

Institutionalizing Faculty Engagement through Research, Teaching, and Service at Research Universities

Tami L. Moore

Oklahoma State University

Kelly Ward

Washington State University

Institutionalizing engagement, especially at research universities, calls for thinking beyond service-learning and the teaching mission. We conducted interviews with 20 faculty members at 15 research institutions in the United States who integrate teaching, research, and service in a community-focused scholarly agenda to support the civic missions of their institutions. Major findings highlight supports and barriers for faculty involvement in community-engaged work, and thereby link directly to discussions of the structures and leadership required for changing institutional policies and practices related to integration and engagement. We conclude by offering recommendations for practice and further research to support institutionalizing community engagement.

Much of the past literature on community-university engagement has focused on service-learning. However, service-learning does not represent a comprehensive view of community-university engagement; rather, it is one aspect of how institutions engage with their communities (Furco, 1996). The successful institutionalization of community engagement, including service-learning, could be aided by a shift in focus from institutionalizing service-learning to realizing the rhetoric of service and engagement championed by so many institutions (Morphew & Hartley, 2006) and their leaders (Boyer, 1996; Ehrlich, 2000).

College and university outreach and engagement may be expressed through faculty teaching, research, and service. Engaged scholarship, service-learning, and public service and outreach are interrelated but involve different aspects of the faculty role. Engaged scholarship encompasses the research domain whereby faculty members incorporate a community orientation in their research agenda. Service-learning focuses on the teaching domain and involves a commitment to working with a community in ways that benefit the community and the faculty member's teaching. Public service and outreach focus on the service domain where faculty, and institutions more generally, lend their expertise to address community-based issues. In this paper, we link this three-pronged conceptualization of faculty work to the broader community-university engagement movement.

While individual faculty members are often the institutional actors pursuing community work, faculty at research-categorized institutions, such as those

who participated in this study, may find it difficult to balance community engagement activities with an institution's expectations for research productivity (Fairweather, 1996; O'Meara, Rice, & Associates, 2005; Ward, 2003). Understanding how the engagement mission is accomplished necessitates an examination of how individual faculty approach their faculty role, as well as the institutional supports and challenges for faculty doing this work. Since Boyer's (1990) reconsideration of scholarship, there has been growing interest in faculty members' roles in community engagement. Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donohue (2003) and Fear, Rosaen, Bawden and Foster-Fishman (2006) examine issues related to conducting community-based research. Giles and Eyster's (1998) proposed research agenda for service-learning points to "critical questions concerning how participation in service-learning affects faculty careers" (p. 68). Reardon (1999), Brody and Wright (2004), and Parker and Dautoff (2007) give attention to tying community engagement to the teaching role through service-learning, and connect with the service-learning literature to explain how and why to involve students in community-based research. Ward (2003) and Colbeck (1998) call for the integration of teaching, research, and service to meet institutional demands for research and exhortations to engage with community needs. Colbeck and Michael (2006) return to Boyer's domains, suggesting public scholarship as an effective approach for integration of different aspects of faculty work. Thus, the literature related to expanded views of faculty work has grown along with looking at service-learning

ing as part of the larger terrain of community engagement. Yet few of these authors directly address the demands of the research imperative on faculty involved in community engagement activities. The research imperative prescribes that faculty fit into pre-specified roles centered on norms associated with traditional notions of what it means to be a scholar (Jencks & Riesman, 1977). What this amounts to on many research-intensive campuses today is an emphasis on research, a de-emphasis on teaching, and a conceptualization of service that often has nothing to do with community engagement (Ward, 2003, 2005).

Research about faculty involvement in community engagement appears frequently in the literature as descriptions of individual practice (Aparicio & José-Kampfner, 1995; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999) or narratives of institutional priorities (Hudson & Trudeau, 1995; Zimpher, Percy, & Brukaradt, 2002). Often missing from this literature are faculty career portraits built around an integrated approach to teaching, research, and service emphasizing community-university engagement. Also absent is an understanding of how individual faculty members navigate institutional contexts. A next step in building support for the institutionalization of community engagement is a deeper understanding of successful faculty integration of research, teaching, and service in community contexts in different disciplinary and institutional arenas, and to learn more about the structures supporting such work.

In this study, we sought to learn about the motivation and accomplishments of faculty pursuing an integrated and engaged scholarly agenda and about the supports and barriers they encounter in a research university. Three research questions guided our work: (1) What strategies do engaged faculty use to integrate teaching, research, and service focused on community engagement? (2) How do these faculty members characterize their experiences in doing this work? and (3) What are the institutional supports and barriers for faculty pursuing the integration of teaching, research, and service with community engagement in a research university environment?

Method

Research Participants

This study is an in-depth analysis of the scholarly lives of 20 full-time faculty, representing 15 research institutions (see Table 1 for participant demographics), who had earned tenure at research universities and were involved in community engagement. Fourteen earned tenure or promotion to full professor based at least partially on their engaged scholarship. Two participants held endowed chairs on their

respective campuses. Six were recipients of the national Ernest A. Lynton Faculty Award for the Scholarship of Engagement and one received the Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award. Two other participants received national awards from their disciplinary associations for their contribution to community-based research or service-learning. All others were recognized for effectively integrating community engagement into their scholarly work by peers in their discipline at the regional and national level, and by senior scholars in the community engagement arena.

The institutions represented by the participant group varied in size. Table 1 reviews information drawn from the Carnegie Foundation classification to provide institutional contexts for the participants' work experiences. Student enrollments ranged from 11,294 to 50,377. The institutions were located throughout the United States, with most in the Pacific Northwest, southwest, and midwest. Two of the 15 institutions were the designated flagship institution in their states, three were the designated land-grant institutions in their states, and five were both land-grant and their states' flagship institutions. An additional four universities were urban-serving institutions; two of these four were branch campuses of land-grant institutions. One institution represented was a private, moderately selective research university.

In general, faculty participating in this study were employed by large, public universities with a commitment to connecting the activities of higher education with the community(ies) served. This commitment, even if it is only a rhetorical one in a mission statement (Morphew & Hartley, 2006), shapes an environment on most of these campuses that the participants described as predisposed (albeit to varying degrees) to support faculty in community-engaged scholarship. The descriptions of these institutions are important for a second reason: They emphasize the degree to which an individual faculty member may or may not have the potential to impact institutional climate and policy related to engagement. Faculty at public institutions also are influenced, to some degree, by the salience of engagement in shaping institutional relationships with state legislators making funding decisions broadly impacting university operations (Weerts & Ronca, 2006).

