# Public Scholarship Reconsidered: Recognizing and Integrating Contexts for Faculty Engagement

*Monica D. Griffin*
College of William and Mary

*The following study analyzes the nearly 20-year curricular evolution of civic engagement at a small liberal arts university in the southeastern United States, the College of William and Mary; in doing so, the researcher qualitatively examines the nature of scholarship in service-learning courses over a period of the last five years to lay groundwork for a more in-depth assessment. With this institutional study, the author makes a case for administrators to design, develop, and evaluate engaged scholarship programming within the integrative contexts of faculty teaching, research, and community partnering proposed by Boyer (1990; 1996).*

## Introduction

Service-learning program planning, faculty development, and institutional assessment are central to sustaining civic engagement in higher education (Driscoll and Sandmann, 2004). Arguably, however, research continues to leave unexamined how such work can be valued as a form of scholarship: Existing "[r]esearch on service-learning continues to document its impact on undergraduate students, faculty, institutions, and communities," but nonetheless "… fails to capture the planning and process dimensions that lead to diverse programmatic outcomes" (Sandmann, Kiely, and Grenier, 2009, p. 17). Few studies address the scholarly dimensions of this work as an integrative pursuit that combines teaching, research, and community partnering across disciplines and fields, a pursuit theoretically grounded (Boyer, 1990, 1996) and empirically emergent from institutional contexts.

Community engaged teaching and research tangibly illustrate the potency of Boyer's categories of scholarship as conceptual areas that do not have fixed boundaries. At the institutional level of analysis, scholarship ranges from focusing on the practical aspects of creating successful engaged scholarship programs, particularly service-learning course development and pedagogy (Collier and Williams, 2005; Huber and Hutchings, 2007); the institutionalization of civic engagement in higher education (Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007; Driscoll, 2009); program and institutional assessment (Holland, 2006). Existing research uses colleges and universities as primary units of analysis, especially research universities as an

identified setting for slower growth (Holland, 2007; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010). The critical challenge for public scholars is not only to articulate in precise and practical terms how faculty and students navigate teaching and learning within contexts of community partnering but also to elaborate (beyond quantitative measures of growth or expansion) the conceptual foundations and institutional contexts out of which higher education organizations nurture the growth and persistence of civic engagement programs aimed at "serv[ing] a larger purpose – to participate in the building of a more just society and to make the nation more civil and secure" (Boyer, 1996, p. 13).

The purpose of this study is to complicate current (though legitimate) considerations of practice, institutionalization, and assessment in engagement with critical questions about recognizing public scholarship within the gray areas of process and development. Qualitative analyses of faculty scholarship through course development, community engagement, and related research is especially revealing and necessary for institutions that do not fit neatly into broad, institutional categories of comparison (such as research, liberal arts, land grant, or mission-driven), but that nonetheless value and engage multiple practices in civic engagement. Research in this vein expands our knowledge of the contexts for institutionalizing civic engagement and creates critical synergy among diverse forms of public scholarship (e.g., course development, service-learning, community research). Through the institutional study I present here, I hope to advocate for increased critical consideration of the multiple contextual environments that foster and sustain civic engagement program development in higher education.

## Research Questions

As an administrator undertaking an academic study of faculty development for engagement, I have found that qualitative inquiry has positioned me to think differently about the intentional mission, design, and resource management for developing a service-learning program over time, as I continue to operate as a reflexive practitioner in a developmental relationship with others toward mutually shared and built goals for the program. As such, with this study I aspire to answer Sandmann, et al.'s (2009) call to reveal "the underlying theoretical assumptions guiding decisions key to service-learning program planning and evolving partnerships among diverse stakeholders" while avoiding the more common uses of "acontextual approach[es] to curriculum and program planning in which social, historical, and political dimensions are not explicitly accounted for in the design, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs" (p. 18). Specifically, as a foundation for the continued development of service-learning programs to support and represent scholarly dimensions of engaged scholarship at William and Mary, this research sought to interpret

the impact of Boyer's (1990, 1996) scholarship of engagement as a theo-retical basis for program development and decision-making in the past and moving forward.

Three overarching questions framed this research:

1. What social, historical, and other institutional contexts have characterized, nurtured, or constrained the growth and development of engaged scholarship at William and Mary?
2. How have faculty, students, administrators, community partners, or others collaborated to effect institutional change with respect to program planning, design, resources, and implementation?
3. How might engaged scholars come to understand and specify scholarly dimensions of faculty work in engaged scholarship, given Boyer's (1990, 1996) critical frames for evaluation?

