston]. Proquest. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/748326338/abstract/6F8EABF4C0634058PQ/1>
- Ward, E., Janke, E., Wrencher, E., Goodner, H., Mitchell, T., & Hempill, M. (2024). Faculty community-engaged scholars choosing to come and stay: Alignment between individual and institutional identities and values. *International Journal of Research on*

- Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.127561>
- Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 632–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2010.11779075>
- Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2017). Faculty development for advancing community engagement in higher education: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 21(2), 131–166. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1333>
- Welch, M., & Saltmarsh, J. (2013). Current practice and infrastructures for campus centers of community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(4), 25–55. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1067>