Sampling Procedure

Participants were identified using purposive sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). We asked scholars recognized as leaders in the field of civic engagement to recommend colleagues around the country who had achieved integration in their work — integration between campus and community and integration of teaching, research, and service. We also contacted

Table 1
Participant Demographic and Institutional Context+ Information

Participant	Participants		Institutional Context				
	Discipline or Field of Study	Rank	Institution Type	Carnegie Basic Classification	Enrollment	Control	Carnegie Elective Classifications
Humanities							
18	Theater	Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/H	12,824	Public	none
19	English	Professor	Urban**	DRU	23,444	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
Social Sciences							
1	Sociology	Professor	Land-grant***	RH/VH	44,836	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
4	History	Professor	LG/Urban****	RU/H	15,498	Public	none
8	Criminology	Associate Professor	Urban**	RU/H	29,953	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
12	Psychology	Professor	Land-grant***	RU/VH	44,836	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
14	Asian American Studies	Professor	LG/Urban****	DRU	11,682	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
16	Communications	Distinguished Professor	Flag*****	RU/VH	50,377	Public	none
20	History	Professor	Liberal Arts	RU/VH	11,294	Private	none
Professional Programs							
2	Education	Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/H	13,558	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
3	Hospitality Business Management	Associate Professor	Land-grant***	RU/VH	23,421	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
6	Bio/Ag Engineering	Associate Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/VH	32,241	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
7	Architecture	Associate Professor	Land-grant***	RU/VH	26,380	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
9	Bio/Ag Engineering	Professor	Land-grant***	RU/VH	23,421	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
10	Nursing	Associate Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/VH	40,687	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
11	Graphic Design	Associate Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/H	12,824	Public	none
14	Education	Professor	Flag*****	RU/H	32,803	Public	none
15	Landscape Architecture	Associate Professor	Land-grant***	RH/VH	44,836	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
17	Law	Distinguished Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/VH	27,792	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships
Natural Sciences							
5	Chemistry	Professor	Flag/Land*	RU/H	13,558	Public	Community Engagement, Outreach Partnerships

+Institutional context information is drawn from Carnegie Foundation classification system as updated April 2010 (<http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>)

**Flag/Land: institution established as an 1862 land-grant institution and is also recognized as the "flagship" institution of higher education in the state

**Urban: urban-located campus, branch campus of a land-grant university

***Land-grant: institution established as a land-grant institution under the 1862 Morrill Act

****LG/Urban: urban-located branch campus of an 1862 land-grant university

*****Flag: Recognized as the land-grant institution in the state

service-learning administrators on campuses recognized for their achievement in community engagement, asking for assistance in identifying faculty who exemplified integrating research, teaching, and service as part of an engagement agenda.

Sampling Criteria

Participants met the following criteria:

1. Each held a tenure-line faculty appointment at a research-intensive university. Participants maintained active research agendas; published regularly in disciplinary venues, teaching-focused journals, and peer-reviewed publications focused on service-learning, community engagement, and administrative issues in higher education; and met institutional expectations for teaching and service.
2. Each included service-learning or experiential learning opportunities in their teaching. The group included faculty teaching in undergraduate and graduate programs in humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and professional schools.
3. Each conducted community-based research or engaged scholarship connected with their students' learning activities.

Procedure

We conducted semi-structured interviews and collected documents related to participants' integration and engagement. The interviews ranged from 60 to 180 minutes, with the majority falling in the 75-90 minute range. Four of the 20 interviews were conducted face to face because of proximity of participant and interviewer; all other interviews were con-

ducted by telephone. The interviews focused on institutional affiliation and current appointment as a context for community-based work, their work and career, and their views of administrators' attitudes toward engagement initiatives or community-university partnerships (see Table 2 for interview questions). Participants were not provided a list of the questions prior to the interviews.

In the recruitment phase, the interviewer/first author informed each potential participant that she/he had been identified by a colleague as someone "successfully" integrating teaching, research, and service. The study's purpose also was outlined in the informed consent documents completed by each participant. Participants provided curriculum vitae, research narratives prepared for annual review or tenure and promotion dossiers, as well as publications representative of their integrated approach to scholarship. This paper focuses on the interview data; we have reported elsewhere on the findings of the document analysis (Moore & Ward, 2008) focusing on how faculty documented community engaged scholarship for promotion and tenure.

Data analysis proceeded in a multi-stage process: First, we analyzed the verbatim interview transcripts using constant comparison techniques (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) resulting in the identification of 46 codes that were then grouped into four themes: Reclaiming the role of educator, pursuing personal passion, working on the margins of the disciplines and accepted standards of research, and working within organizational boundaries/cultures. Next, we created a narrative portrait (Lightfoot & Hoffman-Davis, 1997) of the findings for each participant to highlight the interplay of these four themes. As a second round of member-checking, the two researchers

Table 2
Protocol for Semi-Structured Interviews

-
1. Tell me about the university where you are employed.
 2. What is the attitude of administrators at your university toward engagement initiatives or community-university partnerships?
 3. Describe your current appointment.
 - a. What department/unit?
 - b. What academic rank?
 - c. How long have you been at your current institution?
 4. Help me understand your research agenda.
 5. Tell me about the courses you teach on a regular basis.
 6. Tell me about your most successful work with a community organization.
 7. Tell me about your least successful work with a community organization.
 8. Help me to understand the connections between this work and your research.
 9. Describe the connections between this work and your teaching.
 10. Tell me any about other elements of your scholarly work that we have not discussed, but which you consider important in the integration of teaching, research, and service.

engaged in a reflexive dialogue process followed on this summary (Lincoln & Guba, 2005). The individual portraits were shared with each of the 20 faculty participants. We offered an opportunity for asynchronous dialogue via e-mail to corroborate the portrait as a representation of the individual's lived experience of integration. Five of the 20 participants engaged in such conversations, and those portraits were revised accordingly. The first author also received direct feedback from participants in the study on early versions of these findings: One participant co-presented the findings at a national conference and a second (coincidentally) attended a conference presentation of the research. The revised summaries were finally recoded using the three foci identified in the research questions: Strategies for, the experience of, and institutional supports and barriers to integration and engagement.

