AASCU American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Delivering America's Promise

BECOMING A STEWARD OF PLACE

LESSONS FROM AASCU CARNEGIE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT APPLICATIONS

 American Association of State Colleges and Universities
1307 New York Avenue, NW • Washington, DC 20005-4701
ph 202.293.7070 • fax 202.296.5819 • aascu.org

 facebook.com/aascu

 twitter.com/aascu

BECOMING A **STEWARD** OF **PLACE**

LESSONS FROM AASCU CARNEGIE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT APPLICATIONS

John Saltmarsh
Professor, College of Education and Human Development,
University of Massachusetts Boston

KerryAnn O'Meara
Associate Professor, College of Education, University of Maryland

Lorilee Sandmann
Professor, College of Education, University of Georgia

Dwight Giles, Jr.
Professor, College of Education and Human Development,
University of Massachusetts Boston

Kelley Cowdery
Graduate Student, University of Maryland

Jia Liang
Graduate Student, University of Georgia

Suzanne Buglione
Dean, Bristol Community College (Mass.)

Contents

Foreword

George L. Mehaffy
Vice President for Academic
Leadership and Change, AASCU

Over the past decade, as AASCU has worked to operationalize its concept of "stewards of place," others were working to build a more coherent intellectual grounding for the work of campuses interacting with their communities. One of the more notable efforts in building a concrete concept of civic and community engagement came out of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which in 2006 created a new voluntary classification scheme that highlights the work of campuses committed to partnerships with their communities. The 2006 Community Engagement Classification application and selection process was followed by subsequent rounds in 2008 and 2010.

Beyond the work of associations and foundations, however, there was extraordinary work underway by scholars in the field. No single group of scholars, perhaps, embodies the work of conceptualization and articulation of the concept of engagement more than the authors of this report. For years, John Saltmarsh, Dwight Giles, KerryAnn O'Meara and Loralee Sandmann, along with their colleagues, have worked to build a more robust concept of community engagement. Indeed, by 2010, John Saltmarsh—as the head of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)—had agreed to manage the Carnegie Classification on Community Engagement selections process for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

As we began thinking about the sequel to *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place,* we also wanted to know what the field was learning about community engagement, particularly as represented in the applications of AASCU institutions who were applying for the voluntary Carnegie Classification on Community Engagement. So we asked John Saltmarsh and his colleagues to conduct an analysis of the applications from AASCU institutions in 2008 and 2010 to see what lessons we could learn.

As you can see from the following, our decision to ask John and his colleagues for help was crucial. The report that they have created, which now serves as a companion to *Becoming a Steward of Place: A Guide for Institutional Leaders,* adds substantively to our overall work. The report contributes enormous texture and nuance to our understanding of how to go about the work of engaging with our communities. Indeed, the lessons offered in this report were so important that we included them as an appendix in Becoming a Steward of Place, to make certain that we had the widest possible distribution of these ideas and insights.

We are enormously indebted to John and his colleagues for this very substantial contribution to the scholarship of community engagement. As the authors note, this report is intended not only for presidents, provosts and deans, but for other administrators, faculty and students. For anyone interested in how universities can engage with their communities, this is required reading.

On behalf of the more than 420 institutions in the AASCU membership and the 3.8 million students we serve, I want to thank each of the authors for this robust and substantive contribution to the literature of community engagement.

Preface

by R. Eugene Rice
Senior Scholar, AAC&U

Democracy has to be born anew every generation, and education is its midwife.

—John Dewey

Over the past decade, the institutions that comprise the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) have taken on the particularly unique and mission-appropriate challenge of being "Stewards of Place." During this same period, they launched a very successful initiative, the American Democracy Project (ADP). It is clear that this important sector of American higher education has committed itself to renewing our nation's long-standing commitment to civic engagement in local communities and to preparing the next generation of informed, active citizens in our democracy. Much has been accomplished, and the stories that can be told are rich and inspiring; anecdotal evidence abounds.

Fortunately, during this same period, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—the venerable institution that for decades has given us the classification system used to rank in hierarchical order the nations' colleges and universities—launched a process of rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. For some time now, this classification has been widely adapted by the higher education research community and has become, as Alex McCormick and Chun-Mei Zhao explain, the dominant strategy for classifying institutions even though "it was not intended to be the final word on institutional differentiation" (*Change,* September/October, 2005, p. 52). In rethinking this ordering process, the Carnegie Foundation recently initiated an elective Community Engagement Classification to focus on an essential—but seriously neglected—form of academic responsibilities and achievement in American institutions of higher education.

Becoming a Steward of Place

Fortuitously, the new Carnegie classification in community engagement surfaced on the national scene at the same time as AASCU's efforts to encourage its institutions to foster democratic citizenship and be—in that appropriately powerful phrase—"Stewards of Place." What the Carnegie Foundation sought to assess as markers of engagement, AASCU encouraged its colleges and universities to institutionalize in the life, work and purposes of its schools. This report provides some measure of what has been accomplished and the challenges that lie before us. The congruence and the timing could not be better.

Stewards of Place II is appearing at a particularly propitious time in the recent history of American higher education. In early January 2012, the White House convened a prestigious forum to launch a national conversation about the importance of educating students for informed, engaged citizenship entitled, "For Democracy's Future: Education Reclaims our Civil Mission." In conjunction with this effort, a national task force sponsored by the Department of Education released its final report, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy's Future* (AACU, 2012). Serious concern was expressed about the decline of civic literacy throughout our society and the need to renew the fundamental civic and democratic mission across all sectors of higher education. There was also an urgent call to expand the number of community partnerships and alliances addressing shared civic problems and empowering people to act. Special emphasis was placed on the relationship of K-12 and the role of higher education in promoting civic understanding and democratic practice. No sector in American higher education is better situated to lead the way in advancing civic engagement and cultivating a new generation of citizens for our democracy.

This recent call to reclaim the civic mission of American higher education is marked by a special irony. The decline of civic literacy has been thoroughly documented and the summons to renewal is fully appropriate. The last 25 years, however, have been a cauldron of grass-roots activities—service-learning, public scholarship, learning communities, university/civic partnerships, community-based research—all grappling with the challenges of community engagement and democratic learning. It is because of this period of vigorous initiative and creative collaboration that we have reached what the new reports call, "a crucible moment." AASCU's work on civic issues and the new Carnegie Classification themselves are both a part of this period of creativity and civic agitation. In this report they come together and provide guidance for the future.

Introduction

In 2002, AASCU published *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place*. The report provides a "strategic, 'ground level' guide for presidents and chancellors and other campus leaders that offers a working definition of public engagement, provides exemplars of campus-wide commitment to engagement initiatives, and proposes concrete actions for institutions, public policymakers, and the association to promote an even fuller commitment to the concept of engagement" (p. 4). This pivotal report examined the important ways that many AASCU institutions were embedded in their communities and regions. The report also advocated that more AASCU institutions link their teaching, research and outreach with the daily life, plans and aspirations of the communities of which they are a part.

Over the last decade, many AASCU institutions have taken up this call and become "stewards" for their regions. In this follow-up report examining "ground-level" engagement 10 years later, we explore the nature of the commitments that some of the most involved AASCU institutions have made. We examine the 2008 and 2010 applications of the AASCU campuses that achieved the Elective Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching[1] to gather evidence of the kinds of stewards of place institutional practices occurring on AASCU campuses. In 2008, AASCU campuses accounted for just over 34 percent of all the campuses receiving the classification and in 2010, AASCU campuses made up over 28 percent all classified campuses.[2] The aim of this follow-up report is to understand existing practices as a basis for formulating recommendations for campuses to become more effective stewards of place.

In 2002, *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place* identified "public engagement" as having the essential qualities of being "place-related," "interactive," "mutually beneficial" and "integrated." The publicly engaged institution was defined as being "fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit" (p.9). The AASCU definition of public engagement is consistent with the definition used in the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification: "Community Engagement"

describes "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." (*www.classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php*) We use the terms public engagement and community engagement interchangeably in this report: both involve a process of collaboration and reciprocity and a purpose of creating partnerships of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to: enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good (see the framing of "democratic engagement" in the Saltmarsh and Hartley book, *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*).

Structure of the Report

The remainder of this report is organized to present the *Summary Analysis and Recommendations,* followed by key "areas of focus" that include key findings, examples and discussion in each area. Following the areas of focus is a section on "overall discussion and recommendations." The recommendations are designed to inform campus leaders at AASCU campuses and other engaged campuses—as well as campuses seeking the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in the future—as to way of deepening their institutional commitment to community engagement.

The analysis for this report is based on descriptive statistics of the prevalence of different practices among the AASCU community engaged campuses. We also identified examples—promising practices—from the applications without identifying individual institutions.

Summary Analysis and Recommendations

When the first *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place* report was written, the target audience was executive leadership, namely presidents, provosts and deans. We believe this new report provides important findings not only for executive leadership, but also for other administrators, faculty and students. As Kezar and Lester (2009) have observed, it is critically important to expand notions of shared governance and leadership beyond traditional leaders to consider how we can all be involved in making and remaking colleges and universities to be more engaged with their communities. Also, we see this report as relevant to those who partner with AASCU institutions, to scholars who study community engagement, and to policymakers who seek to develop structures and policies to support it.

AASCU has played a critical role in the larger community engagement movement. The American Democracy Project's civic agency initiative has created hundreds of organic, grassroots spaces for learning about community organizing and becoming engaged in local politics. Likewise, the annual gathering of presidents and provosts, and involvement with the American Commonwealth Partnership, offer important potential venues for advancing public engagement. Based on our findings, we offer the following recommendations specifically to AASCU as it strategically identifies key areas of stewards of place practices on member campuses.