## Profile of the Sample

The College of William and Mary, founded in 1693, stands out among its peers in higher education as a small "public ivy" that ranks high among privately endowed institutions or research universities with larger student bodies. Second oldest in the nation, William and Mary is a state college that offers an affordable, quality education primarily to Virginia students; last year approximately 6,100 undergraduates and 2,100 graduate students enrolled in its 30 undergraduate and ten graduate programs and professional degree programs[1]. A four-year liberal arts university, William and Mary prides itself as a "fertile intellectual environment" where "profes-sors and students are partners in discovery" and shares publicly its faculty productivity in managing excellence in both teaching and research[2]. With a 12-to-1 student ratio, William and Mary boasts more recipients of the Commonwealth of Virginia's Outstanding Faculty Award than any other college or university in the state. Additionally, William and Mary faculty have won grants from the National Endowment of the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Fulbright Program, and others.

The College's emphasis on its liberal arts mission cannot be over-stated as a foundational indicator of civic engagement at William and Mary. Defining indicators of the college as a liberal arts institution that prioritizes excellence in teaching and research are the following goals within William and Mary's mission:

• To develop a diverse faculty which is nationally and internationally recognized for excellence in both teaching and research;

- To provide a challenging undergraduate program with a liberal arts and sciences curriculum that encourages creativity, independent thought, and intellectual depth, breadth, and curiosity;

While the college actively encourages leadership development for its high capacity student body, and hosts countless outreach, consultative, and applied scholarship partnerships through its graduate and professional schools, the institution relies heavily on intensive faculty-student relationships within its largely undergraduate infrastructure to develop academic and research skills in curricular-based engaged scholarship. For this study, I worked directly with faculty who developed program goals and content for first-year students enrolled in service-learning courses. Initially, observations pertained only to courses within a particular first-year student service-learning program funded in part by an endowed professorship and by internal staffing and programming funds, but later observations expanded to include program goals and courses taught in a newly developed community studies minor of application beyond the first-year curriculum.

The analysis presented here represents a summative abstraction of the program's development from archival information, interpreted from my administrative point of view as its director. It is informed by my experience teaching in the program in addition to leading its development. A different, more significant probing of faculty perspectives might constitute another study to be critically developed through follow up interviews with the other faculty of the program[3]; instead, the goal of this article is to reconsider public scholarship as it has emerged distinctively out of particular institutional contexts at William and Mary.

In 2001, William and Mary established the Sharpe Community Scholars Program – a first-year residential service-learning program named for a generous endowment by the late Robert F. Sharpe and his wife to support a professorship for the program, which is now organizationally located in the School of Arts and Sciences at the College. The Robert F. Sharpe and Jane A. Sharpe Professor of Civic Renewal Chair collaborates with the administrative director of the program to effectively reinforce the College's commitment to innovative teaching and research through integrative community engaged scholarship. The Sharpe Professorship is a three-year rotating appointment for which all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members across campus may apply, and stands as both a placeholder for maintaining focus on the centrality of faculty roles in civic engagement and a reserve for resources to stimulate and reward faculty participation engaged scholarship on campus.

Since the Sharpe Program selects between 50 and 75 admitted

students to enroll in courses specially designed to integrate academic study with community engagement, I as the administrative director of the program actively (and annually) recruit faculty to apply not only for the term professorship when it is available but also (often alternatively) to teach courses drawn from existing curricula within departments across several disciplines. All participating faculty are encouraged (and supported) to redevelop courses within their departments into newly designed offerings that integrate community engaged teaching and learning more deeply into the curriculum. Engaged scholarship at William and Mary is reliant not only on the teaching and research of the Sharpe Professor but also on coordinated collaboration among all of the program's teaching faculty with the administrative director.

Currently in its twelfth year at William and Mary, the Sharpe Community Scholars Program invites first-year students to enroll in courses that are specially designed by faculty to integrate academic study with community engagement, primarily through service-learning pedagogy. The sample of service-learning courses that represent the time of program development in this study includes 14 different classes that formed the foundation of community engaged learning for nearly 300 first-year students in the Sharpe Community Scholars Program between 2005 and 2010. The sample included eight academic disciplines, taught by ten faculty from across fields – social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, and education – and represents the full range of tenure-eligible professor ranks (assistant, associate, and full), in addition to adjunct and professional faculty. Nine out of the ten faculty in this sample returned at least a second time to teach in the program, which is fairly common, adapting versions of their courses based on shifts in pedagogy, topical content, and community partnering arrangements. Some courses were "home" to a single community partnership or volunteer site for students. For example, students volunteered in a local school or non-profit agency. Most courses involved several community partnerships for varying purposes: in order to integrate comparative perspectives across community engaged learning, feasibly divide intellectual and hands-on labor among 10-15 students, or by virtue of the professor's ongoing, established community relations.