Results

We used the research questions to frame the findings, highlighting emergent themes from the data analysis, expressed via examples from the participants' narratives. With this approach, we were able to highlight supports and barriers for faculty involvement in community engaged work in a research university environment, and thereby link directly to our discussion of the structure and leadership required for changing institutional policies and practices related to integration and engagement.

Strategies Engaged Faculty Use to Integrate Teaching, Research, and Service

An overarching theme that emerged from the data analysis is that faculty members integrating their teaching, research, and service within community contexts do so by thinking broadly about aspects of their faculty roles. By expanding the boundaries of scholarly work, participants have reclaimed traditional definitions of the role of educator and extended the location of student learning beyond the classroom. As a result, they generate a synergy between teaching and research that positions teaching in ways that support, rather than compete with, research. Four themes helped us understand how faculty integrate the various aspects of their work:

Expanding the Functional Boundaries of Scholarly Work

Despite Boyer's (1990) efforts to re-envision a broader, more inclusive definition of scholarship, O'Meara et al. (2005) found that faculty reward schemes still predominantly reflect faculty work in three traditional categories: research, teaching, and service. Using these three categories as references,

we followed O'Meara, Rice and associates' assessment of faculty reward systems, and coded each interview to identify which (if any) of these traditional functional identities each participant used in discussing his or her scholarship. A few participants ($n = 4$) emphasized research exclusively. One individual discussed the importance of integration as a strategy without providing detail about what roles he integrated or how he accomplished this integration. Just under half of the participants ($n = 8$) primarily discussed their work as an integration of two specific roles (research and teaching ($n = 3$); research and service ($n = 2$); and teaching and service ($n = 3$)). A smaller number of participants ($n = 5$) talked about their work in a way that emphasized their teaching responsibilities and spoke extensively about utilizing service-learning in their courses.

Despite our use of traditional labels for their work, two participants specifically resisted the categories we offered as the foundation of this study and focused instead on articulating a scholarly agenda characterized by integration. The distinguished professor of Communications preferred to "explode that language" which delineates teaching, research, and service because "that is a prejudiced language that gets us into silo-ed thinking" that reinforces the separation amongst faculty roles. As a rhetorician, he saw this as "a problem," one which "prejudic[es] the case" against faculty who pursue a "scholarly agenda that manifests itself into, if you have to use that language, teaching, research and service."

Engaged scholarship cleanly aligns with definitions of research in many disciplines, and simultaneously emphasizes the value of knowledge produced outside the academy. A distinguished professor of Law takes a common approach by "fram[ing her community work], first and foremost, as research — research harnessed for real life things that were identified as important by and for disadvantaged communities." Most participants placed an emphasis on integration as a key to successfully earning tenure and promotion ($n = 16$). This reflects the sentiment of a professor of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, a 30-year veteran who earned tenure at his land-grant institution in 1987: "In order for faculty to be successful, . . . integration is the key."

The 16 participants who emphasized integration as a key to success did not ignore connections with research in characterizing their work. An associate professor in a College of Agriculture captured a common sentiment expressed by more than half ($n = 9$) of this group: "Research is involved in every single project." The functional identity assigned by various participants was articulated by an associate professor of Graphic Design as "a matter of the strategy one needs to take to get tenure," and shapes how partici-

pants integrate teaching, research, and service.

This idea of breaking open categories leads us to what we take as key trends in participants' efforts to integrate their various roles and ground them in community-university engagement. The trend may also explain an anomaly in this data set: While the 20 participants were nominated/identified based on their achievements integrating research, teaching and service, only slightly more than half ($n = 11$) talk about their work as integrated. We do not, however, take this to mean that other participants are not integrating their work. Instead, we see this as a reflection of the predominance of traditional ways of thinking about faculty work, further reinforcing O'Meara et al.'s (2005) argument about faculty reward schemes and demonstrating the degree to which these schemes shape how faculty think and talk about their work. As a result, there is somewhat of a disconnect between how nearly half of the participants categorize what they do using the familiar labels of teaching, research, and service and how they describe the work that they are doing without reference to these labels. In their descriptions, we heard many of them moving away from a single emphasis on "researcher" by reclaiming teaching within the context of the research imperative and reconceptualizing what it means to be *in the classroom*.

Reclaiming the Role of Educator

In a marked turn away from a narrow focus on faculty as researcher, community-engaged scholars participating in this study have returned instead to the early tradition of faculty as professor, someone "declare[d] skilled or expert," who has made a thing or subject "one's profession or business" (Oxford English Dictionary, 1993, p. 2368). The associate professor of Graphic Design put it most clearly: "...my primary role is an educator." Twelve other participants also discussed their responsibilities for educating others as important to their integrated scholarship.

The teaching and learning process is not limited to the teacher/student dyad, in that slightly more than half of the participants ($n = 11$) articulated their teaching philosophy as a mutual process involving faculty, students, and community members. Through service-learning, faculty in the study taught students who were involved with such efforts as participatory design projects gathering input from children about playgrounds at their elementary schools, work with communities on downtown revitalization and economic development initiatives, and tutoring second-language learners through an Adult Literacy Council.

An associate professor of Psychology taught research methods courses by offering "free research" to a community organization and working with her students on-site to design and conduct qualitative

research answering the agency's questions. Other participants provided undergraduate research opportunities through community-based research projects ($n = 9$) and/or mentored students as research assistants on funded projects ($n = 6$). Community involvement reinforces a broadened view of the educational process and we see that the lines between teaching, research, and service become blurred when education is at the center.

Reconceptualizing the Location of Student Learning

We see two elements of the traditional role of educator or *professor* in the narratives, one related to the role of *educator* and the second to the location of the learning. By reclaiming a definition of professor which embraces teaching and learning in both formal and informal settings, the participants in this study also reconceptualized the location of student learning. Education was not limited to the classroom for these participants: "[t]he idea is that we have a mission that goes beyond teaching people to read, write, and do arithmetic. We're involved...with all kinds of scientific discoveries...that take place outside of the classroom, off campus." Participants talked about the education of university students as taking place both in and out of the classroom ($n = 13$), and also about the educative value of research ($n = 12$). Participants also commented on their work providing education to community members ($n = 13$), including community organizations, children participating in after-school programs, tribal communities building educational and social service facilities, and natural resource manufacturers.

