Preparing Future Faculty for Community Engagement: Barriers, Facilitators, Models, and Recommendations

KerryAnn O'Meara, Audrey J. Jaeger

Abstract

This article considers the historical and current national context for integrating community engagement into graduate education. While it might be argued that most graduate education contributes generally to society by advancing knowledge, we are referring here to community engagement that involves some reciprocal interaction between graduate education (through students and faculty) and the public, an interaction that betters both the discipline and the public or set of stakeholders for whom the work is most relevant.

The authors survey and synthesize the literature on the history of graduate education in the United States and assess current barriers to and facilitators of integrating community engagement into doctoral programs. The authors consider what models already exist that might be replicated. Finally, the article concludes with a set of recommendations for national service-learning and outreach organizations, graduate deans, department chairs, and faculty interested in integrating community engage- ment into their doctoral programs.

Introduction

O ver the last two decades there has been a renaissance of sorts in higher education community engagement. Whether measured by the number of Campus Compact member institutions, priority of the topic in national higher education conferences, numbers of students involved in service-learning and community service, or nominations for faculty outreach awards, there is clear evidence that community engagement is becoming embedded in undergraduate academic programs and colleges. Simultaneously, there is greater scrutiny of graduate education, particularly doctoral programs. Researchers *(Aristigueta 1997; Haworth 1996)* note that graduate school curriculums are

rarely updated to coincide with the challenges and madates that are placed on individuals working in either the public or private sectors. Several cross-disciplinary studies have concluded that graduate education does not prepare graduate students for their future roles as faculty *(Austin 2002; Bieber and Worley 2006; Golde and Walker 2006)* As a result, many reform efforts are under way. However, the link between these two discussions—higher education's public mission and graduate education—has been inadequate. Limited national attention has been given to preparing and socializing graduate students and thereby new faculty to their public service role *(Applegate 2002; O'Meara 2006; Stanton and Wagner 2006)*.

This article considers the historical and current national context for integrating community engagement into graduate education. By community engagement we refer to teaching, research, or outreach that connects disciplinary expertise, theories, or ideas to public concerns *(Boyer 1990; Lynton 1995; Ward 2003)*. While it might be argued that most graduate education contributes generally to society by advancing knowledge, we are referring here to community engagement that involves some reciprocal interaction between graduate education (through students and faculty) and the public, an interaction that betters both the discipline and the public or set of stakeholders for whom the work is most relevant.

> *"[W]hen graduate education is isolated from the world, it is impoverished."*

The purpose of this article is to survey and synthesize the literature on the history of graduate education in the United States and assess current barriers to and facilitators of integrating community engagement into doctoral programs. The authors consider what models already exist that might be replicated. Finally, we conclude with a set of recommendations for national service-learning and outreach organizations, graduate deans, department chairs, and faculty interested in integrating community engagement into their doctoral programs.

A few assumptions guide this work. First, we assert, as others have recently, that when graduate education is isolated from the world, it is impoverished *(Stanton and Wagner 2006)*. Integrating community engagement into doctoral programs across every discipline offers opportunities for students to more effectively acquire research and teaching skills, to learn the knowledge of their disciplines in ways that promote deeper understanding and greater complexity, and to make connections with public agencies and groups that enrich the quality of their education. Therefore, even

if tremendous benefit for faculty, knowledge, and the public did not flow from these partnerships, integrating engagement into graduate education could be defended simply on the merits of how it improves the excellence of graduate education.

While we state this as an assumption, we recognize that research and evidence is needed to verify the educational, research, and societal benefits of integrating community engagement into graduate education. Limited research has been done in every discipline, but most published accounts reflect a lone professor integrating service-learning and community-based research into a graduate program *(e.g., Hagan 2004; Quinn 2006)* rather than a major meta-analysis of the impact of such work on stakeholders. For example, Hyde and Meyer *(2004)* studied graduate outcomes in a social work research class and found that students' exposure to methods of gathering, interpreting, and disseminating community-based information were significantly richer and more practical because the class partnered with a community-based organization. Likewise, Coffey and Wang *(2006)* reflected on outcomes of integrating service-learning into an MBA program in China and found it helped in improving team skills and written and presentation skills, and in developing an understanding of community responsibility. Eyler and Giles *(1999)* have well documented how service-learning has been found to positively influence personal and interpersonal development, issue knowledge, analysis of problems and solutions, critical thinking, and engagement with material. Each of these outcomes was found to be highly dependent on the quality of the placement and integration of the service experience with course material *(Eyler and Giles 1999)*. It is hard not to make inferences between undergraduate and graduate education, in that many of the outcomes examined would also be goals of graduate classrooms. On the other hand, there are specific skills, knowledge, and values that graduate programs are trying to develop as they train future scholars, and we suggest a new research agenda is needed to look more carefully at how community engagement can enhance these goals.