## Foundational Indicators

As represented by the Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification in Community Engagement, institutional capacity for sustaining civic engagement is demonstrated by two foundational indicators: (1) institutional identity and culture (e.g., prioritization in mission statement, recognition and awards, assessment and use of assessment data, marketing) and (2) institutional commitment (e.g., executive leadership, coordinating infrastructure, internal budgetary allocations, external funding, fundrais-

ing, tracking and assessment tools for community engagement and related courses, strategic planning, faculty development, and community voice). Driscoll and Sandmann (2004) noted the importance of "institutional fit" for civic engagement:

> The match between institutional history, identity, and value system and how the campus embraces community will determine how successfully civic engagement is integrated into the life and work of the campus.  It will also have a significant impact on how well the scholarship of engagement is accepted and valued among the constituencies. (p. 55)

The Carnegie Classification in Community Engagement calls for continued attention to how colleges and universities develop, sustain, and evaluate the institutionalization of civic engagement in higher education (Driscoll, 2009).  The study reported on here focused on the following foundational indicators of civic engagement at William and Mary as critical contexts that inform identity and culture and institutional commitment to civic engagement: the college mission statement, socio-cultural evolution of a coordinating infrastructure, and strategic planning at multiple levels of leadership and development to ensure quality of learning, scholarship, and community partnering.  Each of these foundational indicators provides opportunities to reflect on the interstitial spaces within which faculty operate to accomplish community engaged teaching and research goals and suggests qualitative measures for revealing not only an organization's progress toward institutionalized civic engagement but also the value added to higher education's mission through faculty development toward engaged scholarship.

**Mission Statement**

The college mission statement defines in both explicit and implicit terms how a college or university values civic engagement.  As a public marker of core values, principle players, and teaching, research, and service goals, the mission statement offers a critical framework for understanding not only what the institution sees as its purpose but also it identifies who represents primary providers and beneficiaries of its major service and industry, how members of the organization implement and operate to accomplish goals, and why the organization functions as it does.  Some goals within a college mission statement are general and largely shared across institutions regionally and nationally, (e.g., "to attract outstanding students from diverse backgrounds," while others may be specific to the organization (e.g., "to address specific problems confronting the Commonwealth of Virginia") and thereby characterize the institution in ways that shape its representation and accreditation in other realms of evaluation (such state

accreditation or national classification schemes such as the Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning).  Importantly, college mission can determine frames for developing and evaluating the scholarship of engagement within a campus setting, both structurally and culturally (Driscoll, 2009; Holland, 2006; Ramaley, 2007).

William and Mary's foundational indicators of identity and culture prioritize civic engagement (and related philosophies of social justice) through specific commitments to public service within its mission statement:

- To attract outstanding students from diverse backgrounds;
- To offer high quality graduate and professional programs that prepare students for intellectual, professional, and public leadership;
- To instill in its students an appreciation for the human condition, a concern for the public well-being, and a life-long commitment to learning; and
- To use the scholarship and skills of its faculty and students to further human knowledge and understanding, and to address specific problems confronting the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation, and the world.

**A Coordinating Infrastructure for Institutional Change**

As a goal of this study was to make transparent the specific contexts out of which a focus on the scholarly dimensions of faculty work in engaged scholarship led to institutional change in civic engagement, in doing so it will characterize the types of change that the college has undertaken over the last 20 years, specifically with regard to faculty development in engaged scholarship.  Civic engagement grows out of an institution's story as much as it does out of the budgets and offices that manage curricular, co-curricular and outreach programs.  In some cases, infrastructure leads program development (for example, through an endowment or large grant start up; administrative revision of tenure and merit policy; or shift in program implementation).  In other cases, infrastructure may grow out of a grassroots expansion of cultural values, practice, and goals.  If engaged scholars can identify specifically how an institution approaches change, in the ebb and flow between structural and cultural dynamics of growth, we can better analyze key areas for further development.

Baer, Duin, and Ramaley (2008) identified three types of change in higher education (e.g., routine, strategic, and transformational) with associated approaches to managing change (e.g., problem solving, planning focus, leadership and core competencies, engagement, and accountability).

Their characterizations of organizational approaches to change are useful schema for identifying and categorizing institutional cornerstones and critical moments of change. Similarly, Bolman and Deal (2003) described organizational processes in terms of structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames that capture multiple realities and a full range of activities in processes of planning, decision-making, reorganizing, and evaluating (see Table 15.1, p. 385 in *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*). An organizational processes framework allows for the possibility of multiple divisions, parties, and contexts to contribute to change within higher education, the authority for which is sometimes defined and determined by location within higher education organizations. Furthermore, Bolman and Deal (2003) reframed the notion of leadership to look beyond talents and styles embedded with individual personalities or characterized by social demographics to prioritize contexts of practice in determining leadership strategy and approaches.