- **Partnerships enacted for mutual benefit, and that honor reciprocity, are a key strategy to achieving institutional excellence and leading-edge teaching, research and professional service at AASCU institutions.**

  As mentioned in the findings section on mission, 68.5 percent of the AASCU campuses referenced their region in their mission statement and all mentioned they had integrated community engagement into some aspect of strategic planning. This is good news and reflective of a historical emphasis, as well as current commitments to community engagement and to place. However, we have two recommendations from both our reading of the entire applications

and ongoing research with faculty, administrators and leaders in the field. First, it is not only important that community engagement be placed in the mission and be central to strategic planning, it must be positioned at the center of how AASCU institutions explain their pursuit of excellence. There can be a tendency among organizational actors to proudly embrace community engagement when describing a public service aspect of the mission, but then to present more traditional research agendas, learning communities or programs when recruiting students and faculty, submitting reports for accreditation, or marketing itself more generally on websites. It is critical that campuses claim community engagement as the vehicle through which they pursue excellent teaching (e.g. service-learning) and excellent research (e.g. public engaged scholarship) and make that identity prominently visible. Second, it is important that campus leaders manage this message alongside messages about the pursuit of prestige via traditional markers such as ranking systems, national faculty awards and fellowships, external funding and reputation-based groups.

- **While AASCU institutions have taken steps to align faculty reward systems with their commitment to community engagement, there is still significant work to do in faculty recruitment, department cultures, criteria used to assess scholarship, and the promotion and tenure review process.**

The findings in this report are consistent with many studies over the last 10 years that show that most campuses are at the beginning, rather than middle, of a journey to transform academic reward systems to value and support faculty community engagement (Saltmarsh et al, 2009). Most changes that have occurred have been at the margins, rather than the center, of those processes. The same review processes and criteria used to judge community engaged scholarship today have been used for decades and they do not capture the impact and significance of the work. Reforming promotion and tenure is further complicated by the large number of non-tenure track appointments being made in those systems. Criteria for promotion and advancement and the degree to which community engagement will be supported are still contested terrain for new tenure track and non-tenure track appointments. Also, campuses often struggle to make changes despite a national higher education culture—and many disciplines—that continue to devalue public scholarship.

Academic reward systems are symbolic representations of institutional identity and aspirations. Therefore, for AASCU institutions to truly become stewards of

place, it is critical they take on this hard work, not only of policy change, but culture change. There are clearly exemplars in this work, such as University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Portland State University (Ore.). However, we see a major opportunity for AASCU institutions to do this work together, and to do so in a way that transforms not only faculty work in their institutions, but the larger prestige and recognition system in higher education more broadly.

- **Given the historical and significant commitment made by AASCU institutions to access for regional students and to improvement of local K-12 school systems, AASCU institutions should now move to develop five- and 10-year benchmarks for improvement in these areas.**

  Every AASCU institution in our sample noted clear and ongoing commitments to the local K-12 school systems where they reside, as well as to providing access to regional students via bridge programs, admissions and financial aid. These seem to us to be clear and compelling commitments for which resources are already employed, and to which there are interests from community and campus in success. What we did not see were many attempts to work collaboratively with K-12 school systems and school districts to identify five-, 10- or even 15-year benchmarks for success in meeting educational improvement and access goals. We think benchmarking some key goals for the work done in these two areas is critically important for the strengthening of the partnerships, the achievement of the goals, and the likelihood the work will be informed by community partner voice. Also, we see this as important to protect resources and avoid mission creep. As institutions attempt to become more selective in admissions, and as state funding is reduced, there can be a tendency to scale back initiatives that are not clearly defined or do not have specific end-goals. Working together to identify specific short term and long term goals for K-16 improvement, and for access for local first generation and underrepresented students, will keep these goals front and center and enhance the public accountability of the campus.

- **Campus commitments to regional economic development and resources expended to support local infrastructure and joint initiatives need to be made transparent and widely known on and off-campus.**

  AASCU institutions are making very tangible, concrete investments in local and regional schools, non-profits, parks and related infrastructure. These investments involve scarce resources and need to be made more public and transparent.

Likewise (while not in this dataset because it was not requested), the local cities and regions that surround AASCU institutions are making very real investments in infrastructure and bridge personnel that benefit the university. For each of these investments, there are stakeholders on both the university and community side who are linked together through mutual interests; we think it is important that these collaborative investments become a more visible part of both city and university planning. It is important that both sides begin to think of themselves as co-creating these university-community organizations and structures that engage in teaching, research and public service in ways that benefit the public.

Partnerships that rely on reciprocity and mutual benefit are a route to sustainable and effective economic development. Economic development is not just about hiring people, occupying or buying spaces, or purchasing goods. It is also about offering courses, services and resources that contribute to the vibrancy of the community to make it a great place to live, learn, earn and play. Some universities are collaborating closely with local and regional economic developers and civic leaders to identify needs, resources, foci and strategies for community economic development—leading to university-business-government partnerships; shared business systems, conference centers, tech transfer, business incubation, and the collection of evidence of the university's contributions. The emphasis is on developing collaborative processes and long-term relationships.

- **Universities are increasingly the place where the knowledge, skills and values of global citizenship are fostered. Also, increasingly, the communities of which AASCU campuses are a part are made up of individuals from across the globe. AASCU campuses should take the lead in developing all public engagement as global public engagement that includes intercultural learning outcomes, regardless of where the engagement takes place. Being a steward of place recognizes that the local is global and the global is local. Global engagement takes place in the neighborhoods surrounding the campus.**

The 2002 *Stewards of Place* report was perhaps somewhat defensive in identifying AASCU campuses as "place related," knowing that global education brings with it prestige and that local engagement suggests parochial concerns.

The 2002 report stated, "While the demands of the economy and society have forced institutions to be nationally and globally aware, the fact remains that state colleges and universities are inextricably linked with the communities and regions in which they are located. Exercising 'stewardship of place' does not mean limiting the institution's worldview; rather, it means pursuing that worldview in a way that has meaning to the institution's neighbors, who can be its most consistent and reliable advocates" (p.9) The data from the current study suggest that AASCU campuses should turn this inextricable linking of the local and the global into an affirmative commitment that advances global education at the same time that it advances local stewardship.

- **A campus committed to public engagement, defined by deeply collaborative and reciprocal partnerships with community-based organizations and individuals, is also committed to organizational change affecting practices, structures and policies. Steward of place campuses, because of their local commitments and responsibilities, have prioritized issues of diversity and inclusion, student success and public engagement. Steward of place campuses have the opportunity to develop practices, structures and policies that facilitate the connections between these priorities.**

  Campus leaders of AASCU campuses are taking the lead in making the connections between faculty and student diversity; inclusive pedagogical practices; diverse learning styles; interest in developing publically engaged scholarship; attracting diverse faculty and retaining them; and attracting underserved students and facilitating their persistence, retention and success. AASCU leaders are making the connections between active and collaborative teaching and learning, collaborative knowledge generation, and student success. They are also paying attention to a growing body of research indicating that for many underrepresented faculty coming into the faculty ranks, a research agenda tied to social issues and the improvement of the human condition is paramount. As a provost at one AASCU campus said to his council of deans, "If you want to take diversity seriously, you need to take engagement seriously." Increasingly, AASCU campuses are taking the lead in remaking their institutions to authentically fulfill their commitments to engagement, diversity and student success.

Areas of Focus

Much research has been conducted over the last decade to understand which aspects of institutional support need to be implemented for a college or university to truly engage with regions, cities and communities. Table I provides a synthesis of this research literature, which is reflected in the indicators of engagement in the Carnegie Classification to explain the areas we focused on in our analysis:

- Mission
- Strategic Planning
- Leadership
- Infrastructure
- Faculty Scholarship
- Faculty Development
- Faculty Recruitment and Reward Systems
- Outreach/Economic Development
- Curriculum
- Learning Outcomes
- Student Leadership

Limitations

One limitation of a study of this kind is that it relies upon a dataset that is entirely self-reported data. The kind of data provided in the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification applications can reveal what is being done, but not how it is being done or the quality of what is being done. Getting a better sense of what community engagement looks like "on the ground" would be important in further studies. One respondent to the report (see acknowledgements)—someone grounded in the work of a steward of place campus— noted, for example, that the data does not necessarily distinguish between what outcomes could be met through community engagement versus what outcomes are actually assessed and are met. Another pointed out that the evidence may indicate the valuing of integrated faculty roles, but it also could be that engagement in teaching, research and service is being done in different areas by different individuals—and all are valued. The application data does not clarify this. Another reviewer pointed out that having a process in place does not reveal how the process is implemented—i.e., "all of us have a definition, but is it used? and how? by whom? how often? toward what ends?"