An important point to highlight here is that expanding the teaching role to include community engagement caused faculty to think not only beyond the classroom in terms of the location of learning but also beyond the traditional idea of a student in a classroom to include other learners. Adopting expanded views of teaching also provided ample opportunity to see more synergy and connection between teaching and research — a particularly important theme to highlight in the research university.

Positioning Teaching to Support Research

A prevailing notion at research institutions holds that teaching and service distract faculty from their primary responsibility — research. In fact, our findings bear strong resemblance to Colbeck's (1998) discussion of distinct faculty roles merging in a seamless blend, and counter Marsh and Hattie's (2002) insistence on the independence of research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Participants in the study specifically discussed their teaching as playing a support role to their research agenda ($n = 8$) when, for example, the associate professor of Criminology

described the evaluation of students' service-learning and internships as informing the questions he explored in subsequent research projects. Teaching provided an important pathway to research for participants (n = 8) who echoed these sentiments from a professor of Education: "what has happened in the course of doing this research and building it into my classroom...has influenced profoundly the way my research goes and has gone."

Faculty Characterizations of their Experiences of Integration and Engagement

While explaining how they integrate multiple faculty roles through a community engagement platform, two intertwined themes — personal passion and academic marginality — reflect the characterization of their experiences. Integration and engagement provide opportunities for pursuing personal passions, but in doing so, participants perceived they are, to some extent, working on the margins of the academy.

Pursuing Personal Passions

Participants in this study have been able to build an active scholarly agenda integrating all three roles which allows them to meet the expectations of the academy in ways that also reflect their personal passions. Although community-based work requires a great deal of time and energy, an associate professor of Psychology said emphatically that engagement strengthened her teaching and research: "I'm definitely better. I integrate more theories in my research as well as in my writing, and I teach differently as a result of that. It was transformative." She knew what was required to progress through the system, but her engaged scholarship connected to something more important. Publications were required "because that's how I get...promoted and get...merit increases[, but] what feeds my soul is knowing that at the end of the day, my work is useful to...make places and people better."

More than half the participants (n = 11) spoke specifically about their work with communities as integral to their sense of self. For example, the professor of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering described his community-engaged work as something that reflected his "basic values of helping people, doing what's important, benefiting society, using what God has given you, your gifting, your opportunities to the greatest advantage." Community-engaged scholarship was the vehicle through which participants connected their personal passions to their scholarly work. Guillory and Ward (2008) indicate that many people of color choose a career in academia as a way to "give back" to their communities. A professor of Asian American Studies described himself as a community activist first: "my primary identity, I

would say, is I'm an organizer. I went into academia essentially to organize, to mobilize resources, to serve [under-represented] communities. [The notion of a research agenda is] not the question that has moved or motivated my work over the years."

Other participants talked about integrating passion and scholarship to support their activism (n = 8). In many cases their narratives were stories of intentionally enacting their faculty roles in ways that build congruence between personal commitments and faculty life. For example, a professor of Chemistry built a long-term and very successful relationship with the local natural resource industry, assisting in reducing harmful emissions: "the [industry] doesn't know just how rabid an environmentalist they've let in the front door. But luckily," he said with a chuckle, "I like to do it by being a partner instead of an adversary." Ultimately, the integration of research and teaching (Colbeck, 1998) with service (Ward, 2003) was not just about integrating work, but — as our participants have demonstrated in articulating their life histories and convictions — integrating passion and personal values together with the research, teaching, and service roles.

Balancing Personal and Professional Lives

The findings in this study highlight individual faculty resisting traditional notions about what it means to be a scholar at a research institution. This counters other studies suggesting that women faculty (in particular) struggle to balance work and family in the research university (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004) and that graduate students choose positions at non-research-intensive institutions to support what they perceive as a healthier balance between personal and professional commitments (Austin, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001). In this study, seven participants credited integration and engagement as having positive impacts on their work-life balance. Participants described themselves as purposefully integrating life and work, and finding a way to match their scholarly agenda with commitments to family, community, and deeply held personal values. An associate professor of Hospitality Business Management told this story:

When I was going through my third-year review for tenure...one of the people that sat on the tenure and promotion committee at that time...told me...that I really needed to not even include that service stuff because people on the committee saw all that service I was doing [as] too much of a distraction to my research...Of course, that didn't fly very well with me because part of what I do in the community is related to...a variety of things that I think help make us a whole person. You know, my life — right wrong or indifferent — will NEVER revolve

totally around being a researcher.

In this context, engagement and integration were not just strategies for doing the work, but also for integrating personal lives with the multiple roles of a faculty member at a research institution.

Working at the Margins

As a result of their integration and engagement, several participants (n = 8) described themselves as working at the margins of traditional definitions of research, teaching, and service. The feeling of marginality played out in many different ways. In some instances, individuals were very matter of fact in discussing the distance between their own scholarship and what they perceived to be the more mainstream work of their colleagues. "Trying to find someone in my discipline who can understand what I'm doing with the community work is tough," said the associate professor of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, "just because there are so few...that do it."

Nearly all of the participants have received recognition on their home campuses for their efforts as community-engaged scholars (n = 17). At the same time, many of these same people (n = 8) also told stories of having been labeled in some way as an outlier by colleagues, their dean, and/or the promotion and tenure process at their institution. These scholars had stories of work not valued or direct criticism by the power structure in their institution. The associate professor of Criminology had colleagues who strongly encouraged advisees not to take the participant's service-learning courses. He attributed these negative attitudes not to an ignorance of the outcomes and impacts of service-learning; rather, his colleagues "just have a perception that it's not academic." He seemed a little surprised by this attitude. The lack of awareness about civic engagement also was likely not related to a lack of information, given that his institution "has been a place where...you could know a lot about this,...[but] the majority of the faculty choose not to learn more." These colleagues seem similar to those of one professor of Education who "don't know quite what to make of" her integration and engagement, "and are slightly puzzled by it." She told a story of one such colleague, who wrote a report on her promotion dossier for the personnel committee. The colleague "missed the point...I don't think it was for lack of trying or because he wasn't attentive...he just didn't understand it." Her read of this experience was that this colleague "was not able to...understand how work that intertwines teaching, research, and service can nonetheless be theoretically sophisticated and can contribute in just the same way as other types of projects can to a rethinking of research."

These experiences of personal and professional

congruence, and the feeling of being marginalized by colleagues for working to achieve congruence, emphasize that faculty work does not occur in a vacuum. Institutional and disciplinary context matter when considering structures that encourage or impede engagement and integration.