**Strategic Planning**

Organizational change to support civic engagement at William and Mary was formed soundly out of core principles within the College's mission, a strategic plan for civic engagement, and the emergent culture of service that resulted from the plan. In sum, the initial strategic plan for civic engagement at William and Mary upheld two primary features: (1) providing extraordinary learning opportunities through volunteerism for exceptional students and (2) establishing the premise of academic integrity to faculty expertise and professionalism.

In 1994, William and Mary undertook the process of organizational change to support and sustain civic engagement as part of a broader institutional strategic plan. The 1994 Strategic Plan for William and Mary named the following areas for developing public service: curriculum, faculty, student activities, and expanded outreach.

Student engagement led institutional change, as the College began efforts with the establishment of the Office of Student Volunteer Services (OSVS) within the Student Activities Office of the Student Affairs Division. The primary goal was to "[promote] a 'culture of service' at the College, [increase] participation in public and community service, and [develop] service involvement as an educational experience" (W&M Digital Archive, 1999)[4]. Student engagement in volunteerism began to expand from philanthropic events coordinated by campus student organizations and the work of the community engagement director to build local community partnerships initially to later support on-going education and mentoring partnerships, as well as domestic and international volunteer services trips.

Although the College's strategic plan made specific and intentional reference to faculty member's academic roles as essential for "focus, stimulation, and reward," initial resources (internal and external) prioritized student development and outreach as key forces for civic engagement change on campus, driven as much by public funding availability as the College's ability to match resources with internal funds.

The following descriptive analysis of organizational change and faculty development toward community engaged scholarship at William and Mary identifies specific institutional contexts as instrumental and meaningful determinants of the value and promise of faculty scholarship in advancing civic engagement in higher education. Additional focus on faculty development within course work sheds light on strategies which may prove effective in creating change with integrity to the core values and practices of an integrative, scholarship of engagement at a given institution.

## Infrastructure Contexts for Developing Public Scholarship

The Sharpe Program was well into the sixth year of curricular-engaged faculty participation and student enrollment in 2007, when then Provost, Geoffrey Feiss, organized a campus-wide writing group comprised of executive leaders, faculty, program coordinators, Deans, public relations administration, students, and community partners to discuss and develop a plan for re-organizing and representing civic engagement as a cornerstone phenomenon of the William and Mary experience. An unusually large group of over 25, this committee deliberated over the span of nearly a year to collectively brainstorm ways to represent and support the College's growth in civic engagement, not only in the professional and graduate schools where outreach and consultative applied scholarship was thriving but now among undergraduates. In 2002, OSVS offered its first international service-learning trip and by 2008, peaked in organizing a total of 16 international service experiences for undergraduate students.

Simultaneously in 2007, both directors (of the Sharpe program in Academic Affairs and of OSVS in Student Affairs) were engaged in on-going dialogue with students, faculty, administrators, and community partners (through an ad hoc Service-Learning Curriculum and Coordinating Committee, SLCCC) who were interested in developing an academic minor program in response to student demand for sustained curricular opportunities beyond the first year to combine academic study with community engagement and partnering. The committee (which was smaller than the Provost's writing group and focused deliberately on curriculum and faculty) invited its members to examine critically many of the challenges inherent to a scholarship of engagement mentioned in the above review of literature: (a) coordination of a "scholarship of teaching" faculty develop-

ment program that draws faculty into alignment with program values and goals through collaborative, reflexive practice, (b) retention, and eventually prioritization, of key elements of a scholarship of discovery as driving the new curriculum, (c) an emergent scholarship of integration that stretches faculty work beyond interdisciplinary boundaries to consider research practice and intention across fields of community interaction and relationships, and (d) development of curricular structure to support cultivating a scholarship of application with and within communities, as feasibly and mutually determined between faculty and community partners, given student capacity.

A critical outcome of the Provost's 2007 writing group was the symbolic strategy to merge and co-locate former OSVS and the Sharpe program in a combined office, now known as the Office of Community Engagement and Scholarship (OCES)[5]. The continuing directors of community engagement and engaged scholarship programs remained within their respective divisions of Student and Academic Affairs, but were jointly charged with identifying and maximizing opportunities for managing organizational efficiency and synergies between programs. The Office of Community Engagement and Scholarship was officially co-located and in operation in the fall of 2009. Also in 2009, William and Mary's faculty approved the Community Studies minor program, the design and proposal for which was developed collaboratively by the SLCCC (described above), as a structured program within Arts and Sciences' Interdisciplinary Studies curriculum. Faculty approval of the minor was based largely on the shared reassurance of institutional leaders (the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences at the time) to fund an additional professorship annually to support the minor, modeled after the Sharpe endowed professorship. The W&M Professor of Community Studies professorship was a human resource strategy that ultimately fortified structural support for institutionalizing curricular-based civic engagement, and, again, symbolically and resourcefully represented the centrality of faculty roles and leadership. Finally, a simultaneous initiative to stimulate and support undergraduate research at the time created a sufficient knowledge base among faculty, for recognizing and appreciating the academic goals of the minor, as research-driven.