A second assumption is that graduate education is, as the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate has observed, work grounded in disciplines and departments *(CID 2006)*. Each department and discipline must ascertain what integrating engagement into their doctoral programs should look like and find critical experiences and windows that make the most sense for the content and framework of that discipline *(O'Meara, 2006; 2007a)*. These critical experiences will differ considerably by discipline. Finally, we assume

that doctoral and research universities, and faculty within them, have responsibilities to act as stewards of the public trust and to be involved in making research real, relevant, and significant to people's lives both inside and outside academe. Part of the responsibility of becoming engaged in communities is ensuring that institutions, their faculty, and their students are prepared with the skills necessary for their work with the public. Such actors must also be oriented toward sharing power and resources, appreciative of diversity, and prepared to assess the impacts of their work. There are many stories of universities "using" community members in medical trials, exploiting scarce community resources, and then disappearing *(Cone and Payne 2002)*. Thus as we advocate in this article for greater engagement between graduate programs and the public, we advocate for reciprocal university-community partnerships characterized by humility, genuine concern, and long-term commitment. This will require new visions of what knowledge is, where and how it is created, and what should be done with it. This can happen only if campuses continue efforts to transform their reward systems and if engagement is integrated into the fabric of disciplines, not added on to the margins.

> *"Part of the responsibility of becoming engaged in communities is ensuring that institutions, their faculty, and their students are prepared with the skills necessary for their work with the public.*

Historical Context

A review of the history of graduate education in the United States is largely an analysis of the history of doctoral and research universities. Thus it is not surprising that the current lack of engagement in graduate education stems from its historical development. Several key components of this history illuminate the challenges of incorporating engagement into graduate education. For example, the German influence of research and specialization, the development of research universities as elite institutions for the preparation of elites, the establishment of the Ph.D. degree and the individually produced research dissertation, the ways in which research universities have prioritized basic over applied research and science-based over professional and liberal arts curricula all reverberate today in graduate programs throughout the country. As we look at each of these themes in the history of graduate educa-

tion, it is also important to consider what might have supported greater infusion of engagement into doctoral programs as each influence was incorporated.

The earliest American colleges tended to be small and focused on the liberal arts, thus advanced studies were attained mainly in Europe *(Westmeyer 1985; Veysey 1965)*. Germany, until the latter part of the 1800s, was the primary place for Americans to obtain an advanced education; Oxford and Cambridge did little to provide for postgraduate education, and the French institutions lagged behind the German universities *(Brubacher and Rudy 1976; Geiger 1993; Veysey 1965)*. Brubacher and Rudy noted that American scholars studying in Europe tended to bring back with them a viewpoint focused more on exact research and scientific specialization than was found in German universities. In many ways American scholars idealized the German university model with its emphasis on academic freedom and learning for its own sake. They wished to re-create this ideal in places such as Johns Hopkins in 1876. German-educated American scholars did not embrace the German idea of investigation for investigation's sake but identified more with scientific specialization, which they saw as the entire purpose of the university *(Veysey 1965)*. It was with both idealism and distrust that Americans regarded the German university model and its focus on free pursuit of nonutilitarian learning without regard to the immediate needs of the surrounding society *(Brubacher and Rudy 1976; Veysey 1965)*.

> Aspiring Americans who visited Germany and returned with the phrase "scientific research" on their lips compounded this phrase from elements of German theory and practice which had had very different contexts in their original habitat. The German ideal of "pure" learning, largely unaffected by utilitarian demands, became for Americans the note of "pure science," with methodological connotations which the concept had often lacked in Germany. *(Veysey 1965, 127)*

A pragmatic approach to research, more democratic and perhaps more American, did not find its way into the training and preparation of doctoral students because early scholars emphasized specialization and basic research. Absent this influence, Americans might have considered what Gene Rice *(1996)* has referred to as the "American scholar" framework in developing requirements for the Ph.D. American university guidelines for the Ph.D. might have

incorporated demonstrations of the applicability of knowledge, collaborations of university students with public groups, or other types of extensions of disciplines into the problems of the world. Instead the emphasis for graduate education was set purely on original, individual research, following components of the German research university closely, even though many students would not pursue faculty positions afterward.

Closely connected to the German influence and the establishment of graduate research universities such as Hopkins was the changing focus of early liberal arts colleges such as Harvard to become more specialized research universities. These institutions supported the increased need for the Ph.D. Yale awarded the first Ph.D. in 1861. "The Ph.D. [was] reserved for that small group which gave promise of making first-rate contributions to original research" *(Brubacher and Rudy 1976, 194)*. Although Yale and twenty-five other institutions had developed a Ph.D. before Hopkins was established, Hopkins was known for producing large numbers of Ph.D.s, which filled most faculty positions until the early 1900s *(Rudolph 1962)*. Throughout the history of doctoral education, the rhetoric is

> *"Throughout the history of doctoral education, the rhetoric is often that of the rationale for the 'talented tenth,' or the idea of joining a distinctive privileged society."*

often that of the rationale for the "talented tenth," or the idea of joining a distinctive privileged society. Dating back to the medieval universities and paralleling the long history of secret societies in Ivy League research universities, there is a persistent representation of doctoral education as an elite experience. This sense of doctoral students as "captains" if not "generals" of expertise in ivory towers has created the perception that although doctoral students might inhabit a university community while they pursue their degrees, what they are doing is somehow not of or for the people, but for a private good. This perception, which is deeply grounded in reality, thwarts community engagement. In addition, the expectation that the best way to learn expertise in a discipline is through apprenticeship with a more senior scholar set apart from the world can limit imagination about how we train and prepare future scholars.