Supports and Barriers to Integration and Engagement in Research Universities

Faculty work supporting community-university engagement missions happen in particular contexts. We found that some of these contexts actively support faculty in their work in the community but in others faculty carry out their work in the face of challenges and barriers. The themes presented here address these.

Barriers to Engaged Scholarship

The research imperative and traditional notions about meeting this imperative, together with issues related to the long-term funding of community-engaged scholarship, presented barriers to faculty working at integration and engagement.

Prevailing definitions of scholarship. Participants in this study had appointments in a variety of geographic, institutional, and disciplinary contexts (see Table 1). However, across these differences, nearly every person said something that echoed this participant: "the rhetoric of this institution as a whole is that we think that [work in the community] is the next best thing to buttered bread." On all 15 campuses represented in the study, conversations about engagement and community work have been expanding and increasing over the past decade. In general, there is fairly strong campus support for activities supporting engagement and community-university partnerships. Unfortunately, however, much of the support is seen as rhetorical: Participants (n = 12) talked about their institutional contexts in ways similar to the comments of a professor of Asian American Studies, who noted about his institution that "[t]here's rhetoric and there's reality;" or "a lot of talking and no action." While research institutions are increasingly committed to engagement with the community, the structure of promotion and tenure is still skewed in favor of traditional research at many institutions. For example, a professor of History at a prominent private university told us:

[t]here is...a university commitment that is honest and sincere that we ought to engage the community...but for those people who are on tenure track appointments and tenured appointments, if you have any sense, you're going to understand that it's something you do because you like doing it, because it's something you think is important, but not because you are rewarded in the normal reward structure.

Participants confirmed that both tenure and promotion required faculty members to be active participants in the scholarly conversations of their discipline ($n = 10$), meaning that the engaged scholar must also be working within the parameters of acceptable scholarship in a given discipline. This professor of History explained that none of his colleagues worked on the local history of the state or region where their university is located; to do so might give their work the reputation of being “not real history.” Faculty in the study were keenly aware of what were perceived by colleagues as organizational and disciplinary boundaries for genuine scholarship.

Participants felt the push to fulfill traditional expectations for publishing and receiving external funding, and positioned their work accordingly. This was true for five of the seven associate professors who reflected either on their tenure experiences or their goals for further promotion, and also for seven senior scholars who reflected on the relationship between engaged scholarship and their bids for promotion to professor or distinguished professor. An associate professor of Nursing would “not mention any service work” that she has done if or when she applied for promotion to full professor, “[because] the academic milieu here would not value that at all. It would not be seen as an asset.” Although integration and engagement have been personally and professionally very rewarding for these participants, it was clear from their comments that they felt the pressure to accumulate what the distinguished professor of Communications referred to as “the coin of the realm”: peer-reviewed publications and grant funding.

Limited campus funding targeted for engaged scholarship. Half the participants ($n = 10$) mentioned funding as a barrier. Despite campus-level rhetoric in support of engagement, many campuses are not providing continuation funding to support community-engaged scholarship. Five interviewees had received major grants from federal agencies or foundations with limited periods and scopes of work. Two of these five pointed to difficulties in sustaining projects or contracts requiring long-term funding commitments. A professor of Education recognized nationally for her after-school programs explained the challenge this way:

Having a vision for a program is not the problem. Finding people to be engaged in the work is not the problem...[O]ne of the major challenges has been to keep funding constant for the programs that we've developed in the community. It's a struggle and it's constant. Unless you find a benefactor or unless somehow the work is embedded in some institution that can fund it itself, it's difficult to continually make sure there's enough money to do the kinds of things that you want to do.

Two others spoke specifically about the continual effort needed to ensure funding. The associate professor of Nursing expressed skepticism about institutional willingness to provide support for projects without external funding. Community-university partnerships are, she argued, “a good way to start a program but long term, I don't think universities, as a general rule, are going to commit the resources it takes to do that.”

Supports for Engaged Scholarship

Alongside the barriers encountered in their institutions, faculty also found that there were particular types of support making a difference in their work.

Available funding can make a difference. The findings of this study suggest that funding for engagement initiatives is not only a barrier but also a support to engagement. Faculty are challenged by university expectations to bring in external grants and contracts when other institutional funding is not available. However, for those who have received external support for their research, major funding serves as an antidote to marginality. As a recognized or valued product of scholarship, external funding can serve to legitimize engaged scholarship.

Several participants had successfully received funding to support engagement initiatives. Hired into a department after earning tenure at a previous institution, the professor of Chemistry saw colleagues' skepticism toward his applied research projects. They were initially “not sure that what [he] does is [science].” Within five years of arriving at the institution, he had won a \$250,000 National Science Foundation (NSF) grant to support the applied research he was conducting which draws students into public policy processes at the local, county, and state levels. He subsequently received an NSF instrumentation grant for an additional \$150,000 to purchase the equipment necessary for analysis to support the policy research and recommendations his students were developing. His projects continued to be successful, gaining him recognition on his campus and from the NSF program responsible for launching his initiative. Later, his colleagues were much more supportive: “[a]t this point what they say is, yeah, there's certainly some good [science] problems in the middle of all that stuff you do.” This was a stark story of the difference external funding can make for an engaged scholar. Half of our participants ($n = 10$) used externally funded research grants as a platform for integrating engagement into an active scholarly agenda.

Institutional commitment to the rhetoric of engagement. Another paradoxical finding relates to the characterization of institutional support for engagement as “all talk...no action.” Clark Kerr's (1963) notion of the modern “multiversity” offers a potential explanation

tion, suggesting that universities are many things to many stakeholders. Even a largely rhetorical commitment by administrators to engagement had the effect of creating a foothold for the participants to use in positioning their work in support of the university's stated goals ($n = 14$). This was done most effectively in annual reviews and promotion and tenure narratives. The work was somewhat easier on several campuses described by faculty as offering generally supportive environments for engagement. Nine participants specifically discussed their campus in this manner. We heard such a description from the professor of Sociology who emphasized "networks" of colleagues across campus creating "an environment...where people...are encouraged to think different (sic)." This produced what one person called "a vitality" connecting "the people and the dialogue and the camaraderie." There was "mission-driven institutional support" for engagement at a Midwestern land-grant institution, and an urban campus put together "a document about how to document engaged service." One participant went so far as to say that his campus "has grown into a very conducive environment for people who are interested in" conducting community-engaged scholarship.