TABLE 1. **Institutional Supports for Community Engagement: Review of Extant Research**

Kinds of Institutional Support	Literature Noting Importance
Emphasis of engagement in mission, vision, strategic planning documents	Axelroth and Dubb, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Driscoll, 2008; Holland, 1997; Hollander, Saltmarsh & Zlotkowski, 2001; Morton & Troppe, 1996.
Leadership from president, provosts, deans	Driscoll, 2008; Driscoll & Sandmann, 2004; Furco & Holland, 2004; Hollander, Saltmarsh & Zlotkowski, 2001; Sandmann & Plater, 2009, 2012.
Campus service-learning and community engagement centers and personnel who support faculty and students and who engage in partnership development and support	Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Furco, 2003; Furco & Holland, 2004; 2009; Holland, 1997; Hollander, Saltmarsh & Zlotkowski, 1999; Strong et al., 2009.
Integration into campus faculty roles and reward system policies such as hiring, promotion and tenure, definitions of scholarship, contract renewal, merit pay, awards	Abes et al., 2002; Furco, 2002; Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan, 2002; Holland, 1997; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Mundy, 2004; O'Meara, 2002; 2004; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Sandmann, 2009;Saltmarsh et al., 2009.
Faculty development	Austin & Beck, 2010; Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Furco, 2003; Holland, 1997; Kecskes, 2006.
Curricular commitments (integration into majors, minors, general education, service-learning transcript designation)	Butin, 2010, Holland, 1997; Bringle and Hatcher, 2009; Sandmann et al., 2009; Zlotkowski, 1999.
Promotion, marketing and making the community engagement visible	Morton & Troppe, 1996; Holland, 1997.
Institutional research and assessment (requiring reporting and assessing impacts)	Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Driscoll, 2008, Furco, 2003; Kecskes, 2012.

Mission

Key Findings

68.5 percent of the AASCU campuses referenced their region in their mission statement. These were specific references to commitment to a geographical area smaller than a state (region, neighbors, area, urban, city) and often included the local and the global.

Examples

- ". . . the university is committed to advancing the regional and global community through scholarly activities, research and public service;" "We envision engaged citizens of [X University] (students, faculty and staff) who genuinely invest in their university community and their host communities (locally, regionally, nationally and globally)."

- "[X University] seeks to respond to the needs of the region and greater metropolitan area, serve as an engine of change in the academic and socioeconomic environments of the state, and create a productive future for our students, our region, and enrich the lives and opportunities for all members of its community."

- "[The mission is to] foster interactions and partnerships with our surrounding communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region."

Discussion

There were powerful examples of mission statements that connected a commitment to community engagement to a larger purpose of higher education and to a commitment to the local area and to the region. Some examples of these statements are:

- ". . . to further the goals of a democratic society through wide participation and civic responsibility in community, social, and economic affairs."

- "Graduates are provided a foundation . . . for lives of ethical and civic responsibility to better understand global complexities and an American society of increasing diversity."

- "[X University] will bring together an increasingly diverse and talented student body, faculty, and staff to form a learning community that, along with community partners, involves its members in active learning, scholarly discourse, and reflection. Through engaged excellence [the campus] creates opportunities for students to display leadership, civic engagement, social responsibility, and effective citizenship."

The mission statements reveal some common characteristics related to community engagement, including:

- Outcomes linking student learning to engagement in the community;
- The integration of teaching, research and service connected to engagement; and
- Specific research connection to engagement.

Outcomes linking student learning to engagement in the community:

- Just over 13 percent of the mission statement responses made a specific connection between student learning outcomes and engagement in the community. This number does not include 9 percent of the responses that include the term "service-learning," signifying community-based academic courses. Examples of student learning linked to engagement are:

  - ". . . faculty and staff work actively to develop students as citizens and leaders of the community by combining classroom learning with out-of-class experiences (internships, practicum, service-learning, and related experiential opportunities.)"

  - "[The University] focuses on student-centered learning enhanced by community partnerships and . . . graduates students who are prepared to be engaged citizens in the regional and global community."

The integration of teaching, research and service connected to engagement:

- Mission statement responses in 12 percent of the cases made specific reference to the relationship of the core faculty roles to community engagement. These missions included language such as:

  - "[X University] is committed to being an outstanding, teaching-intensive, research-driven university that emphasizes student engagement, scholarly and creative achievement, civic participation, and global perspectives."

- "The University is committed to academic excellence and community partnerships through curriculum, teaching, scholarship, and services."

- "The [College] unites excellence in teaching, scholarship, civic engagement, and stewardship to create a student-centered learning community."

Specific research connection to engagement:

- In 12 percent if the responses, the mission statement specifically references the connection between research and engagement. Examples of this connection included:

  - "We engage in collaborative activities . . . to generate, disseminate, integrate, and apply knowledge."

  - "We conduct wide-ranging, collaborative research to meet society's needs and engage in service projects and partnerships to enhance the university and community's social, economic and intellectual life."

Strategic Planning

Key Findings

Every application checked the "yes" in the framework and provided evidence affirming that community engagement is part of their strategic planning. In almost every case, community engagement was specifically and concretely articulated, encompassing multiple dimensions of the institution.

Examples

There is strong evidence that being an institutional steward of place shapes the strategic priorities of the AASCU campuses. There is also evidence of a framing of engagement with community that was reciprocal and mutually beneficial, valuing the assets that the community brings to the partnerships.

Aligning as a Steward of Place:

- "The Strategic Plan, entitled 'Moving Forward Together,' makes very explicit the importance of community engagement and stewardship of place . . ." Enhance [the campus'] sense of stewardship of place by increasing its commitment to [the region]."

- "This Design Principle highlights a legacy of community service and engagement between university and community [as is] designed to develop our local communities, regions and state. The emerging global economy broadens our definition of community to include the world, and The University of [X] is committed to engagement as citizens of our school community, our local community and the world community. The University of [X] will be known for this commitment to engagement at all levels and for transcending the artificial barriers that separate and isolate."

Reciprocity and Collaboration:

- "Provide opportunities to learn from external communities through internships, cooperative education, and other field activities . . . Promote collaborative and innovative exchanges . . . to . . . enhance opportunities for all learners . . . Develop mutually beneficial working partnerships with public and private sectors; Develop community-centered programs . . ."

- "The university is committed to direct, two-way interaction with area communities and other external constituencies—regional, national and global—through the creation, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit."

- Evidence of reciprocity and collaboration was also apparent in examples of community advisory boards and collaborative planning between campuses and community partners. Some of the responses to the Carnegie framework address joint planning processes. Some examples include:

  - ". . . community input was solicited as part of the strategic planning process through a Community Connections Forum and through invited community participation in a follow-up forum, Shaping Our Future Together."

  - "[The campus'] most recent strategic planning effort began with Campus and Community Dialogue sessions in fall 2007. Eleven sessions in [the city] and across the [region] with more than 350 participants that included students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community leaders, the [campus] community, in a pre-strategic planning organization development process, identified the strengths of the university and the aspirations of its people. Participants were encouraged to turn their focus to their hopes and dreams for the immediate future."

- "A nine-member Outreach and Engagement Task Force is integrally part of efforts to develop the new 2011-2016 strategic plan. Four town hall meetings are being planned to solicit community feedback throughout the year-long planning process.

- "In the strategic planning process . . . faculty and staff members, along with local community members and state representatives, worked cooperatively and candidly to create a visionary affirmation of mission."

Discussion

Four strategic priorities emerged in the Carnegie data:

- Economic development;
- Connecting local engagement to global engagement;
- Commitment to K-12 schools; and
- Connecting community engagement to student retention and success

Economic Development:

- 35.8 percent of the responses identified economic development as a priority of community engagement. Economic development includes a range of activities: (1) workforce readiness; (2) hiring and procurement; (3) local investments; (4) preparing future entrepreneurs; (5) assisting current small businesses, nonprofits and entrepreneurs; (6) tech transfer; and (7) business and research incubators. A sample response is:

  - "The fourth of five strategic directions in the Strategic Plan . . . reads, 'Economy and Quality of Life: Be a leader strengthening the economy of the [region] and enhancing the quality of life for its citizens . . . establish and maintain collaborations and alliances among academic institutions . . . economic development agencies, and industry; promote and support entrepreneurial activities . . .; facilitate the transfer of products of research, innovation, and other academic endeavors to business and industry . . .'"

Connecting Local Engagement and Global Engagement:

- Of all the applications analyzed, 23.8 percent identified a strategic priority of making international engagement and partnerships a compliment to the local strategic engagement activity. An example of how this was expressed is:

- "Goal 10 is to 'Internationalize/Globalize the academic culture and environment,' which includes the strategies to 'Develop partnerships with local, national, and international communities, businesses, and government leaders for the delivery of academic offerings . . . '"

Commitment to K-12 Schools:

- 15 percent of the responses specifically identified a strategic commitment to the local K-12 schools as a strategic priority. A sample response included:

  - "Strategies include involving the community to assess regional needs and opportunities for partnerships, collaborating with K-12 schools to increase college attendance, and establishing avenues for community stakeholders to become involved in [the campus'] community engagement work.

Connecting Community Engagement to Student Retention and Success:

- 12 percent of the responses specifically identified the retention and success of undergraduates as a dimension of their community engagement strategy. This commitment was expressed in a number of ways, including:

  - "Essential to 'Student Access & Success' is [the campus'] commitment to incorporate service-learning into degree programs through the CSLL; and support existing and new clubs/organizations that foster service-learning and civic engagement."

Leadership

Key Findings

74.6 percent of the applications indicate that the president of the campus is explicitly promoting community engagement on campus, followed by the provost/chief academic officer at 55.2 percent. 8.9 percent of the campuses identified the vice president for student affairs, and 4.4 percent identified positions such as vice president for economic development, public relations, or community affairs as promoting community engagement. Attending social events was identified most frequently (40.1 percent) a as way that the executive leadership promoted community engagement, followed by presentations to the legislature at 17.8 percent. Serving on local, regional and state boards of directors (31.5 percent)

and allocating financial resources (15.7 percent) are the two of the most prevalent actions by executive leadership expressing engagement.

Examples

- "President utilizes a variety of media to connect to the community. [X University] produces a cable television program, hosted by president. In this innovative program, president engages community leaders, elected officials, faculty members and students in a conversational dialogue about issues of community interest. This 30-minute program airs on local cable. In addition, the president and provost make presentations designed to foster community engagement at [X] City Council meetings and to area service organizations."