Likewise as we look at the development of the academic career we see separation between the public and the scholar. As

research universities expanded, the emphasis for faculty changed from teaching to research. Thus these institutions produced more research-minded graduate students. The development of departments, university presses, scholarly journals, and disciplinary societies all supported the movement of graduate education as a means of producing specialized, independent researchers to fill future faculty roles *(Brubacher and Rudy 1976; Cohen 1998; Rudolph 1962; Veysey 1965)*. While it was widely understood that research contributed to the "overall store of human knowledge," this knowledge was most often ingested and interpreted solely within the elite society of scholars, and thus separate from the general public.

In some ways the land-grant movement offered the most promise for public benefit; it is often cited for developing the prototype for the engaged scholar and engaged graduate education *(Peters et al. 2005)*. Land-grant colleges, established through the Morrill Act of 1862, were intended to educate students in fields such as agriculture and engineering, but as Johnson *(1981)* noted, most early land-grant colleges enrolled very few students, and, in practice, many provided a high school education. Johnson noted that contrary to their historical image, many land-grant colleges viewed the field of agriculture as a "stepchild." Land-grant colleges did provide an important incremental step in building the educational system in the United States, but the movement to render services for rural and community development came much later. The land-grant idea of service was more fully realized with the 1914 Smith-Lever Act, which established the Cooperative Extension Service. Cooperative extension advances knowledge in agriculture, the environment, and the health and well-being of individuals, as well as serving a variety of other community needs. "Extension" means "reaching out," which was the purpose of extension services—to "extend" college and university resources to help address and solve public needs and concerns through informal, noncredit programs *(CSREES 2006)*. Although early land-grant colleges were more engaged with communities than other private institutions, their focus was still often scientific, and there was great diversity in the types of programs they operated. The legacy of the land-grant movement in inspiring and informing engaged graduate education today is thus both real and illusory *(Peters et al. 2005)*. Its reality is reflected in the many clinical programs in the natural sciences and social sciences that it created and that still exist today, engaging faculty and teams of doctoral students in partnerships with communities. Nonetheless, the legacy is illusory in that it does not reflect the very real limitations of the early land-grant colleges and what

they accomplished, and much of the idealism that surrounded this model gave way to more pure research university values among flagship campuses.

While the history of American graduate education is predominantly a story of the ascendance of disciplines and specialized knowledge, the professions (e.g., divinity, law, medicine, social work, and education) provide an interesting partial exception. These professions have always considered the development of character and ethics as primary concerns in creating "professionals" in their respective fields. In addition, some of the first "schools" of medicine, law, and divinity developed outside research university walls using apprenticeship models. Thus from their very beginnings the oldest law, medical, public health, and social work schools have incorporated experiential clinical programs, often serving poor nearby neighborhoods. One famous example is the University of Chicago, which embraced the college settlement house idea wherein students worked in communities to help address poverty and other urban challenges. Jane Addams and her colleagues were leaders in establishing the field of social work that affiliated with the University of Chicago's school of sociology *(Mayfield, Hellwig, and Banks 1999; Rudolph 1962)*. Interestingly, historians of Hull House demonstrate that it provided excellent opportunities for doctoral students to merge theory and practice while serving relevant community needs. However, as the departments with which Hull House collaborated became more research-focused, their relation- ship deteriorated.

That universities could better serve the public by connecting their programs to public and community issues did not escape the attention of higher education leaders at the turn of the century. In the early to mid 1900s organizations such as the Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, American College on Education, American Association of University Professors, and the Carnegie Foundation begin to criticize graduate schools for the lack of preparation given to future faculty in the area of teaching *(Brubacher and Rudy 1976; Rudolph 1962)*. It was another seventy years before critics addressed the preparation of graduate students in the area of community engagement. The Council of Graduate Schools and Graduate Record Examinations Board maintained that graduate disciplines should include deliberate and significant work outside the university walls. Their report also expressed

the hope that it would become the norm for graduate students and professors to examine carefully the social implications of all projected research, thus linking course work to independent study and, wherever possible, directing student-faculty projects in such a way that meaningful social change might be accomplished. *(Panel on Alternative Approaches 1973, 34)*

Current graduate professional education may provide some of the best examples of what the Council of Graduate Schools in 1973 had envisioned. However, despite their advances over other disciplines in developing bridges between theory and practice, or maybe in part because of their difference in this area, professional schools were often at odds with graduate schools and seen as offering a lesser valued degree. Professional study was seen as anti-intellectual. Prominent members of the academic community considered separating professional education from the university "to preserve the integrity of the graduate school as a place for pure research" *(Geiger 1993*, 217). However, professional schools provide some of the best models for clinical and experiential learning across disciplines, as will be discussed later.

This section began with the assertion that a historical look at graduate education would account for the challenges facing higher education community engagement today. Support for graduate students in terms of research support and funding is often directed toward scientific research endeavors. Since the 1920s fellowships and other funding opportunities were closely tied to the sciences (mathematics, physics, and chemistry). This trend continued through World War II into the 1950s with the expansion of the National Science Foundation and a major federal commitment to upgrade the nation's scientific capacity *(Geiger 1993)*. Research universities have long paid graduate students as teaching assitants, but few opportunities have existed for graduate students to apprentice within the service mission of their institutions, except through individual engaged faculty mentors. Some doctoral students have also found engagement opportunities in doctoral programs in metropolitan and urban comprehensive instituions with think tanks and research centers linked to city public schools, health care centers, and environmental issues. Although civic engagement opportunities have flourished for undergraduates over the last two decades, similar experiences across disciplines are not typically available for graduate students. It is imperative that graduate students develop a greater awareness of how their discipline can contribute to solving

real-world problems as well as how disciplinary knowledge can be transformed through interaction with real-world settings. In the next section we examine how these historical barriers connect with obstacles higher education faces in trying to integrate community engagement and graduate education.