Good mentoring makes a difference. Several participants ($n = 3$) emphasized the importance of mentoring received from senior colleagues. One participant credited her first department head for encouraging her to "push the boundaries" because her engaged scholarship "is significant work and it fits the mission of the university." When offering this advice he also reminded her "to do all the things that you have to do to be successful [i.e., publish and get external funding]." Another participant was "the baby" in a faculty learning community of engaged scholars; she said she "cannot overstate" the impact of her participation in the group on her work, "it was phenomenal." Interestingly, she differentiated this experience from the formal mentoring she received from her advisor:

Mentoring has some formalizations around it, I think...[E]ven though I would consider my faculty advisor an absolutely fantastic mentor, I don't think he's so honestly described his mess-ups with me as much as [my partners in the learning community] described their mess ups with me...It was more mutual in the learning, and mentoring tends to have a more hierarchical nature to it. This was co-learning.

These findings align with other literature emphasizing the importance of providing opportunities for engagement in graduate education (Colbeck, O'Meara, & Austin, 2008; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2007), and the importance assigned to mentoring experiences by par-

ticipants in a formal Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop (Allen & Moore, in press). The third participant to comment on this theme perfectly emphasized the importance of this topic: "Without a mentor we spend a lot of time learning and maybe never get it right. I would imagine a lot of people have gotten discouraged and stopped."

Our findings make clear that institutional context is important to faculty and their interactions with communities as expressed through teaching, research, and service. Across the findings, we see the importance of institutional leaders and accompanying structures on the campus in creating environments that support or stifle engagement. We turn now to a fuller discussion of institutional contexts and the leaders that support engagement.

Discussion

Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, and Damon (2001) and later the Good Works Project Team (2008) have studied "good work," asking the following question: "How do individuals who desire to . . . do work that is at once excellent in quality and socially responsible succeed or fail?" (2008, p. 24). This notion of "good work" has been used by others in higher education. Austin (1990) identifies "the belief that universities and colleges are involved in 'good work,' that is, the production of knowledge for society" (p. 65) as a core value of higher education. Walshok (2000) argues something similar as a foundational tenet of the engagement imperative, calling research universities to use the capacity to generate new knowledge in response to community needs. Universities need to facilitate conversations that advance community engagement to realize more fully institutional mission statements supporting engagement, which can also be understood as "good work" discussed by Gardner et al. (2001) and the Good Works Project Team.

Berg, Csikszentmihalyi, and Nakamura (2003) apply the findings of Gardner et al. (2001) to the civic mission of higher education. Berg et al. (2003) describe the "good work" of universities and their constituents as "likely to happen when three conditions are met: the work lives up to . . . best practices, it responds to societal needs, and it is experienced as meaningful and enjoyable by those who do it" (p. 49). These ideas shape our discussion, emphasizing structures and practices necessary to support faculty in doing the good work of integration and engagement. By invoking the various "good work" studies to contextualize engagement, the research university can position itself as a milieu which can either support or hinder faculty in enacting the rhetoric about deepening community engagement. This brings us to the task of aligning rhetoric and reality, then opera-

tionalizing structures and leadership to support good work. In doing so, we point to tensions between the research imperative and calls for deeper engagement which must be resolved as part of the institutionalization of a commitment to community engagement.

Rhetoric of Engagement and the Reality of Faculty Work

At first glance, Berg et al.'s (2003) conditions for "good work" appear to be present in participants' narratives. The data presented in this paper yield numerous examples of channeling campus resources to do the "good work" of bridging campuses and communities through integration and engagement. Several of the participants' projects have been held up as best practices in award nominations and the scholarly literature related to engagement and integration. Participants describe the work as supporting congruence between their personal and professional lives. The work is clearly meaningful to them in its connection to their personal passions, and the collaboration with community keeps the work responsive to societal needs.

Faculty in the study, however, differentiated between what one called "talk" and "rhetoric" related to service on their individual campuses. We see two key points here: (1) a disconnect between verbiage (e.g., "it's a great thing to be involved in and it is part of the institutional mission") and actions associated with engagement (e.g., concern that the actions will be rewarded fully in promotion, tenure, or merit raise decisions); and, (2) the role that particular leaders play in cultivating a culture which supports engagement. The "disconnect" we identified can inhibit "good work" because it is what Berg et al. (2003) would call a "misalignment" between rhetoric and action. Misalignments result from an institutional context which may reflect an articulated mission of community engagement which is "in harmony with what the society and culture deem necessary and valuable" (p. 43) but is not successfully providing "what external stakeholders expect, need, and value" (p. 42).

Berg et al. (2003) focus their discussion on creating conditions for close alignment between the energy and effort of individuals within the university and the institution's mission as support for individual efforts to do "good work" (Good Works Project Team, 2008). The individual narratives of engagement, when juxtaposed against institutional policy and practice, highlight structural issues which must be addressed in addition to individual effort and institutional mission.

Structures for Institutionalizing Engagement

A prevalent theme in the interviews is that participants' views of their work are, in part, shaped by

institutional expectations for faculty to be actively involved in traditional research. Faculty at the institutions represented in this study are encouraged to participate in scholarship manifested through traditional outlets of scholarly work (i.e., grants, publications). In other words, "good work" is being defined as synonymous with more traditional definitions of research, per Jencks and Riesman's (1977) discussion of the research imperative. Even when faculty articulate their passions and sense of themselves as educators, it is not uncommon to make such statements in reaction or relation to discussion about the research imperative. That is, faculty will ponder what they are doing in the community as part of their teaching, research, and service. However, given the prevalence of the research culture associated with the faculty role, they often also must justify what they do in relation to traditional expectations for research. A senior faculty member put it this way: "For faculty to engage [with the community] and gain from it, we need to produce publications and we need to have funding."

Looking at the findings through the lens of "good work," we see that wide-scale shifts such as the institutionalization of community-university engagement call for campus leaders to do two things. First, they must look holistically at campus culture. While service-learning is one venue for, or prong of, community engagement, the findings from this study suggest that positioning service-learning as one part of a larger faculty work landscape within a research university helps faculty get recognition for their teaching. When viewed as part of a larger whole, service-learning activities can be situated as part of a scholarly agenda that co-mingles teaching, research, and service and also connects campus and community. Adopting such a view of faculty work and campus-community engagement calls for faculty presenting their work in particular ways, but it also calls for support from campus leaders, who must provide a realignment of this culture to a new definition of good work which more closely reflects the university's civic mission.