- "Each fall, to emphasize the importance of engagement, the provost, members of the provost's staff and the vice chancellor for public service accompany new faculty members on a one- or two-day tour of their region, stopping at sites where the institution maintains a significant outreach presence to hear from veteran faculty about their scholarly engagement activities."

- "In order to demonstrate the importance of community engagement, the chancellor regularly conducts regional listening tours on which he promotes the institution's engagement with the community, has moved a regional economic development institute to his office and hired a special assistant to run it."

- "While many of these [community engagement] programs began on grant funding, the university saw the positive effect they had on [X University] students and the local community, and when grant-funding ended, [campus] leaders made the commitment to sustain them."

Discussion

The documentation indicated that leadership matters in two main ways:
Being the institutional public advocate for community engagement; and
Committing personal and institutional time and resources to community engagement.

Leading Through Public Advocacy:

- Examination of the applications found that the executive leadership for community engagement manifested itself primarily through the effort of the leaders being publically visible and vocal about their advocacy for engagement. The executive leaders speak about community engagement to constituents on and off campus at various occasions. Typical statement might include: "Institutions of higher education have been challenged to be more responsive to the economic needs of the region, state and nation, with the corresponding charge that we need to change in some fundamental ways to meet these needs" or "We change the lives of those in our communities by asking the right questions and expecting much better from our society. . . . We're not just building a city with a university in it, we're building a university-city."

- Also, the executive leaders frequently write about community engagement using various venues such as the campus newspaper, alumni magazine, and professional and institutional Web pages. An example of a president's statement in the university's magazine was: "We are proud that our university is a major partner in helping protect and serve the people in our communities. During these exciting times, we need to continue to have our shoulders to the wheel, producing graduates who are well-trained and ready to assume jobs in every area of human endeavor. The university will seek additional collaborative partnerships with school systems, municipalities, government agencies and private firms—conducting scientific research to prepare students for rewarding careers."

Leading Through Personal and Institutional Commitment:

- In some cases, as leaders advance in their careers, their personal commitments to community engagement persisted and grew, or reinforced the institutional commitment where they set "the tone and provide the fabric for each unit of the campus to create the tapestry of community engagement across the curriculum, which has become [X University's] way of life." The data also reveal that the executive leaders serve on various local community engagement related committees and boards; provide space; "create policies and procedures that support the growth of service; and garner financial resources that sustain service programs." One particular investment frequently noted and provided as evidence of institutional commitment, was joining and sustaining the institution's membership in national organizations, such as Campus Compact.

Infrastructure

Key Findings

100 percent of the applications indicate that they have some kind of coordinating infrastructure for community engagement. 43.3 percent of the institutions have a single coordinating unit, followed by 28.4 percent that have multiple coordinating units on campus. The yearly data (2008 compared to 2010) reveal that the number of institutions with single coordinating units dropped from 24 to five, while the campuses with multiple units increased from three to 16. 100 percent of the applications indicate that they have internal, core operational budgets for community engagement.

Examples

- Single coordinating unit: "[X Center] was founded in 1999 as a campus-wide initiative to build and advance partnerships in [X and X] Counties. The office advances community-based programs by supporting faculty in developing community-based teaching that integrates academic theory with community service, facilitating faculty research that directly addresses local problems, and coordinating civic engagement experiences."

- Multiple coordinating units: "Two centers/offices exist for the purpose of supporting and advancing community engagement: [X] and [Y]. [X] is funded through Academic Affairs, and [Y] is funded through the President's Office."

Discussion

AACSU institutions are structuring themselves to lead, coordinate, deliver and fund community engagement, though they are doing it differently and are usually driven by the size of the college or university.

Organizational Structures to Support Engagement:

- Our analysis found that the majority of the institutions have or moved towards centralized infrastructure for the promotion and coordination of community engagement. Specifically, two main infrastructure types are currently evident in AASCU institutions: (1) Single coordinating units where one predominant entity is responsible for campus-wide coordination of community engagement, including but not limited to service-learning, applied research, volunteerism and partnerships. (2) Multiple coordinating units where two or three parallel entities align with the three divisions:

academic affairs, public or government relations or institutional advancement. Each entity is a centralized body that coordinates engagement within the respective division.

Resource Development is Pervasive for Community Engagement:

- In terms of funding, it was found that all institutions have located permanent operational money for community engagement units (offices and/or centers). State allocations are the main source. There are also resources brought in through fundraising and grants—from partnerships, contracts and grants with federal, state and local governments, along with private foundations, corporations, organizations and private individual donors. Fundraising for community engagement is core to all the institutions: "All program fund-raising is directed at community engagement as one of the core principles on which the university is built." Several entities have played major roles in fundraising. The advancement office or office of development, "secures non-appropriated resources from: individuals, corporations, foundations, governmental agencies;" foundation and student organizations who "are immersed in various community projects" "throughout the year with events;" campaigns; drives; and other initiatives. Other fundraising arms include community engagement centers and units, as well as individual faculty and staff. For instance, "Faculty and staff contributions are earmarked to foster community engagement in the form of student scholarships."

Faculty Scholarship

Key Findings

100 percent of the applications indicated journal article publications and conference presentations in both the faculty scholarship associated with curricular engagement achievement and outreach and partnership activities. Engaged scholarship is evident across disciplines: A variety of fields in natural sciences, social sciences and liberal arts reported faculty scholarship associated with curricular engagement achievement, as well as outreach and partnership activities. Education is the leading field for both types of faculty scholarship.

Examples

- "Dr. [X] in Earth and Atmospheric Department spent time in . . . filming 'X,' a movie which has been picked up by the Discovery Channel." (Scholarship associated with curriculum.)

- "Arts Management: [X] (2008), with the help of students, conducted focus groups within the community and developed a Cultural Plan for [X] County." (Scholarship associated with outreach and partnership activities.)

- "Dr. [X] (Social Institutions) led a total of 213 students who participated in the service-learning micro-lending project (70 fall semester, 112 spring, 31 summer). Students raised money through various projects and donated the funds to small entrepreneurs." (Scholarship associated with curriculum.)

- "As part of ongoing efforts to make primary archaeological information and data available to professionals and the interested public, the Archaeological Survey maintains an extensive online library of PDF versions of its reports for public dissemination." (Scholarship associated with outreach and partnership activities.)

Discussion

Faculty members are involved in scholarly work associated with community engagement, resulting in a wide variety of scholarly products across disciplines and fields addressing curricular, outreach and partnership venues, usually featuring student involvement.

Engaged Scholarly Products are Diverse:

- Our examination of all the application responses indicated that there is no clear distinction between the products/artifacts of scholarship associated with curricular engagement and with outreach and partnership activities. Conference presentations and journal publication are the two primary forms of faculty scholarship of community engagement. Second-tier types of scholarship were books, book chapters, action research studies and reports (technical, research). There were not many policy reports. For certain disciplines, such as art or performance, the engaged scholarship took forms of performance, exhibition and other artistic products. "[X University] values performance and artistry as forms of scholarship. Replacing the retiring [X] Quartet . . ., the [Y] immediately conquered audiences in [X city] and [Y city]. Donor contributions endow faculty

positions for the members, who teach [X University] students and work with regional musicians while maintaining an international performance schedule. Other forms of faculty scholarship included workshop; editorial; training program; curriculum/course design; video; manual/guide/workbook/pamphlet; newsletter; online showcase; and media-appearance/recognition.

Faculty Development

Key Findings

61.2 percent of the campuses indicate targeted on-campus workshops and conferences for faculty, with 26.9 percent indicating the presence of "diverted" programs (what we refer to as "diverted" are programs for faculty development that are not solely focused on community engagement but devote some of their resources and activity to assisting faculty with community engaged teaching and research). 37.3 percent have targeted funds for faculty travel to attend and/or present their community-based research and engagement activities at conferences (14.9 percent diverted). Faculty learning and development opportunities include 28.4 percent offering targeted service-learning and community engagement outside speakers; 23.9 percent of campuses offering targeted faculty seminars, brown-bags and other short-term seminars; and 11.9 percent providing targeted year-long learning communities for faculty. Only 7.5 percent of campuses identified presence of a targeted service-learning library and similar resources. In terms of Human Resource Assistance and Project Support, the highest categories are funding for community projects (rather than courses); staff that provide faculty support in designing and assessing courses; and funding for staff development (each 13.4 percent targeted). 34.3 percent of campuses offer targeted funding for course/curriculum development.

Examples

- "Other support for professional development includes forums organized by our Office of Service-Learning: 'Shop Talks,' scheduled regularly during each semester as an opportunity for faculty, staff, community members, and students to discuss their service-learning experiences and learn from one another, and end-of-the-year 'Reflections on Civic Engagement.' In the spring of 2008, we held a series of Book Chats based on the recent book, *Educating for Democracy,* by Anne Colby, Thomas Ehrlich, et al."

- **"The Center for Instructional Excellence supports university programs that provide professional development support for community engagement. Each newly selected group of Service-Learning Faculty Fellows is required to create and facilitate three service-learning workshops for campus instructors."**

Discussion

A number of campuses provided on-campus faculty development workshops and seminars (61.2 percent targeted; 26.9 percent diverted) to assist with creation and/or modifications of courses, improving pedagogy, and opening up space to discuss their teaching and scholarship with colleagues across disciplines.