Barriers to Integrating Community Engagement into Graduate Education

First, it is important to acknowledge that there are many graduate programs wherein community engagement is seamlessly embedded. However, using the definition of community engagement we posit in this article, these programs are more the exception than the rule, and there are many barriers to integrating community engagement more widely into graduate education. Barriers stem directly from the historical development of graduate education, research universities, and notions of scholarship. History shows that the pursuit of specialized scientific research has shaped the requirements and culture of graduate education. The science model has held and continues to hold the greatest prestige on college campuses. The more specialized a graduate student's interest, the greater the institution's perception of the student's value, and the more likely that student will seek and receive external funding. These students become insular and thus are the most likely to be disconnected from communities. Professional schools, on the other hand, are often the most connected to community efforts but are often considered peripheral rather than central to the research university mission. Consequently, standards and priorities set by elite research universities and disciplinary agendas are focused on basic research.

Research universities themselves serve as major barriers to incorporating community engagement in graduate education. These institutions have a unique role in generating norms for the academic profession *(Ward 2003)*. Most doctoral students aspiring to become faculty are trained at research universities, and thus their graduate education is preparing them more for research than for any other aspect of faculty life *(Braxton, Luckey, and Helland 2002; Golde and Dore 2001)*. Research has shown that graduate students express limited understanding of and experience with the variety of roles that faculty members undertake, particularly in the area of community engagement *(Austin 2002)*. Teaching and learning in doctoral programs at research universities are often narrowly focused and highly specialized. In addition, these institutions maintain a fervid commitment to basic over applied research. This

type of learning is not easily applicable to solving complex social problems. Furthermore, the individualistic nature of graduate education is antithetical to the collaborative nature of engagement, although only the latter can address many societal challenges.

Another barrier facing engagement as a part of graduate education is the message regarding reward structures sent to graduate faculty. Reward systems in research and doctoral universities tend to emphasize research and external funding, not community engagement *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002; Jaeger and Thornton 2005, 2006; Colbeck and Michael 2006a; O'Meara 2002; Ward 2003)*. Research universities exist in a competitive culture and do not yet offer recognition for alternative pathways to excellence and prestige that involve doing things that are different, such as community engagement *(Holland 2005)*. Furthermore, institutions that are focused on gaining prestige and becoming more like the most selective research universities have difficulty creating reward systems that encourage and sustain community engagement work *(O'Meara 2007b)*.

> *"[T]he individualistic nature of graduate education is antithetical to the collaborative nature of engagement, although only the latter can address many societal challenges."*

Consequently, faculty members receive inconsistent messages, particularly at land-grant institutions. The mandate of a land-grant institution to serve the public is negated by a lack of rewards for public service *(Jaeger and Thornton 2006)*. If reward systems do not support community engagement work, future faculty will likely be socialized away from scholarship that has a public purpose. Furthermore, prospective faculty are also socialized away from community engagement work by the cultures of the disciplines on campus, which generally reward research activity over public service activity *(O'Meara 2006; Tierney and Rhoads 1993)*. This synergy of both institutional and disciplinary cultures assigning a value to research creates a somewhat united culture inside the academy that devalues public service and may be in direct conflict with the culture external to the academy that demands public service *(Jaeger and Thornton 2006)*.

Funding and sustainability serve as another set of barriers to integrating community engagement into graduate education. Public service work is impacted by the trends of academic capi-

talism *(Slaughter and Leslie 1997)* much as is the research enterprise (e.g., need to seek external funds). Faculty at research universities are pressured to seek external funding, and much of their work with communities is done without significant external funding or corporate partnerships. This reality compounds the stigma attached to community engagement *(Jaeger and Thornton 2005)*. In contrast, faculty in some of the sciences with the least engagement occurring are closest to the market and most successful at securing external funds *(Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004)*. Departments and disciplines that are not able to bring in such scarce resources exhibit less influence within their institutions.

Even if faculty and graduate students are able to obtain funding for community engagement projects, there could be a tendency to partner with groups who have financial resources to sustain such endeavors. In a culture where fund acquisition has become as important as publications, this partnership trend will impact who faculty and graduate students seek as partners or as target populations for public service endeavors. This trend indicates that those who cannot pay may one day not be served *(Jaeger and Thornton 2005)*.

The final barrier related to expanding community engagement in graduate education stems from those previously mentioned but deserves further attention. Most graduate students do not learn to "see" community engagement as a way of being a scholar *(O'Meara 2006)*. They then become faculty who do not see community engagement as a way of teaching and discovering in their discipline. History continues to repeat itself as graduate students become specialized, narrowly focused researchers and are not aware of knowledge as having a public purpose. Thus epistemologies and frameworks around the process, products, and locations of scholarship thwart adoption of community engagement in some disciplines *(Colbeck and Michael 2006; O'Meara 2006)*. Emphasis within graduate programs on the products of scholarship over the process, on disseminating to academe as opposed to professional or community audiences, and on the knowledge of experts as opposed to knowledge created within communities, makes it much less likely that either doctoral students or their faculty men- tors will appreciate the opportunities inherent in connecting their scholarship to public concerns.