Leadership for Institutionalizing Engagement

Administrators at institutions represented in this study played a major role in managing change supporting community engagement. A persistent theme throughout this study has been the important role particular senior administrators play in keeping an ethic of service and engagement central to campus culture. One participant, a landscape architect, has been at the same institution for more than 20 years. Early in his career, "[t]he notion of community-based [research]... was like what is that?" Now, this campus is nationally recognized as a leader in the scholarship

of engagement. He specifically attributed the change to the provost, who saw “the multiple natures of teaching, research, and service” as “something that is (sic) important and works together. She launched an entire effort here on campus.”

We refer to the influence of these champions of engagement as the *power of one* and we saw it most clearly in the comments from people at institutions that have recently experienced a transition in leadership. There was general concern that if/when these champions left, the culture of engagement and integration was, or would be, threatened. This concern does not seem to be unfounded, in light of the Good Work Project Team’s (2008) findings across multiple studies which demonstrate that a culture of good work may emerge under the influence of a single champion, but ultimately depends on wider commitment across the institution. This power of one has introduced values supporting engagement in some institutions, but has not achieved a total institutionalization of that commitment which could survive the departure of a key leader. These findings also resonate with the experience of a participant at an urban institution, who described “one of the . . . most discouraging and frustrating things in the last couple of years”: he and several colleagues worked diligently, and successfully, for 10 years to lay the groundwork for making a case recognizing engaged scholarship in the promotion and tenure process. Now, with a new administration, much of this work is being disregarded or undone: “[d]ifferent administrators come in and precedents of 10 years ago really have no meaning for them.”

We see through our interviews that key actors can be both architects and revisionists concerning faculty involvement in campus-community engagement. Study participants’ narratives emphasize the key role organizational structure and campus leaders play in creating conditions to foster the “good work” of campus-community engagement. Therefore, we conclude with recommendations for practice and future research.

Recommendations for Practice

University administrators support faculty as principal actors in doing the good work of fulfilling higher education’s civic mission (Kezar, Chambers, Burkhardt, & Associates, 2005). Doing ethical, effective, and useful work results from a complex interaction of cultural (from the rules of the profession) and social (from the people in the profession) codes internalized and reflected in personal standards (Good Works Project Team, 2008). Based on our findings, we offer the following recommendations for shaping the cultural and social codes on campuses working to institutionalize community engagement.

Adopt Holistic Views of Faculty Work

Community-university engagement activities can lead to very creative and expanded views of what it means to be a faculty member. By adopting more holistic views of faculty work and about each aspect of the faculty role (teaching, research, service), campuses can support the success of faculty. Many campuses have clearly stated missions supporting community-university engagement and calling for broad conceptions of scholarship (Boyer, 1990); yet these are often juxtaposed with very traditional ways of viewing the faculty role. As expressed by faculty in the study, the research university culture directs faculty to focus on traditional means and outlets for research. However, we also found that when faculty have been involved in the community through their teaching, research, and service, they have been highly productive as scholars.

Inform Campus Administrative and Staff Audiences about Community-University Engagement

Participation in community engagement can be expressed in all aspects of the faculty role. Conversations about community-university engagement need to be broadened beyond individual faculty and key senior administrators. The administrative staff who support faculty can play a key role in facilitating or hindering all aspects of faculty work including community engagement. The findings of this study identify barriers to integration and engaged scholarship: traditional notions about how to meet the research imperative and the availability of long-term funding for community-engaged scholarship. Our findings highlight the particular importance of sharing information about community-university engagement and its relationship to the promotion and tenure process with a broad range of administrative units. For example, given the importance of external funding to community-university engagement and research noted by participants, it is particularly important to educate staff supporting research, grants, and contracts. Informing administrators and staff members about the different prongs of engagement can in turn help those people support faculty work. Not only faculty, but those that surround faculty, need to be aware of the multiple ways faculty can be involved in community engagement especially as it supports the research mission of the university.

Revise Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Faculty Handbooks to Reflect Campus Commitments for Community-University Engagement

The research university context provides endless

opportunities to connect campus resources with community needs. The challenge of this environment, however, is that faculty can feel confined to traditional definitions of scholarship. In a time of leadership transition, they may also feel uncertain about the rhetoric underlying decision-making processes. Promotion and tenure guidelines and faculty handbooks communicate, and to some extent solidify, what a particular campus values with regard to faculty work. If campuses are to encourage engaged scholarship, handbooks and promotion and tenure guidelines need to address how and why one might choose to connect faculty work with community needs and give examples of how to document this approach. Community engagement needs to be described for each of the different categories of faculty work (teaching, research, and service).

Encourage Mentoring

Faculty at all stages of their career can benefit from mentorship. Mentors provide guidance about institutional contexts, disciplinary norms, and the nuances of faculty work. Some study participants pointed to mentoring as a key structure supporting their development as engaged scholars, and we highlight it again here because it reflects findings from the scholarship related to, and professional practice of, university engagement. Mentors also play a key role in helping faculty, especially junior faculty, think about how they allocate time relative to the mission of their campus. With regard to community-university engagement, mentors can play a role in providing insight about how to integrate different aspects of the faculty job as well as how to connect the work of campus with the larger community. Mentorship does not necessarily link just one faculty member to one mentor; it can be more broad, allowing multiple mentors to play a role in the development of several faculty. The key is to actively encourage engaged scholars to seek mentoring in support of integration and engagement and for campuses to build structures to support this. The scholarship related to integration and engagement includes ideas related to each of these recommendations, and it can be a rich resource for campus leaders.

Recommendations for Further Research

Our findings help us understand why faculty engage with communities, their experiences in doing so, and the supports and barriers for their work. In addition, our work also suggests topics warranting further investigation to tease out the nuances of integration and engagement.

Expand the Number/Characteristics of Research Participants

In this study, the sample size allowed us to satisfy some of our curiosity about how faculty succeed with

community-based scholarly agendas in light of the demands of the modern research university. Future studies could expand the number of participants, the number of participants per discipline, and/or the types of institutions (public, private, comprehensive, liberal arts, community colleges) in an effort to offer more detail about the importance of different contexts.