## Interpreting Meaning from an Institutional Analysis of Engagement

In its earliest years of planning for civic engagement, the College's leaders drew on a strategic process to mobilize symbolic, structural, and human resources in order to cultivate a culture of service and create a structure that would integrate multiple perspectives in carrying the trajectory of civic engagement at the College. The latter years aspired to a transforma-

tional process that remains to be completed, perhaps with implementation of other elements of change identified in the literature (Baer, Duin, & Ramaley, 2008; Bolman & Deal, 2003). The present representation of change is not intended to suggest that there was never dissent among specifically involved parties, legitimate concern or critiques over resources or other matters; nor does it acknowledge in particular the absence of key stakeholders or groups or individuals who perhaps questioned or challenged change at various points. Notably, the 1994 strategic plan's description of civic engagement most accurately predicts and characterizes a scholarship of application and integration that is now extensively represented by the outreach scholarship and partnerships developed in William and Mary's graduate schools of Education, Law, and Business, or the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences, for example.

The conceptual (and practical) frontier for an authentic scholarship of engagement at William and Mary, remains at the undergraduate level, where faculty are charged to lead a liberal arts education, train early community engaged researchers, and maintain productive research agendas of their own. For public liberal arts institutions, where these factors blur neatly within a political frame of the "best that higher education has to offer," the challenges for creating a supportive growth infrastructure alongside tensions for faculty managing productivity in all areas mentioned above are numerous. Sandmann, et al. (2009) call for attention to five dimensions of a proposed model for service-learning program planning: research, relationships, roles and responsibilities, representation, and resources. The timeline above offers some historical context for understanding the values, traditions, and strategic processes by which William and Mary managed change toward institutionalizing civic engagement. The remaining analysis shifts to focus on specified elements of program planning at the College.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

Within the newly established infrastructure of the Office of Community Engagement and Scholarship, the Director of Engaged Scholarship is primarily responsible for managing and coordinating curricular-based programs in the Arts and Sciences for undergraduates, including the Sharpe Program. Administratively located in Academic Affairs, the Sharpe director reports to the Dean of Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies in the Arts and Sciences, who is director of the Charles Center (which "strives to support student and faculty excellence"). More specifically, the Sharpe Community Scholars Program strives to support the development of select first-year students through the integration of academic studies, research and community engagement.[6] As an academic administrator of engaged scholarship programs, the Sharpe director role encompasses a range of responsibilities – from administration and coordination, teaching, student

development, faculty development, and outreach (in scholarly and public media forms).  From the vantage point of academic administration, this combination of roles affords a view of the program that includes history, design, and adaptive changes that respond to outcomes.

## Relationships

Engaged scholars have argued that sustained, authentic engagement requires attention at the department level for cultivating faculty participation (Kecskes, 2008).  The Sharpe Program's curriculum structure is designed to support faculty, as well as student development.  Throughout the academic year preceding the fall semester, the academic administrator recruits faculty to participate in the program by redesigning an existing course to integrate community engagement or partnering as part of the core content, principles, or theories within the course.  Some faculty choose to create entirely new courses, which in most cases are offered within their home academic departments and disciplines.  In exchange for their participation, faculty are supported with a salary stipend and undergraduate teaching fellows to manage communications, logistics, and other aspects of community engaged teaching and learning.  Sharpe faculty are also required to participate in a faculty development seminar, to work together in revising courses to form a cohesive, academically grounded program around mutually identified ethical and theoretical values of the program, which are additionally reinforced for students through a 1-credit co-enrollment course required of all Sharpe students.  As such, they form an early "community of practice" (Briggs, 2007) who collectively engage in the reflexive practice of reviewing syllabi, pedagogical issues, and integrative teaching components of their course including community partnering matters.