Research has shown that graduate students want "meaning" in their work *(Austin 2002)*. Austin notes that prospective faculty want to engage in work that has a positive impact on the broader

society and work that has personal significance for them. If graduate programs are unable to incorporate community engagement within the curriculum as well as through teaching and research endeavors, everyone inside and outside the academy is disadvantaged. Graduate students will leave institutions without learning the importance of connecting their disciplinary work to public purposes. Furthermore, they will be less likely to work with colleagues from other disciplines and with people outside academe *(Austin 2002; Austin and Barnes 2005)*. Thus graduate programs become less vital to education's essential public service role. Undergraduates who want to continue their community engagement work as graduate students will be disillusioned by the lack of opportunity available to them *(Stanton and Wagner 2006)*. While there are many barriers to expanding community-integrating engagement within graduate education, there are many more reasons why it is imperative to work toward this goal.

Facilitators and Models for Engaged Graduate Education

Despite the formidable barriers that exist to integrating engagement into doctoral programs, there are also many levers for change. Three in particular are timely. First, as mentioned earlier, doctoral education is itself experiencing significant scrutiny and reform. Chris Golde and Timothy Dore *(2001)* observed through their survey of doctoral students that there exists a three-way mismatch between reality, the traditional purposes of doctoral education, and doctoral student aspirations. Students are often not aware of the range of faculty roles across institutional types nor the demands of faculty work life. Doctoral programs still do little to introduce students to the scholarship of teaching and learning or to prepare them to link their disciplinary passions to the problems and needs of communities and society *(Applegate 2002)*.

In response to concerns that doctoral programs do not adequately prepare students for careers as twenty-first-century faculty members in colleges and universities, many reform efforts are under way. Programs such as the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), the University of Washington's Re-Envisioning the Ph.D. program *(University of Washington 2002)*, the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation's Responsive Ph.D. initiative, and the Preparing Future Faculty program are all examples of such innovations. The CID project included eighty-four departments at forty-four universities that engaged in a process of reflection, implementation of program changes, and assessment *(CID*

2006). The program leaders determined through this project that doctoral students should learn to be "stewards of their discipline" who among other roles can transform knowledge by applying and-communicating it within and outside academe, as well as across traditional disciplinary boundaries. The focus of the last decade in graduate education reform has been on teaching, but national associations and graduate deans are beginning to look more closely at how to better prepare graduate students for community engagement (*Applegate 2002; Bloomfield 2006a; O'Meara 2006; O'Meara 2007a; Stanton and Wagner 2006)*. As disciplinary associations and graduate deans begin to talk of "transformation" of doctoral programs, national service-learning and outreach organizations are available to provide new visions and portraits of knowledge, skills, and orientations toward engaged scholarship.

A second reason for hope is what might be thought of as a recent quickening within disciplinary associations and fields regarding civic engagement. Within the last five years many disciplinary associations have created, revived, or put new emphasis on special interest groups and projects focused on the public aspects of their work. Within the discipline of history there is a significant focus on "public history," including a Task Force on Public History (*American Historical Association 2003)*. Anthropologists have supported civic purposes through the field of public anthropology (Public Anthropology).

> *"[A]n… important set of potential allies … is found in offices of service-learning, offices of outreach, and national service-learing organizations."*

The American Sociology Association's ninety-ninth annual conference focus was on public sociology (*Maclay 2004)*. Likewise, in July 2007 there will be an international conference on service- learning in teacher education in Brussels, Belgium (*ICSLTE 2007)*, and this conference follows over a decade of journal articles and U.S. conferences on teacher education and service-learning, as well as a service-learning Special Interest Group at the American Educational Research Association Conference. The field of engi- neering has likewise been active, and the 2006 Conference on Service-Learning in Engineering included discussions of why service-learning is critical for engineers, why service-learning matters to industry, and funding and institutionalizing service-learning in engineering pro-

grams *(EPICS 2007)*. These are just a few examples of burgeoning disciplinary efforts, but there are many more.

Third, an equally important set of potential allies and/or facilitators for integrating community engagement into graduate education is found in offices of service-learning, offices of outreach, and national service-learning organizations that have grown and matured over the last ten to twenty years. Many research and doctoral campuses have directors of service-learning who are natural partners for graduate faculty and doctoral students in establishing partnerships with community agencies. Land-grant colleges often have offices of outreach charged with facilitating economic development surrounding their campuses and leveraging university resources for public benefit (the University of Massachusetts, Penn State, the University of Georgia, and Michigan State are some of the many institutions that have outreach offices and programs). Campus Compact, an organization of college presidents committed to service-learning and civic engagement, just celebrated its twentieth anniversary by adding over a thousand campuses to its membership. Many of these campuses are research and doctoral campuses. Likewise, the Outreach Scholarship Conference in Columbus, Ohio, in October 2006 brought together land-grant and research universities (such as Penn State, Michigan State, and the University of Wisconsin) to discuss campus outreach, economic development, and outreach scholarship through and across the disciplines. In February 2006 the University of Minnesota held a forum on civic engagement and graduate education, cosponsored by the Office for Public Engagement and Campus Compact. Victor Bloomfield, associate vice president for public engagement at the University of Minnesota, authored a position paper, Civic Engagement and Graduate Education: Ten Principles and Five Conclusions *(Bloomfield 2006b),* that served as a basis for discussion at a March 2006 Wingspread Conference, Civic Engagement in Graduate Education: Preparing the Next Generation of Engaged Scholars *(Johnson Foundation 2006).* In April 2006 California Campus Compact hosted a Symposium on Civic Engagement and Graduate Education to gather California campuses together to analyze the current state of civic engagement, service-learning, and community-responsive research at the graduate level *(CACC 2005).* Each of these meetings brought together national leaders involved in graduate education and community engagement to develop strategies for creating infrastructure and support for graduate community engagement across disciplines. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching *(2005)*