Investigate Developmental Trajectories of the Faculty Career

Exploration of engaged scholars' career development would allow deeper understanding of how scholars develop a research agenda that meshes the time required for building mutually beneficial relationships with communities with the research imperative. Findings in such studies would be extremely useful for mentoring emerging scholars on positioning their integration and engagement vis-à-vis institutional expectations.

Consider Group Factors Influencing Faculty Development

This study allowed us to look at how a heterogeneous group of faculty integrate their work and participate in community engagement. Future research could examine different subgroups (e.g., those who participate in engagement activities before versus after tenure, faculty who work in disciplinary versus interdisciplinary contexts). Such work could explore the nuances of particular disciplines and faculty rank and provide insight on practices and structures to support faculty development.

Consider More Details about Institutional Culture/Context

This could be done methodologically by conducting in-depth case studies of particular campuses, allowing detailed descriptions of what supports and hinders faculty in their pursuit of engagement. This also could be done comparatively by looking at faculty work in campus contexts where community engagement enjoys strong support and in campus contexts where faculty pursue involvement in community work in spite of campus barriers.

In this study, we show that a group of highly engaged faculty members are making good on the promise of campuses to meet community needs. Faculty are doing important work that merits attention from administrators and other campus leaders who want to further their campus engagement. This work also warrants the attention of academic leaders who work with faculty. The institutionalization of community engagement requires the participation of both faculty and administrators, and must focus on building structures and developing leaders to support the on-going good work of faculty.

Note

The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their helpful suggestions in revising this manuscript, Zarrina Azizova for her contribution to the data analysis, and Jaquelyn Gotch for her editorial assistance.

References

- Allen, A.D., & Moore, T.L. (2010). Developing emerging engagement scholars in higher education. In H.E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S.D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions* (pp. 447-458). Volume 2: *Community-Campus Partnerships*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Aparicio, F.R., & José-Kampfner, C. (1995). Language, culture, and violence in the educational crisis of U.S. Latino/as: Two courses for intervention. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 95-104.
- Austin, A.E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W.G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and culture* (pp. 61-74). *New Directions in Institution Research*, No. 68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A.E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Berg, G.A., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Nakamura, J. (2003) Mission possible? Enabling good work in higher education. *Change*, 35(5), 41-47.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20.
- Brody, S.M., & Wright, S.M. (2004). Expanding the self through service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(1), 14-24.
- Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 647-671.
- Colbeck, C.L., & Michael, P.W. (2006). The public scholarship: Reintegrating Boyer's four domains. In J.M. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship* (pp. 7-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass..
- Colbeck, C., O'Meara, K., & Austin, A.E. (2008). Graduate education and community engagement. In C. Colbeck, K. O'Meara, & A. Austin (Eds.), *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professoriate* (pp. 27-42). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E.A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press for the American Council on Education.
- Fairweather, J.S. (1996). *Faculty work and the public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon Schuster Company.
- Fear, F.A., Rosaen, C.L., Bawden, R.J., & Foster-Fishman, P.G. (2006). *Coming to critical engagement: An autoethnographic exploration*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In Corporation for National Service (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2-6). Columbia, MD: Cooperative Education Association.
- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When excellence and ethics meet*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giles, D., & Eyler, J. (1998). A service-learning research agenda for the next five years. In R. Rhoads & J. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 65-72). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Golde, C.M., & Dore, T.M. (2001). At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education (www.phd-survey.org). Philadelphia, PA: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Good Work Project Team. (2008). The Good Work Project: An Overview. Retrieved May 13, 2010, from http://www.goodworkproject.org/docs/papers/GW%20Overview%204_08.pdf
- Guillory, J., & Ward, K. (2008). Tribal colleges and universities: Identity, invisibility, and current issues. In M.B. Gasman, B., Baez, & C.S. Turner (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary approaches to understanding minority serving institutions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hudson, W.E., & Trudeau, R.H. (1995). An essay on the institutionalization of service-learning: The genesis of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 150-159.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1977). *The academic revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Kerr, C.M. (1963). *The uses of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kezar, A.J., Chambers, T.C., Burkhardt, J.C., & Associates. (2005). *Higher education for the public good*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lightfoot, S.L., & Hoffman-Davis, J. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.
- Marsh, H.W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic or independent constructs? *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 603-641.
- Moore, T.L., & Ward, K.A. (2008). Documenting engagement: Faculty perspectives on self representation for promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(4), 5-28.
- Morphew, C.C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 456-471.
- O'Meara, K., & Jaeger, A. (2007). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: History, barriers, facilitators, models and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11(4), 3-26.
- O'Meara, K., Rice, R.E., & Associates (eds.). (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oxford University Press. (1993). *The new shorter Oxford English dictionary*. Thumb Index Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, B., & Dautoff, D.A. (2007). Service-learning and study abroad: Synergistic learning opportunities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(2), 40-53.
- Reardon, K.M. (1999). A sustainable community/university partnership. *Liberal Education*, 85(3), 20-25.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walshok, M.L. (2000). A research university perspective. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 295-305). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press for the American Council on Education.
- Ward, K.A. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29. No. 5. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ward, K.A. (2005). Rethinking faculty roles and rewards for the public good. In A. J. Kezar, T.C. Chambers, J.C. Burkhardt, & Associates (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good* (pp. 217-234). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *Review of Higher Education*, 27, 233-257.
- Weerts, D.J., & Ronca, J.M. (2006). Examining differences in state support for higher education: A comparative study of state appropriations for research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 935-965.
- Zimpher, N.L., Percy, S.L., & Brukardt, M.J. (2002). *A time for boldness: A story of institutional change*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Authors

TAMI L. MOORE (tami.moore@okstate.edu) is assistant professor of Higher Education in the Educational Leadership Program at Oklahoma State University. Her research agenda focuses broadly on the role of higher education institutions in the communities they serve, employing social and critical theory in the reading of community engagement. Her current projects explore issues related to faculty work and community-engaged scholarship as well as the relationship between geographic place and community-university engagement.

KELLY WARD (kaward@wsu.edu) is professor of Higher Education and Ellison Faculty Fellow at Washington State University. Her research focuses on faculty life. She studies faculty work and family balance, as well as faculty roles, including the development of a service ethic among faculty. She is author of the ASHE Higher Education Report Series monograph, *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*.