## Resources

In the early spring of each calendar year, students who are newly admitted to the college are invited to apply for enrollment in a faculty designed community engaged learning course that is embedded within departments in the arts and sciences, or other schools when available.  The co-enrollment structure of the Sharpe program – wherein students take credit-bearing courses within academic disciplines and also take a common program course that threads skills-based, community engaged learning objectives with discipline-based seminars – creates an opportunity for both faculty and students to explore, develop and advance fundamental skills in combining teaching, learning and community engagement.  In addition to the Sharpe Professorship, and salary stipends for all teaching faculty, the program funds allocate support for each course to include employment of Teaching Fellows who are usually (advanced) undergraduate, but sometimes graduate students who support faculty development and management

of the integrative aspects of the service-learning courses, partnerships, outreach and research.  Depending on the course and community partnering arrangements, Teaching Fellows contribute the following range of support to faculty work in engaged scholarship: discussion facilitation on content as well as reading and writing skills, logistics management for transportation and coordinating administrative and research-based meetings between students and community partners, and assisting with developing students' academic skills for writing, evaluating, reporting, and sharing knowledge in a variety of public domains.

**Research (and Representation)**

With the 2009 formation of the Community Studies minor, the Sharpe program's 1-credit course offering was moved into the minor in order to align community engaged learning objectives across curricular engagement programs.  The interdisciplinary minor in Community Studies is designed to prepare students for community-based research and emphasizes the academic relevance of multiple disciplines for  understanding and responding to social issues and concerns in local, regional, and global communities; the collaboration of scholars with and within communities as part of developing research plans and strategies for implementing social or policy change; and the integration core principles of ethical and rigorous academic research with practical strategies for effective community engagement.  The Community Studies minor requires a minimum of 18 credit hours that include introductory, methods, and theory seminars in addition to elective course work leading to research.  Also required is a minimum of 60 hours in a sustained community engagement/partnering commitment that is directly correspondent to student's indicated research interest, the development of which is supervised by faculty.

The flexibility of self-design and individually articulated interests as managed within structured course work were an intentional integration of the cultural foundations of civic engagement at William and Mary (e.g., starting with and emanating from student initiative and capacity) with faculty and community knowledge systems.  Faculty instructors and advisors in Sharpe represent a range of faculty from varied disciplines, all of whom guide Community Studies students in developing an academic plan to build research skills and knowledge as part of a sustained commitment to community engagement as a strategy for both learning and action.  While scholars have argued that advising does not itself constitute authentic faculty scholarship (Rubin, 2000), William and Mary's Community Studies faculty advisors (including the director) constitute experts within distinctive fields of study and practice, guiding students directly and critically through an ethical practice of the scholarship of engagement.  True to the concept of a "community of practice," Community Studies faculty form standards for

demonstrating scholarly merit and align those standards with the institutional review board for managing ethics in community engaged research for undergraduates. They additionally link discipline-based course work and faculty research projects to interdisciplinary considerations in community engaged scholarship and negotiate partnerships that are educational to students and valuable to communities, while finding resources to support and develop students' capacity for continuing in community-based research (Barge, et al., 2008).

Researchers have argued that faculty role integration within and between departments (as researchers, advisors, and professionals) is necessary for sustaining faculty participation in engaged scholarship (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006). From the academic administrative perspective, faculty role integration within Community Studies is an organic and significant indicator of institutionalization of civic engagement, especially within small, liberal arts colleges and universities where the emphasis is placed equally on maintaining academic integrity to the liberal arts mission in teaching service-learning courses, and maintaining an active research with governance profile for faculty merit and scholarship expectations.

In their analysis of Carnegie documentation data, Weerts and Sandmann (2010) found that faculty who expanded their roles beyond the traditional boundaries of teaching and research to more fully integrate elements of service created spaces, connections, and enterprises that constituted indicators of institutionalized civic engagement at large research universities. I would argue that these issues apply to smaller, liberal arts institutions that also emphasize research and high impact student learning and also suggests that a further set of issues remain important for the enterprise of developing engaged scholarship programs at smaller institutions: (a) managing internal mandates for vision/mission alignment with programs and practices, as prioritized over external measures of progress and varied sources of funding, private and public; (b) confronting significant cultural and philosophically-driven changes in smaller contexts, over structural or policy changes as indicators of progress and quality of programming; and (c) substantiating a deeper, qualitative representation of the scholarship of engagement as a precursor to demonstrating change through quantitative measures of growth, which then fortifies the scholarship of engagement as foundational for higher education generally, not merely as the countercurrent, comparison to traditional research output by faculty.

# Implications for a Public Scholarship Reconsidered

## Boyer's Categories

Boyer's (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered has become, of course, a critical platform used by higher education scholars to identify the decline, transformation, or perhaps relocation of faculty work in ways that align with traditional ways of evaluating scholarship, such as tenure, merit, and promotion policies.  In some aspects, debate over Boyer's conceptions of faculty scholarship has led scholars to question what counts and what does not count as scholarship, including significant questioning of whether Scholarship Reconsidered is itself misguided or misused (Rubin, 2000).  Part of this critical debate grounds faculty scholarship in the social founda-tions of education by focusing instead on student learning as embedded within civic philosophies and pedagogies for preparing active, productive citizens for society (Dewey, 1933; Freire, 2000), while others use Boyer to identify and assess high impact practices, in some cases making con-nections to other scholarship in diversity, student affairs, and co-curricular dimensions of higher education (see Kuh, 2008, for example).