"The ACT Faculty Fellows Program is a year-long program designed to improve the pedagogy of faculty with some experience with service-learning. Faculty members must apply to the program, and if selected they attend nine Service-Learning Workshops; create at least one new service-learning course and/or adapt an existing course to include service-learning within one year of completing the program; prepare a presentation to their department regarding what they gained from the program; and are encouraged to attend [X State] Campus Compact's Annual Service-Learning Institute. Plans are currently in place to create a similar fellows program for faculty interested in improving their pedagogical use of community-based research."

"The Center for Civic Engagement has developed a number of programs designed to support faculty who engage with the community. These programs include the CCE Course Development Grant Program (provides funds to faculty to develop a new citizen scholar course—to date 24 grants have been awarded; the Lead-Learn-Serve Program will award an additional 21 faculty grants in the next 2 years); a Faculty Development Workshop Series (these workshops have included Curriculum Integration Workshops, workshops on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, and roundtable discussions with USFSP faculty who have been awarded the course development grants ('Insights into a Civically Engaged Classroom')."

Faculty clearly act as mentors to their colleagues in course development and document various types of engagement scholarship, but they are doing so with some compensation but rarely a full course release. Some veteran service-learning faculty are voluntarily taking on this role.

"[X Center] Faculty Fellows are awarded one course release per year to serve as liaisons between the Center and their respective colleges. They serve as resources to other faculty members, conduct research on service-learning and/or implement service-learning projects."

"The Service-Learning Advisory Committee, a faculty senate committee, provides professional development support to faculty, staff, community partners and students through one-on-one consultation services, mentorship, resources and Web materials. The advisory committee is also actively engaged in the recognition of service-learning and community engagement."

Institutions indicated that faculty and staff colleagues—though often faculty—assist other faculty with incorporating their engaged scholarship (whether it be teaching, research or service) in portfolios for promotion and tenure.

"A 'Faculty-in-Residence' who has extensive expertise in community-engaged scholarship is available through [X Department] to provide assistance on how to document such scholarship."

"For the past eight years, .25 FTE release time has been assigned in both fall and spring semesters for a faculty member (designated the Service-Learning Faculty Associate), which allows that person to enhance his or her SL knowledge and skills and contribute to the SL activities at [the campus]."

Funding for course design and projects is mentioned as an important resource. Additionally, funding and faculty professional development for community-based and similar research projects was mentioned numerous times in addition to (and sometimes rather than) community engaged teaching.

"Competitive service-learning mini-grants are awarded to faculty proposing to integrate service-learning into existing curriculum; 10 mini-grants were awarded in 2007-08. The [X] Center offers mini-grants to faculty wishing to partner with nonprofit organizations on research for or about the nonprofit sector. Since 1999, [X Center] has provided more than $200,000 in support of such activity."

"The Center for Civic Engagement budget includes $8,000 for staff members to attend national and regional conferences, workshops, seminars and/or other professional development opportunities."

Faculty Recruitment and Reward Systems

Key Findings

40.3 percent of applications indicate that specific department recruitment ads speak of having a community engagement mission (17.9 percent general campus recruitment ads), and 37.3 percent of campuses have department-specific faculty job descriptions that include community engagement (6 percent report all faculty job descriptions include community engagement). 47.8 percent of applicants indicate that individual departments on campus recognize community engagement in promotion and tenure (P&T) policies. In terms of promotion and tenure, 23.9 percent indicate reformed P&T policies to redefine community engagement as a scholarly activity, and 22.4 percent have revised P&T guidelines to note the importance of community engagement in faculty roles overall.

Examples

- **Recruitment:** On the provost's faculty recruiting web page, [X University] intentionally seeks faculty who are committed to its mission. "Through an ambitious eight-year planning process, a thorough study of programs, and attractive retirement incentives, [X University] is now embarking upon a major reallocation of faculty positions to better accomplish its mission. The university seeks faculty who are committed to the concept of citizen-scholar, and who embrace the challenge and opportunities for higher education in the 21st century."

  "Because of the direction to 'promote community engagement and development,' faculty are being sought who have had experience with 'service-learning and experiential learning opportunities, international experiences and leadership programs;' thus, new faculty members come with the expectation to engage the community and are reassured by the infrastructure that assists them."

- **Reward System:** "In January 2008, [X University]'s president and provost presented the revised '[X University] Faculty Roles and Rewards: Teaching,

> Research, Service Redefined,' which describes the institution's alignment with Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered, where four areas of scholarship are defined, including Scholarship of Application. Scholarship of Application at [X University] 'applies to works that link the scholarship of a discipline to the values and mission of the academy and the greater needs of society.' The scholarship of application addresses the question, 'How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?' Such scholarship might include technical assistance, policy analysis, consultation, program evaluation and the like. These scholarly activities are encouraged to increase the visibility of the university scholar's application to the community."

Discussion

Those institutions that reformed either their P&T policies and/or their faculty roles overall to emphasize community engagement did so in a sweeping manner, with support, documentation and guidance coming through the provost and/or other areas of leadership.

"Personnel decisions, including promotion and tenure, are based on two broad sets of criteria: the five criteria set by [X University] board of trustees as they are interpreted by the provost at [the University], and the goals set annually by the provost. Both sets are distributed in written form and discussed orally with the deans. Teaching is one of the five board of trustees criteria and is described on the provost's website as 'the primary responsibility of faculty members at [X University].' Valued in the description of effective teaching is 'the incorporation of service-learning or practical projects' and 'mentoring [students] in internships or service-learning.' Scholarly ability, a second criterion, includes many kinds of scholarship, but 'the scholarship of teaching' is singled out as 'very appropriate.' Thus, scholarship based on community-based pedagogies is not only rewarded, but encouraged. A third criterion, university service, includes 'contributions to our community and region,' an element of service that has been emphasized to the deans for several years. Faculty are also encouraged to advance the college's annual academic goals set by the provost. Those goals, drawn from our strategic plan, include 'Engagement,' which means to 'create an intellectual and experiential understanding of civic engagement;' 'broaden the college's service mission to include stronger interaction, dialogue, communication, societal and economic benefit and mutual concern for the local community, region and state;' and 'develop an in-depth understanding of the occurrence, observance, response and

recovery of global emergencies to better prepare graduates as responsible global citizens.' This year faculty were asked, in furtherance of this goal, to 'collaborate with others in [X City] and [X Area] on projects to expand community sustainability efforts; to strengthen schools, organizations and agencies; and to enhance the quality of life in our area.' Faculty must report on progress toward annual goals."

Many institutions indicate that publications and presentations about community engagement that were peer reviewed, presented at recognized professional conferences, etc., are considered the same as "typical" scholarly work and do not receive differential treatment in tenure and promotion cases (or different categorization in written policies).

"Community engaged scholarship is classified no differently than other scholarship. The research could be within the individual's field and peer-reviewed or considered pedagogical research and [published in a] peer-reviewed journal. The key is that the work is peer-reviewed and within the individual's area of expertise."

"Promotion and tenure policies and practices (i.e. mentoring) encourage faculty to incorporate community engagement in their classroom teaching and research and submit their findings in papers and presentations for refereed journals and conference proceedings. As such, engaged scholarship 'counts' as scholarly activity that results in a refereed presentation or publication to show dissemination and peer review. We also value faculty engagement contributions in the category of service."

"The [X University] Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (ARTP) policy requires that faculty meet competencies in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, contributions to the community, and contributions to the institution. The ARTP policy encourages the scholarship of community engagement, which is described as scholarship that is 'directed to issues of public concern.' The policy document gives examples of evidence that 'counts' for Scholarly or Creative Achievements. Examples of approved evidence include 'research pertaining to assessment of the results of student efforts to learn or research directed to issues of public concern,' 'an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress, for example . . . work directed to issues of public concern,' and 'creative activity culminating in innovative programs, service-learning experiences or policy proposals, programs or materials pertaining to issues of

public concern.' Individual academic departments are responsible to further detail these four areas to best address their respective disciplines and constituents, and several specifically identify scholarship related to community engagement as valued forms of scholarship that 'count' in the ARTP process."

Quite a few institutions indicated that community engagement falls primarily under "service" in P&T, though that was given varying degrees of weight per institution.

"The most common classification for community-engaged scholarship is service. However, faculty are being encouraged to also consider this service as scholarship of application. Some departments currently classify community engagement as such. For instance, the Department of Anthropology, Sociology & Social Work views scholarship of application as useful as theory building and other kinds of scholarship. The Department of Communication is revising its P&T document to include research growing out of community-related projects in the scholarship category. Foreign Languages & Humanities also recognizes that community engagement activities may occasionally overlap with teaching as well as scholarship."

A number of institutions mentioned proposed P&T policy revisions currently in progress, some fully integrated into the institution's policies and others by department.

"While current P&T policies allow for community engagement scholarship, several departments are revising their documents to tighten definitions and provide more specific examples of possible evidence. The Department of Political Science and several engineering departments, for example, have recently revised their P&T criteria to be more explicit about including engagement scholarship."

"In 2007, the Research Environment Committee and Faculty Senate jointly sponsored a revision to the Faculty Handbook related to adding the 'Scholarship of Engagement' to existing interpretations of scholarly activity. During the 2008-2009 academic year, departments will be operationalizing the meaning of 'Scholarship of Engagement' in department criteria. Even before this bold move, many departments had contributions in this area. This official move, generated at the 'grassroots' level, assured a common ground for evaluating scholarship."

The scholarship of application, as well as applied research, were mentioned most frequently when referring to how community engagement is written into policies.

"[X University] defines community-engaged scholarship in two ways. First, the implementation of community engagement is service. Second, the research and publication about community engagement is considered the scholarship of application. In the revision of the promotion and tenure guidelines over the last two years, faculty have included mechanisms for recognizing and rewarding community engagement as an important activity for faculty."