has just created a new classification system to acknowledge and assess campus-community engagement. This new benchmarking tool follows efforts by the Princeton Review and Campus Compact (Campuses with a Conscience) and Washington Monthly (classification based on national service) to benchmark university engagement and will likely make land-grants and many other institutional types consider how community engagement might be more central to their work. This movement has also been fueled by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges who, along with other national associations, have been focused on connecting the resources and expertise of universities with community, state, national, and international problems.

This is all to say that significant resources are available to those faculty, department chairs, and deans who want to create service-learning and community-based research opportunities for their doctoral students. Many of these groups did not exist ten years ago but now have matured and can provide critical resources and expertise to build partnerships between graduate programs and relevant community groups. Having thought long and hard about how to institutionalize service-learning across campuses, these groups can offer organizational change strategies and lessons learned that can be applied to the integration of community engagement in graduate education.

Lastly, there are the graduate students themselves who became involved in the service-learning movement of the last ten years and are entering their doctoral programs wanting to connect their experiences with their studies. Whether other movements succeed or fail, campuses may look to these previously engaged graduate students to push their programs in developing classroom learning opportunities that connect to critical societal issues and more socially relevant scholarship through their own work with communities.

Models from Professional Schools and Extension

We can also look to experiential, community-based education offered by professional schools and extension programs for models of structural and conceptual support for community engagement. Public health and medical programs are far ahead of many other disciplines in having established permanent long-term partnerships between graduate programs and medical clinics. Perhaps because of the necessity of engaging the public in studies of disease,

clinical trials, and rehabilitation programs, these programs have developed many innovative ways of linking graduate study with individual and community needs.

One such program is the University of California, San Francisco, Community Partnership Resource Center (CPRC), a Department of Family and Community Medicine initiative to facilitate partnership activities between UCSF and local communities, involving faculty and graduate students in project development, implementation, and evaluation; community-based participatory research; and social advocacy (UCSF School of Medicine). One of the most effective interdisciplinary associations in public health is Campus Community Partnerships for Health (CCPH). Founded in 1996, it is a growing network of over 1200 communities and campuses across North America that promote health through service-learning and community-based participatory research.

Likewise there are many illustrations of the difference law students and their faculty can make in improving the world through their studies. The University of Maryland Law School is known for centers, projects, and initiatives that link faculty and students with concerns in the Baltimore area and throughout the world. It identifies organizations such as the Civil Justice Network, Community Law in Action, and the Maryland Healthcare Ethics Committee Network as community partners (University of Maryland School of Law) and utilizes clinics, internships, and summer practicums as ways of linking student study of law to the concerns of community partners.

Land-grant colleges and universities, as previously mentioned, have the unique opportunity to engage the public through cooperative extension. County extension agents and faculty involved in extension lend their expertise in meeting the public needs at a local level. This can be accomplished through the delivery of informal workshops and classes, conducting informal applied research, and building learning capacity in the community, as well as carefully designed research projects *(Adams et al. 2005)*. No matter what the activity or program, cooperative extension offers many examples of how graduate students might develop an immediately realized public scholarship agenda with communities.

Several observations about models from teacher education, law, medicine, social work, and similar professionally based programs are important. First, the service students provide is often under the supervision of a faculty mentor. Second, these often are structured programs available for all students, rather than to an elite group.

Third, the content of the service provided is considered central to what the community needs, rather than peripheral. Students learn valuable core skills and ethical principles while engaged in work that makes a difference. Consequently we can learn much from these models about setting up long-term partnerships between departments and community partners.

Recommendations for Integration of Engagement with Graduate Education

The following recommendations are intended for deans, graduate program directors, and faculty interested in transforming doctoral programs to include engagement. Rather than a top-down or grassroots strategy, we suggest a multifaceted approach that simultaneously works in several directions. We advocate that graduate programs

- build on the foundation and models of the undergraduate service-learning movement, and on clinics and experiential learning in the professions and extension.

- engage faculty and doctoral students in conversations about transforming doctoral education to include engagement. Consider within these conversations how doctoral programs might be revised to better address the Carnegie project's five developmental trajectories—developing independence, creativity, capacity, confidence, and responsibility *(CID 2006)*. Consider how service-learning and community-based research opportunities might help students grow in these areas as well as support collaboration in concert with individual work.

- create programs to train doctoral students in methods of applied research and participatory action research as well as means of community needs analysis and asset mapping *(Austin and McDaniels 2006; O'Meara 2006; Stanton and Wagner 2006)*.

- create faculty development programs around community engagement across career stages.