Boyer (1990) explained that "[t]he scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university.  Not just the outcomes, but the process, and especially the passion, give meaning to the effort" (17). This observation is especially true when creating learning experiences for undergraduate students, experiences that are aimed to train and develop stu-dents toward community engaged scholarship.  Research for faculty experts and teachers is an entirely different enterprise than it is for undergraduate student learners, and additionally different for community practitioners – each drawing on different reserves for knowledge and resources, each accountable to different measures for making progress, achieving efficacy in specified outcomes.  The critical task for academic administrators of engaged scholarship programs is to match faculty expertise in both teach-ing and research fields with students' interdisciplinary learning needs, and additionally, to support faculty development and leadership in managing community partnerships that enhance learning and pose opportunities for mutual exchange.

A "scholarship of teaching," according to Boyer represents "the highest form of understanding" (Aristotle qtd. in Boyer 1990).  Briggs (2007) makes a case that curricular renewal and reform is often best fa-cilitated by faculty collaborations, but clarifies the work as the product of a community of practice more or less dependent upon institutional sup-port, departmental influences, and faculty incentives and purpose for being involved.  Briggs suggests that out of a community of practice springs

"scholarly teaching," building on the work of Hutchings and Shulman (1999). According to Hutchings and Shulman, scholarly teaching "entails… certain practices of classroom assessment and evidence gathering . . . informed not only by the latest ideas of the field but by current ideas about teaching the field . . . [and] invites peer collaboration and review" (In Briggs 2007, 704). Service-learning programs often begin with best practices in the scholarship of teaching, with program administrators compiling resources, convening collaborative groups to share course development plans and integrating syllabi with program goals.

Boyer's "scholarship of application" is a complicated analytical category for engaged scholars interested in understanding faculty and student scholarship as an integrative endeavor. Faculty participation in service-learning or engaged scholarship programs is commonly understood, evaluated, (and sometimes undertaken) as governance or service. As such, faculty participation (and evaluations of faculty work) might constitute misguided frames for undertaking engaged scholarship. Specifically, Boyer draws a clear distinction between "citizenship activities and projects that relate to scholarship itself:" "…Service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor—the accountability—traditionally associated with research activities" (22). The scholarship of application for faculty work presupposes foundational knowledge and extensive experience in the discovery processes and parameters for adequate research. Similarly, community engaged learning is often misunderstood (or even dismissed) as the scholarship of application, whereby scholars attempt to assess the intellectual value of engaged scholarship by examining the merit of students' "applied knowledge" in a field setting.

Boyer's "scholarship of integration" describes a domain of interdisciplinary overlap in scholarship, not merely between and among academic disciplines, but importantly between the research and activity of both educator and practitioner fields of knowledge. The scholarship of integration, as a critical pedagogical strategy, is an intentional, intellectual pursuit of scholarship that makes connections between fields.

The scholarship of integration practiced by faculty might better articulate the intersections between student learning and faculty teaching at the undergraduate level, both with and within communities and partnerships as contexts for generating knowledge. Faculty consideration of students' capacity for research beyond pedagogical goals of learning with and within community settings is a critical first step toward the scholarship of application for undergraduates, if the quality of research and partnership is to be effective and useful to community partners. It is precisely within

this vortex of relations – e.g., faculty, student, community – that academic administrators are challenged to manage and evaluate curricular-based engaged scholarship in terms of:

1. Faculty assessment and management of student capacity for conducting applied research within the design of the course and community partnership; and
2. Curricular design to develop and train students toward completing competent and ethical community-based research.

Key qualities of "authentic" public scholarship for undergraduates may be debated within the contexts of colleges and universities, by scholars (e.g., faculty, students, and administrators) within a community of practice. Still, we must articulate a broad baseline for understanding the conception and practice of community engaged scholarship in multiple contexts and higher educational settings, and including community partners. While the timeline described earlier in this article offers some historical context for understanding the values, traditions, and strategic processes by which William and Mary managed change toward institutionalizing civic engagement, it also serves as the basis of preliminary analysis for this researcher to move forward in developing program and institutional assessments of engaged scholarship as the program's administrative director. See Appendix A for an encapsulated, qualitative review of the nature of community partnerships and projects as observed by the academic administrative director using Boyer's conceptions of faculty scholarship[7]. Follow up with the teaching faculty and community partners to corroborate the interpretive framework applied across courses for this study is a warranted next step. In the researcher's view such an undertaking would yield better results; however, using a different methodology (intensive interviews, for example) to make a different, nonetheless important case for attention to faculty and community reported experiences in engaged scholarship, in synthesis with philosophical assumptions and practices that went into the program's planning. An attempt to represent or evaluate those experiences using the current data would likely misrepresent the complexity of perspectives, actions, and shifts that actually occurred, while also offering a misleading evaluation of the quality of faculty teaching, research, independent of other measures of merit and productivity which are external to the program.