"Community engagement is reported most frequently in service and scholarship. Faculty seeking tenure or promotion are encouraged to describe their professionally-related service in the community in their dossier—either as service or as scholarship of application."

Outreach/Economic Development

Key Findings

98.5 percent of campuses reported the presence of education/K-12 community partnerships. The majority of campuses (76.1 percent) cited that they freely share cultural opportunities and the use of various campus facilities with members of the community, as well as support community and economic development through programs and practices on and off campus (71.6 percent). 65.7 percent of campuses reported a commitment to underserved populations, specifically focusing on access and creating opportunities for first-generation students and minority groups in the local region. 22.4 percent of campuses were involved in sustainability/environmental initiatives, as well as contributions to public safety.

Examples

- **"The Public Service Media Study Group, launched with funding from the National Science Foundation, is composed of faculty, graduate students, community members, and [X University] public broadcasting professionals. The group provides a forum for interchange and exploration of issues faced by public media and higher education as both reexamine a shared commitment to public engagement. Working in partnership with [X University Broadcasting], the group produces a series of televised Common Ground Lobby Talks, which bring together the academy, the community, and the**

power of public media to provide a forum for nuanced discussions of public issues."

- "[X University's] facility, located in downtown [X City] and within walking distance of our main campus, is the physical and symbolic manifestation of the college's commitment to its outreach and partnership programs in the [city] community (and it institutionalizes the college's commitments to the community that extend from its two HUD grants). The college rents two floors of a building that was remodeled to our specifications. The first floor contains community meeting space; a community art gallery; three offices that house our Community Outreach Partnership Office; a Center for Economic Education; and the [X City] Downtown Partnership (a community economic development organization for which the college funds office space). The second floor consists of two state-of-the art and technologically equipped classrooms that are used for college classes (especially those that target a non-traditional student population, such as graduate courses) and for community programs. The facility is designed to function as both an outreach and a partnership center."

Discussion

Out of the 67 applications reviewed, all but one institution (98.5 percent) mention K-12 partnerships including tutoring, mentoring, child development centers, evaluation and research programs, and professional training (e.g., CEUs).

"Many courses and clubs offer opportunities for students to tutor in schools and community centers, many with a focus on tutoring low income, diverse K-12 students, such as the 65th Street Corridor Project (Departments of Ethnic Studies and Psychology)."

"The Center is also the home of the Southwest [X State] Education Consortium's Regional Education Service Center that currently helps more than 24 school districts in 18 counties meet the professional development needs of their teachers, teaching assistants and administrators."

Additionally, many institutions report a focus on STEM programs and partnerships focused on K-12.

"DesignLab is a K-12 science and engineering training program for students and teachers offered by [X University]'s Future Engineers Center."

"The College of Education collaborates with SRI International on Digital Mathematics: [X dean] serves as the principal investigator on this project funded by the Helios Foundation and the Pinellas School Foundation. The project is designed to increase student achievement on state mathematics standards for grades 6-8. "

Many institutions report having strong partnerships and programs that benefit underserved populations, especially youth.

"Upward Bound program is offered to first-generation and/or economically disadvantaged high school students and provides instruction in reading, writing, study skills and other subjects necessary for success in education beyond high school. Students receive academic, financial and personal counseling, exposure to academic programs and cultural events, and tutorial services."

"The Access & Opportunity Center is a partnership between [X University-applicant], [X Institution-partner] and a local school district. The program is aimed at increasing participation in rigorous college preparatory course work in grades 8-12, improving high school graduation rates, and increasing post-secondary participation among underrepresented students."

One of the most reported forms of outreach is extension education programs, which range from online and distance degrees to non-credit and no-charge personal interest classes (e.g., ceramics, aerobics, etc.).

"Extended Learning runs training programs, non-credit courses, certificate programs and professional development for businesses, nonprofit groups, government agencies and individuals on-site as well as at two off-site learning centers—the Phoenix Center, located in [X City, State], and the Metro Center in [X City]. Examples include a Leadership and Management certificate program offered in conjunction with the American Management Association, and a contract dating from 1995 with the [X County] Department of Social Services to offer staff development in leadership and computer skills. Extended Learning also runs an extension program in [X City, State] to help military members and their families work toward degrees."

"The [X University] Community School of the Arts offers non-credit instruction in the arts to students of all ages without audition or formal application. Classes in Arabic language are provided as non-credit courses by the [X University] Middle Eastern Studies Program as a service to the community."

Workforce development is an important aspect of outreach at many campuses, with many of the 71.6 percent of campuses who report community and economic development initiatives citing it as a primary focus. Small business development was also part of many university outreach initiatives.

"[X Department] is host to a regional office of the [X University] Technical Assistance Program (TAP). This statewide initiative has the mission of advancing [X State's] economic prosperity, health and quality of life, and provides 'technical assistance to business and industry.' The TAP Senior Account Manager, housed at [X Department], works closely with CEDaR and the Office of Engagement to collaborate with the surrounding communities on issues of business and economic development."

"The Small Business Development Center (SBDC) was established to deliver quality, in-depth, one-on-one business consulting and training to small businesses located in the [X City] region while providing consulting opportunities for students. During 2009-2010, the SBDC provided 3,134 hours of small business consulting to 351 small business clients. [X University] partnered with the [X City] Workforce Center to provide workshops and training."

"[X State] Family Business Center provides high-level support for family businesses, including speakers, forums and affinity groups (e.g. succeeding generation members). The [X State] Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership's 10-month leadership program offers experiential learning to business owners and organization decision makers to improve management abilities and profitability of firms while building new business relationships."

"In partnership with the [X State] Economic Development Corporation, [X University] develops and administers Economic Development Job Training grants. Workforce Development coordinates with regional companies, schools and agencies to meet the U.P. workforce needs. Often delivered onsite in 12 counties, last year 1,344 individuals enrolled in 221 courses."

A number of institutions also reported providing programs aimed at senior citizens in the community. These ranged from non-credit courses and activities to allowing seniors to take classes toward a degree free of charge as long as admissions standards were met.

"Extended Education operates OSHER Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) and Open University. OLLI brings college learning to area seniors (50 or older). Short courses are offered by university faculty, as well as by qualified members of the senior community."

"The Learning is Forever (LIFE) program is another non-credit opportunity, which is affiliated with the Elderhostel Institute Network. LIFE is dedicated to providing high-quality, low-cost adult-education experiences on topics such as photography, Shakespeare and scrapbooking, and sponsors trips to theater productions and exhibits."

"[X County] residents age 60 and over may attend [X University] 'tuition free' as long as space is available and they meet admission requirements."

Curriculum

Key Findings

95.3 percent of campuses report that community engagement is integrated into student research. Most campuses (98.6 percent) report community engagement being integrated into internships and/or co-op experiences. 88.3 percent of campuses report that it is part of their study abroad experiences.

Some examples of community engagement curriculum adoptions were in the following areas:

- The integration of community engagement as a requirement for graduation;
- The integration of community engagement as part of First-Year Experiences;
- The adoption of community engagement in General Education goals and outcomes; and
- Plans for service-learning course designation, a community engagement minor and certificate program, and a minor in leadership.

Examples

The evidence in the applications noted institution-wide curriculum adoptions in the following examples:

- The addition of service-learning to required courses and honors courses; the integration of CE as a requirement for graduation (one campus); the integration of CE as part of capstone courses and First-Year Experiences; the adoption of CE in General Education goals, strategic planning, outcomes (almost half); and the integration of CE as part of orientation training.

- Mentioned less frequently were service-learning course designation, criteria development and definition, plans for service-learning course designation, a CE minor and certificate program, a minor in leadership, and student recognition of CE on transcripts and certificates.

- One applicant noted plans for the assessment of service-learning influence on transfer and retention.

The evidence in the applications noted the following curriculum-related activities:

- Most frequently cited were internships, clinical placements and practica; next was study or travel abroad and exchange program opportunities and research assistantships.

Discussion

Curricular engagement was widely reported in the applications, with 100 percent indicating they had a definition and a process for identifying service-learning courses. About 95 percent reported having mechanisms for assessing the impact of engagement on students, while only about half reported noting community engagement on transcripts. Over 90 percent reported that community engagement was integrated into the wide range of student activities, with the exception of study abroad being a little lower.

Learning Outcomes

Key Findings

The overwhelming majority of campuses (93 percent) reported that they had institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with the community, and all but one reported departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement. Of the student goals and learning outcomes noted, the following categories appeared in order of frequency, ranging from 34 percent to 14 percent:

- Civic Engagement: 2008:10; 2010:14
- Respond to Community Needs: 2008:8; 2010:6
- Diversity & Inclusion: 2008:7; 2010:6
- Group Skills: 2008:10; 2010:3
- Application: 2008:3; 2010:7

95.6 percent of campuses indicate that they measure the impact of community engagement on students (including courses and co-curricular programs).

Examples

- Responsible citizenry, demonstrate how citizenship works, greater sense of responsibility for civic matters and community engagement.
- Passion for contribution or making a difference, willingness to serve.
- Role of civic values in a diverse democracy.
- Take informed action individually as a citizen; demonstrate a commitment to civic responsibility.
- Identify the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society, contributing their knowledge and experiences to their own community and the broader society.
- Develop public stance/attitudes toward serving or make a significant difference in the communities.
- Identify community needs, analyze issues and understand how organizations handle social issues.

- Study a problem or conduct an analysis addressing policy issues.
- Understanding the needs of the community they serve/understand and analyze issues/advocacy.