- connect the university to policymakers and economic development efforts, making university campuses central and not peripheral to what is happening in their community, region, and state. If each graduate program considered adopting one community partner

and beginning conversations with that partner about ways in which they might serve each other, students, faculty, and communities would reap significant benefits.

- develop a research agenda modeled after the work of Eyler and Giles *(1999)* in undergraduate education that looks critically at educational outcomes of embedding community engagement into graduate programs.

- encourage interdisciplinary team approaches to the most challenging public issues *(Center for Studies in Higher Education 2005)*. Consider engagement projects that encourage students to look at problems from muliple, even competing, perspectives.

- invest in infrastructure for community engagement, including curriculum development, human resources, grant writing, and the sharing of university resources.

- develop a faculty culture that values the contributions of multiple forms of scholarship, mentoring and advising graduate students, and knowledge contributions from the community *(O'Meara and Rice 2005; Jaeger and Thornton 2005)*.

Summary

In this article we considered the history, barriers and facilitators, and exemplar practices and models for community engagement in graduate education. However, Schuster and Finkelstein's *(2006)* most recent research on trends in the academic profession leaves us with more questions than answers. Their analysis of faculty survey data from the last four decades suggests that we are moving toward greater stratification or unbundling of the faculty role. More faculty than ever are being hired in part-time adjunct positions, in non–tenure track appointments, and in positions that emphasize teaching or research or service. On the other hand, more women and faculty of color are joining the academic ranks and searching for ways to find meaning through their work. Likewise, there are pressures on campuses to strive toward greater U.S. News & World Report rankings *(O'Meara 2007a)* and engage in academic capitalism at the expense of service missions *(Jaeger and Thornton 2005)*. Future research is needed to understand how community engagement influences graduate education, how the trends just mentioned influence whether campuses embrace engagement,

and how changes in appointment type, values, and goals influence faculty adoption of community engagement in graduate programs. Campuses and national associations need to recognize embedding community engagement within graduate education as a core strategy for future institutionalization of this work. Investments made in graduate programs today will bring community engagement to the center of scholarly agendas, disciplines, departments, and institutions tomorrow.

References

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

Adams, R. G., R. M. Harrel, D. J. Maddy, and D. Weigel. 2005. A diversified portfolio of scholarship: The making of a successful extension educator. *Journal of Extension 43* (4). http://www.lib.ncsu.edu:2462/joe/2005august/comm2.shtml.

American Historical Association. Task Force on Public History. 2003. *Public history, public historians, and the American Historical Association.* http://www.historians.org/governance/tfph/TFPHreport.htm.

Applegate, J. 2002. *Engaged graduate education: Seeing with new eyes.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Aristigueta, M. P. 1997. Strategy and theory for interpersonal development in public administration education. *Journal of Public Administration Education 3* (2): 163–76.

Austin, A. E. 2002. Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education 73* (1): 94–122.

Austin, A., and B. Barnes. 2005. Preparing doctoral students for faculty careers that contribute to the public good. In *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging voices from a national movement*, edited by A. Kezar, T. Chambers, J. Burkhardt, and Associates, 272–92. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, A. E. , and M. McDaniels. 2006. Using doctoral education to prepare faculty to work within Boyer's four domains of scholarship. In *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship*, edited by J. M. Braxton, 51–66. New directions for institutional research, no. 129. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Bieber, J. P., and L. K. Worley. 2006. Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education 77* (6): 1009–35.

Bloomfield, V. 2006a. Civic engagement and graduate education. *Communicator 38* (3): 1–2, 6. Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools.

Bloomfield, V. 2006b. Civic engagement and graduate education: Ten principles and five conclusions. University of Minnesota Office for Public Engagement. http://www.academic2.umn.edu/grad_ed/index.htm.

Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J. M., W. Luckey, and P. Helland. 2002. Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 29* (2). San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Brubacher, J. S., and W. Rudy. 1976. *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities*, 1636–1976. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

California Campus Compact (CACC). [2005]. Civic Engagement at Research I Institutions. http://www.cacampuscompact.org/cacc_programs/pip_research1/index.html.

Campus Compact. http://www.campuscompact.org/.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. [2005]. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. http://www.carnegie-foundation.org/classifications/.

Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID). 2006. Project overview. http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/files/assets/CID_Project_Overview.pdf.

Center for Studies in Higher Education. 2005. *Promoting civic engagement at the University of California: Recommendations from the strategy group on civic and academic engagement.* Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Studies in Higher Education.

Coffey, B., and J. Wang. 2006. Service learning in a master of business administration integrative project course: An experience in China. *Journal of Education for Business 82* (2): 119–25.

Cohen, A. M. 1998. *The Shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Colbeck, C., and P. Michael. 2006a. Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In *Public scholarship*, edited by R. A. Eberly and J. R. Cohen, 17–26. New directions for teaching and learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colbeck, C., and P. Wharton Michael. 2006b. The public scholarship: Re-Integrating Boyer's four domains. In *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship,* edited by J. M. Braxton, 7–20. New directions for institutional research, no. 129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH). http:// depts.washington.edu/ccph/index.html.

Cone, D., and P. Payne. 2002. When campus and community collide: Campus-community partnerships from a community perspective. *Journal of Public Affairs 6* (1): 203–18.

Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES). 2006. Extension. http://www.csrees.usda.gov/qlinks/extension.html.