Discussion

There was much variance in all of the application data related to learning outcomes; this is reflective of differing constructions of learning outcomes—some that are grounded in taxonomies of learning, and others that define what students will do/accomplish. In what might be regarded as a surrogate measure or context for outcomes, several campuses mentioned the existence of majors requiring service-learning; one institution reported that 88 percent of its majors have civic engagement learning outcomes; another mentioned that 41 percent required service-learning. Another citation was that two-thirds of all capstone courses included CE.

Civic engagement, as noted above, was the most frequently cited learning outcome. It was variously defined as: responsible citizenry; greater sense of responsibility for civic matters; community engagement; passion for contribution; make a difference; willingness to serve; and understanding role of civic values in a diverse democracy. The main conclusion from these data is the widespread use of civic engagement as a learning outcome, but a very diffuse and differentiated variety of how that is defined and implemented.

Student Leadership

Key Findings

100 percent of campuses report students having a leadership role in community engagement. The vast majority of campuses (95.5 percent) indicate that student leadership is included in a student leadership curriculum. 50.8 percent of campuses note community engagement on student transcripts.

Examples

Leadership Course Offerings and Internships, including:

Leadership Challenge Project, where students were charged with developing their own projects in response to identified needs and a 3-day leadership retreat for incoming first year students to assess themselves, understand a social change model and develop group and project skills.

Students in Community Engagement received leadership training and a budget to develop their own projects.

Leadership training in honors courses.

An Emerging Leaders Living Learning Community.

Leadership Projects included:
Centennial Leaders Project, Emerging Leaders and Public Affairs Distinction all at one institution, where students are part of the planning, implementation and assessment.

Peer Council and Student Senate, where students led CE planning and implementation.

Leadership Institute, where students were working with the American Democracy Project.

Civic Place Project, where students were appointed to lead CE work.

Students for Free Enterprise, where students defined and developed their own projects.

Student Partnership Projects, including:
A community center run in collaboration with community partners, where students run entrepreneurial ventures.

A partnership between a student government association and local city.

A partnership between a student government association and the local mayor, where communication, co-planning and the student hosting of a community forum enabled the CE projects.

Students who are on staff at a CE center.

Planning and implementing CE projects and both undergraduate and graduate student research presentations at conferences.

An intentional "culture of leadership;" one institution reported the assessment of leadership development outcomes.

Discussion

In both years, 100 percent of the applicants answered "Yes" to the question, "Do students have a leadership role in community engagement?" As the examples indicate, there were no clear patterns, and the examples given were very diverse and often mentioned by one or a few campuses. In some cases, regular student leadership activities—such as Greek organizations, athletic teams and student government—were listed as relevant to student leadership in community engagement. The evidence in the applications raised questions of who became leaders. It was noted that in one project, students were appointed as leaders and there were references to Honors College students versus students in general. A few applicants noted that community engagement was greater for first year students versus seniors, and that they had set goals for changing this. Much of the evidence was often noted as engaging smaller numbers of students (i.e. 50).

Student leadership roles included: students on advisory boards; planning; recruitment of volunteers; coordination; data collection; assessing community engagement activities; fundraising (the most prominent role in 2010 applications); and coordination (the most prominent role in 2008 applications). Some applicants noted clear connections between leadership and service. Among applications from both years, this was most often noted as students influencing what community engagement looks like on their campuses.

Conclusion

by R. Eugene Rice
Senior Scholar, AAC&U

AASCU institutions have a very special niche in American higher education and the responses of those applying for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification demonstrate that there is emerging a very different way of thinking about academic excellence—a different vision. In the history of American higher education there are only two comprehensive visions of academic excellence that have been fully institutionalized and, over time, have come to dominate our thinking about academic work and how it ought to be organized, assessed and rewarded. The first is the liberal arts college model, and the second is the conception of the research university. Over time, these two models of academic excellence have served us well, and the lives and careers of generations of students, faculty and alumni have thrived.

These two models have been challenged by other configurations, the best example being the land-grant college model, with its outreach mission and extension programs. It was particularly effective when our society was dominated by agriculture and the industrializing process. Following World War II and the generous federal funding of pure research, the vision of the land-grant college gave way to the overarching power and prestige of the research universities, which, in most states, came to dominate.

During the last 25 years, the limits of the two dominant visions of academic excellence, in their fully institutionalized form, have become increasingly apparent. As a result, American higher education has moved into a major period of transition—some would say, transformation—searching for alternative approaches to our work. It has been a time of enormous creativity and constructive leadership. Much has been done to change the way we learn, teach, construct our inquires, and organize our work. The AASCU campuses that have claimed an institutional identity as "Stewards of Place"—and sought recognition through the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification—have led the way in envisioning a new

approach to thinking about academic excellence and the meaning of success in our changing world.

Without denigrating the significance and power of the two conceptions that have dominated our thinking about academic excellence—on which we have relied and will need to build—it is important that we point out that without radical change, these two models are no longer economically or organizationally viable.

We want to ask: Is there a third way emerging out of the recent turbulence and innovative generativity? Are there characteristics of excellence that are emerging that can take us in new directions—a new prototype of academic success?

When the original Stewards of Place report was issued in 2002, most of the more impressive advances cited in community engagement were additive—included on the margins—often segmented off and requiring additional cost. They had not been fully integrated into the core processes of the institutions. The imaginative innovations had not been structured into the hearts of our colleges and universities.

In the data provided in this new report, we can see community engagement becoming more central to the core functions of the campus. A period of innovation and assessment has revealed key characteristics of a "third way" for American higher education—a different model of academic excellence in an institutional steward of place.

- **Integration/Beyond Differentiation**
  Integration needs to be built into the very structure of our institutions, from the relationship of academic and student affairs, the way we relate to students, conduct our research, work with community organizations, and reward our faculty and staff. This integration, however, needs to be built on the specialized advancements and achievements that have marked our segmented and narrowly divided past. This is integration beyond differentiation, not a return to a simpler unspecialized past. Berkeley's Robert Bellah, one of our most thoughtful social philosophers, in commenting on the impact of specialization on our society and universities observes, "The process of differentiation can no longer be sustained. Differentiation has gone just about as far as it can go, it is time for a new integration" (1970, p. 257).

This integration needs to be both structural and intellectual. The questions of meaning—questions of interconnection—need to be pursued. Years of specialization encouraged the growth of instrumental knowledge, the questions of "how." A stewards of place model focuses on substantive questions—questions related to "why."

- **Collaboration/Beyond Hierarchy**

  In the responses of the AASCU institutions to the community engagement inquiry, the commitment to collaboration is cited frequently. Collaboration needs to be incorporated into the pursuit of excellence. It is becoming increasingly evident that in a complex, global world, collaboration will be a pivotal requirement for success. In a 2011 article on the "Battle for German Brains" (Inside Higher Education, Sept. 7, 2011), it is reported that because "science today depends on international networks," Germany is now virtually requiring international post-doctorates in the sciences. The preference is for U.S. post-docs because of the free flow of information across the faculty status system and, particularly, between faculty and students. In Germany, the controlling authority of the senior professors often stifles the exchange of ideas, information and innovative techniques. In some of our highly competitive research universities, faculty are increasingly becoming individual entrepreneurs, focusing more on "my work" than "our work." It is a professional model that encourages faculty to be more competitive, exclusive and hierarchical.

  Much of the work of the engaged campuses requires what is being referred to as the "unbundling of the faculty role." Each of the traditional responsibilities of the faculty member—teaching, research, service—now require working with a network of academic personnel. Courses are designed, not just by the faculty member who is the traditionally trained content specialist, having come up through the tenure track, but by a team of technical specialists, librarians, student affairs personnel, practitioners, community partners and even students. Some are "managerial professionals" with their own credentials and degrees. The old collegial culture that can be traced back to Oxford and Cambridge is no longer dominant. Community engagement requires a more open, democratic structure without the academic status hierarchies of an earlier time. This is one of the more difficult challenges of a new and different approach to excellence.

Democratic learning and engagement requires a different epistemology and an orientation to knowing that is itself more democratic. Expertise will always be honored and have its place in the university. Community engagement, however, requires that the "wisdom of practice" is honored as well. Donald Schön called for a shift in "institutional epistemology" in his seminal 1995 Change magazine article, "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." Giving voice to the practitioner and attending to how students learn and make meaning will be required. Research, itself, will need to be more collaborative. No longer can we speak exclusively of the "application of knowledge." Attention needs to be paid to a more reciprocal, less hierarchical scholarship of engagement, where inquiry and learning take place in the company of others.

- **Inclusive/Beyond Diversity**

  The widespread recognition in American higher education that diversity is an "educational value and catalyst" is a significant achievement. The time has come, however, for us to move beyond diversity—honoring the "other"—to seeing it as a part of structural inclusion. Educational institutions in a pluralistic democracy require a shift of this sort—a new kind of excellence.

  Here we have two antithetical forces: interdependence and diversity. The press for increased diversity is an interim step in the right direction. The emphasis there is on individual identity, separateness and the honoring of difference. Interdependence pulls in the opposite direction. Bringing the two together is the next step and is required in a pluralistic democracy and in an interrelated global community.

  Susan Strum's recent article, "The Architecture of Inclusion" (Sturm, 2006; Sturm, et. al., 2011) is helping us understand inclusion that is built into the design and the architecture of systems—beyond diversity. She reports on the extraordinary NSF program organized to increase the inclusion of women in science programs. Learning communities are forged across a variety of universities that produce both collaboration and competition in support of institutional change. The press for diversity is built into comprehensive structured inclusion. Steward of place campuses are increasingly building a new architecture of inclusion.