Driscoll, A., and E. Lynton, eds. 1999. *Making outreach visible: A workbook on documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Engineering Projects in Community Service (EPICS). 2007. 2006 Conference on Service Learning in Engineering: Session Overview. http://epicsnational.ecn.purdue.edu/public/conferences/national_2006_agenda.

Eyler, J., and D. Giles. 1999. *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Geiger, R. L. 1993. Research, graduate education, and the ecology of American universities: An interpretive history. In T*he European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays,* edited by S. Rothblatt and B. Wittock, 234–62. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Golde, C. M., and T. M. Dore. 2001. *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education.* Philadelphia, Pa.: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts. http:// www.phd-survey.org.

Golde, C. M., and G. E. Walker, eds. 2006. *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline.* Indianapolis, Ind.: Jossey-Bass.

Hagan, M. 2004. Acculturation and an ESL program: A service learning project. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development 32*: 443–48.

Haworth, J. G. 1996. *Assessment in graduate education: Present realities, future prospects.* New directions for institutional research, no. 57. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, B. A. 2005. Institutional differences in pursuing the public good. In *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*, edited by A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, and J. C. Burkhardt, 235–59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hyde, C. A., and M. Meyer. 2004. A collaborative approach to service-learning, and scholarship: A community-based research course. *Journal of Community Practice 12* (1/2): 71–89.

International Center on Service-Learning in Teacher Education (ICSLTE). [2007]. The First International Conference on Service-Learning in Teacher Education. http://www.clemson.edu/ICSLTE/conference/index.html.

Jaeger, A. J., and C. H. Thornton. 2005. Moving toward the market and away from public service?: Effects of resource dependency and academic capitalism. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 10* (3): 53–67.

Jaeger, A. J., and C. H. Thornton. 2006. Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy 20* (2): 345–66.

Johnson, E. L. 1981. Misconceptions of the early land-grant colleges. *Journal of Higher Education 52* (4): 333–351.

Johnson Foundation. [2006]. Previous Conferences: 2006 Conferences, briefings, and events. http://www.johnsonfdn.org/06conferences.html.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. http://www.nasulgc.org/Kellogg/kellogg.htm.

Lynton, E. A. 1995. *Making the case for professional service.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Maclay, K. 2004. American Sociological Association's 99th annual con- ference to emphasize "public sociology." Press release. http://www. berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2004/08/09_asa.shtml.

Mayfield, L., M. Hellwig, and B. Banks. 1999. The Chicago response to urban problems. *American Behavioral Scientist 42* (5): 857–69.

Merriam, S. B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K. 2002. Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education 26* (1): 57–80.

O'Meara, K. 2006. Preparing future faculty for engagement. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

O'Meara, K. 2007a. *Graduate education and civic engagement.* NERCHE brief 20. http://www.nerche.org/briefs/NERCHE_Brief_20 Graduate-Education_and_Civic_Engagement.doc (28 April 2007).

O'Meara, K. 2007b. Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research 22*: 121–79.

O'Meara, K. A., and R. E. Rice, eds. 2005. *Faculty priorities reconsid- ered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education. 1973. *Scholarship for society.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Peters, S. J., N. R. Jordan, M. Adamek, and T. Alter, eds. 2005. *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system.* Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation Press.

Preparing Future Faculty. http://www.preparing-faculty.org/.

Pruit-Logan, A. S., and J. G. Gaff. 2004. Preparing future faculty: Changing the culture of doctoral education. In *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*, edited by D. H. Wulff and A. E. Austin, 177–93. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, S. M. 2006. Facilitating service-learning for the first time with advanced graduate students: A mentoring perspective. *Mentoring and Tutoring 14* (1): 97–110.

Rice, R. E. 1996. *Making a place for the new American scholar.* New pathways, inquiry no. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Rudolph, F. 1962. *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press.

Schuster, J. H., and M. J. Finkelstein. 2006. *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Singleton, S., D. Hirsch, and C. Burack. 1997. *Organizational structures for community engagement.* NERCHE working paper 21. Boston, Mass.: Graduate College of Education, University of Massachusetts Boston.

Slaughter, S., and L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., and G. Rhoades. 2004. *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stanton, T. K., and J. W. Wagner. 2006. *Educating for democratic citizenship: Renewing the civic mission of graduate and professional education at research universities*. Stanford, Calif.: California Campus Compact.

Strand, K., S. Marullo, N. Cutforth, R. Stoecker, and P. Donohue. 2003. *Community based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W. G., and R. A. Rhoads. 1993. *Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC higher education report, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). School of Medicine. Department of Family & Community Medicine. Community Partnership Resource Center. http://www.familymedicine.medschool.ucsf.edu/community%5Fservice/cprc/.

University of Maryland School of Law. Community Partners. http://www.law.umaryland.edu/public.asp.

University of Washington. 2002. Re-envisioning the Ph.D. http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/.

Veysey, L. R. 1965. *The Emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walshok, M. L. 1995. *Knowledge without boundaries: What American research universities can do for the economy, the workplace and the community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, K. 2003. *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement.* ASHE-ERIC higher education report, vol. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Westmeyer, P. 1985. *A history of American higher education*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. The responsive Ph.D. http://www.woodrow.org/responsivephd/.

About the Authors

KerryAnn O'Meara is assistant professor and program coordinator, Higher Education Program, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Audrey Jaeger is assistant professor and co–program coordinator, North Carolina State University.