- **Engagement/Beyond Walls and Silos**

  Taking on the charge of community engagement and the responsibilities of being "Stewards of Place" raises serious questions about the ways we organize academic work. Departmental divisions often stand in the way of collaboration and inclusion. Disciplines—which are now frequently referred to as silos—often separate faculty from one another and create a kind of methodological orthodoxy that discourages rich inquiry and constructive relationships rather than facilitate them. The walls that separate the campus from the local community become barriers to the sharing of knowledge and stand in the way of creating the kind of reciprocity that builds community and serves the common good. The walls of the university will have to become more permeable and the silos challenged. The relationship between theory and practice will have to be rethought, and the precedence given to theory over practice in the rewarding of scholarly work and student success will need to be reexamined.

  To value becoming stewards of place will obviously put a special emphasis on local knowledge at a time when it is cosmopolitan knowledge that, in the dominant reward system, is most honored. Rewarding local knowledge challenges the established academic reward system and the evaluation of faculty, and would logically seem to be at a disadvantage in a global academic system. The detailed examination of AASCU institutions most committed to being stewards of place—taking the learning needs of the local community seriously—reveals the kinds of institutions generating the sort of knowledge that global communities need most. The local focus and the global priority complement one another. Cosmopolitan knowledge, though important, requires a level of abstraction and disengagement, a different way of knowing. The walls and silos we need to get beyond have the potential for being circumvented by new alliances being formed—locally and globally—through new networked connections.

- **Networked/Beyond the Split Between Content and Process and Content and Context**

  In our discussion of community engagement, not enough has been said about the profound influence of technology on what we know and how we learn. The new generation of students is already moving toward being interconnected and global. Websites, Twitter, the blogosphere, Facebook,

Linked-In—the whole world of social media—are challenging the way we think, create, organize, make meaning and relate to one another. Some time ago, Clifford Geertz wrote in his famous essay, "Blurred Genres:" "Something is happening about the way we think about the way we think."

Now the new world of learning facilitated by information technology and the dispersion of social media are intertwining thought and action, where all the participants in the learning process are interdependent actors: all are experts, all are learners, all are teachers.

Now that Google is a verb, in most of the developed and developing countries everything has the potential for being interconnected in the new networks for learning. The contrast with the underdeveloped countries (and within those countries) is a critical issue, particularly with those of us claiming to take a democratic future seriously. If higher education is moving in this technologically enhanced direction, as is so obvious, the disparity between the rich and the poor stands out in stark relief, and the implications for the future are particularly discouraging.

In the networked world, process and content are fundamentally intertwined. The content specialists (faculty) are no longer the key players. Also, content and context are substantially interrelated. Knowledge will no longer be generated in the university and then applied. As John Seely Brown has argued: "Meaning emerges as much from context as content. This truly opens a new dimension of meaning creation." He gives a particularly striking example: "Let me change the music of a film and I can alter not only its meaning but what you actually see" (5).

The engaged campus will play a key role in our future, whether we are talking about how students learn or connections to the larger world—both local and global. The older separations of content and process and content and context are no longer the best ways to approach learning, engage in inquiry or generate new knowledge.

A different approach to academic excellence is emerging, one that puts priority on integration, collaboration, inclusion, engagement and, if we attend to it, is networked. The colleges and universities that are striving to take community engagement and its implications seriously are moving us toward a different prototype of excellence. The slogans of these institutions

are telling: "Let Knowledge Serve the City," "Scholarship in Action," "The New American University." AASCU and its American Democracy Project have brought visibility to and recognition for the community engagement, public scholarship and campus community partnerships that have shaped a new institutional identity—and new model of excellence—of being a "steward of place."

Acknowledgements

While the authors take full responsibility for any errors, misinterpretations or gaps in data or analysis, this report is significantly stronger because of the insights and feedback from expert respondents who are grounded in the culture and practice of Steward of Place campuses. We are enormously grateful to Joyce Gibson, Emily Janke, Kevin Kecskes, Cecilia Orphan and John Presley for their thoughtful critique of the report and their invaluable suggestions.

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2012). A crucible moment: college learning & democracy's future. Washington, DC: AACU.

Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, (9)1, 5-17.

Antonio, A., Astin, H., & Cress, C. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. The Review of Higher Education, 23(4), 373-397.

Astin, A. W. Vogelsang, L. J., Misam J., Anderson, J., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U., Saenz, V., & Yamamura, E.Y. (2006). Understanding the effects of service-learning: a study of students and faculty. HERI, UCLA.

Axelroth, R. & Dubb, S. (2010) The road half traveled: university engagement at a crossroads. University of Maryland: The Democracy Collaborative.

Bloomgarden, A. H. (2008). Prestige culture and community-based faculty work. Electronic Doctoral Dissertations for UMass Amherst. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI3336986

Bloomgarden, A. & O'Meara, K. (2007). Harmony or cacophony? faculty role integration and community engagement. Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, 13(2), 5-18.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 71(3), 273-290.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In L. R. Sandmann, C. H. Thornton, & A. J. Jaeger (Eds.), Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: the first wave of Carnegie classified institutions (pp.37-46). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 147. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.

Butin, D. W. (2010). Service-learning in theory and practice: the future of community engagement in higher education. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Colbeck, C., & Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. A. Eberly & J. R. Cohen (Eds.), Public scholarship. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 105, (pp. 17-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40(1), 38-41.

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2004). Roles and responsibilities of academic administrators: supporting the scholarship of civic engagement. In M. Langseth & W. Plater (Eds.). Academic Administrator's Guide to Civic Engagement and Service-learning (pp. 51–68). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Furco, A. (2003). Self assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Furco, A. & Holland, B. (2004). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education: issues and strategies for chief academic officers. In M. Langseth, W. M. Plater & S. Dillon (Eds.). Public Work and the Academy. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Geertz, C. (1980). Blurred genres: the refiguration of social thought, in: The American scholar, vol. 49 no. 2, pp. 165-179.

Gelmon, S. and Agre-Kippenhan, S. (2002). Promotion, tenure, and the engaged scholar: keeping the scholarship of engagement in the review process. AAHE Bulletin, 7-11.

Inside Higher Ed, "The Battle for German Brains," September 7, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/09/07/germany_woos_its_postdocs_in_the_u_s_to_come_home_with_goal_of_reforming_universities.

Hinck, S. S. & Brandell, M. E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service-learning. American Behavioral Scientist, 43(5), 868-881.

Holland, B. A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: a model of key organizational factors. Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, 4, 30-41.

Hollander, E., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Indicators of engagement. In Simon, L. A., Kenny, M., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.). Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society Through Service-learning (pp. 31-50). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kecskes, K. (2012). The engaged department and higher education reform: research, theory, and transformation of the academic unit, in Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, (Eds.). Research on Service-learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment, Stylus Publications.

Kecskes, K., Collier, P., Balshem, M. (2006). Engaging scholars in the scholarship of engagement, In McKnight Casey, K., Davidson, G., Billig, S., Springer, N. (Eds.). Advancing Knowledge in Service-learning: Research to Transform the Field. Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT, 159-181.

Kezar, A. & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. Research in Higher Education, 50, 715-740.

McCormick, A. and Zhao, Chun-Mei (2005), Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie Classification, Change, September/October, 2005, p. 51-57.

Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. Journal of Business Ethics, 15, 21-32.

Mundy, M. (2004). Faculty engagement in service-learning: individual and organizational factors at distinct institutions. In M. Welch & S. Billig (Eds.). New Perspectives in Service-learning: Research to Advance the Field (pp. 169-194). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

O'Meara, K. A. (2004). Reframing incentives and rewards for community service-learning and academic outreach. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 8(2), 201–220.

O'Meara, K. & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is…how faculty explain their practice. Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 16(1), 1-16.

O'Meara, K. & Rice, R. E. (2005). Faculty priorities reconsidered: rewarding multiple forms of scholarship. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Parkins, L. C. (2008). Predicting faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy at research universities (unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University.

Sandmann, L. R. (2009). Second generation: community engagement promotion and tenure issues and challenges. In J. Strait & M. Lima (Eds.). The Future of Service-learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice (pp.67-89). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Sandmann, L. R., & Plater, W. M. (2012). Assessing institutional leadership for service-learning: A research agenda to improve practice. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.). Research on Service-learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.). (2009). Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: the first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 147. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.

Saltmarsh, J. and Hartley, J.M. (2011). To serve a larger purpose: engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, G., O'Meara, K. A., Sandmann, L. R., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.). Creating Our Identities in Service-learning and Community Engagement (Advances in Service-Learning Research Vol. 10) (pp. 3-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Schön, D., (1995). The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology. Change, v27 n6 p26-34 Nov-Dec.

Strong, E., Green, P., Meyer, M., & Post, M. (2009). Future directions in campus-community partnerships: Locations of service-learning offices and activities in higher education. In J. Strait & M. Lima (Eds.). The Future of Service-learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice (pp. 9-32). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Sturm, S. (2006). The architecture of inclusion: Advancing workplace equity in higher education. Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, 29, 247-334.

Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). Full participation: building the architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education (White
paper). Columbia University Law School: Center for Institutional and Social Change.

Thomas D. and Brown, J. S. (2011), New culture of learning: the imagination for a world of constant change, January. Online PowerPoint presentation.

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N. & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty engaged scholarship? The Review of Higher Education, 33(4), 437-472.

Zlotkowski, E. (1999). Pedagogy and engagement. In R. G. Bringle, R. Games, & E. A. Malloy (Eds.). Colleges and Universities as Citizens (pp. 96-120). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.