## Public Scholarship Reconsidered

Additional research on program curriculum and the structure of engaged scholarship partnerships inherent therein will allow administrators and faculty to frame an understanding of their work within the contexts of integrative scholarship, as characterized and co-navigated by faculty, students, and community partners through shared philosophical values as well

as emergent, practical decisions.  The current systematic, qualitative documentation of the conceptual and practical processes that form the program is a critical step toward developing assessment tools that will more adequately report the value added to campuses and communities who endeavor to support an integrative scholarship of engagement toward accountability. Value-added measures are often already embedded in a university's system for managing assessment, but academic administrators who manage and coordinate curricular-based engagement programs can move proactively in the direction of assessing the program's progress with customized attention to institutional contexts, philosophical and theoretical assumptions, and specific elements of program planning and implementation.

For example, as Community Studies students demonstrated their capacity for engaging community-based research with faculty at William and Mary, participating faculty and academic administrators found they had more to learn about developing student capacity for research with faculty with and within communities.  (See Appendix B for a summary of first-year assessments.)  The manifold implications for an public scholarship reconsidered are revealed by this preliminary study.

First, engaged scholars (especially academic administrators of curricular-based community engagement) are in a position to demonstrate the relevance and value of qualitative research in forming a more broadly conceived scholarship of engagement than the current literature bears. There are several conceptual and theoretical models on which to draw (Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Clayton, P.H., 2007; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010).  This study makes use of the conceptual literature on organizational change and leadership to identify the strategies and processes the led an institutional movement to support civic engagement at William and Mary, and Boyer's conceptions of faculty scholarship to characterize program development.  Qualitative data may complicate some conceptions, but start the process for recognizing data points within conceptual quadrants and categories of integrative, scholarly activity.

Second, academic administrators are in a critical position to design faculty role integration within the curricular structure of engaged scholarship programs.  Doing so structures both time and priority to support faculty experiences as leaders, mediators, negotiators, and specialists in integrative scholarship.  Flexibility in how faculty development is designed into the program allows faculty the benefit of allocating time between departments and managing their autonomy in determining how to represent and structure relationships between departments or organizations.  (The potential disadvantage to this approach is that it can render research aspects of faculty work in engaged scholarship invisible to evaluating parties.) Academic administrators are challenged to find ways of representing en-

gaged scholarship as scholarship for both internal and external audiences.

Finally, engaged scholars must recognize the multidirectional influences of knowledge systems within fields of practice. The scholarship of engagement bears impact on how higher education organizations come to understand and value engaged scholarship as scholarship and, likewise, higher education research that reveals what actually occurs in faculty work in varied settings can shape and influence knowledge, assessment, and reporting on the scholarship of engagement for colleges and universities. Qualitative research meaningfully reveals the practice as dynamic and structured within unique contexts of structure and culture that are neither bound nor limited to quantifications of practice, publication, or partnership. As a research community, administrators and faculty who are engaged scholars are in a position to reveal the complexity of the scholarship of engagement as a foundational feature of higher education, while pushing for internal and external accommodation of more robust programming and representation of institutional practices.

# Notes

[1] See https://www.wm.edu/wmataglance/index.php.  (Last accessed 5/31/2012).

[2] See http://www.wm.edu/about/wmdifference/knowledgecreation/index.php.  (Last accessed 5/31/2012).

[3] For example, the recent studies conducted by the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement (Michigan State University, University Outreach and Engagement) set a somewhat new research agenda for understanding faculty work in engaged scholarship by analyzing faculty descriptions about their work (see Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2011) and documenting a typology of scholarship by faculty with successful tenure outcomes (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2009).

[4] See https://digitalarchive.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/16521/studenthandbook199900coll.pdf?sequence=1.

[5] The Office of Community Engagement and Scholarship serves as a resource for faculty for the integration of engaged teaching and research, supports students in their development as active citizens and scholars, and develops partnerships with communities as central missions of the University.

[6] The program's mission statement was recently updated in February 2009 by a group of Sharpe students, as part of an independent study class "Engagement Communications and Outreach."

[7] The names of courses, faculty, departments, and faculty rank were omitted from this presentation of information to protect the identities and potential evaluative impact on participants with the program.

[8] Characterizations of scholarship are drawn from program records on course and project outcomes, syllabi, notes from meetings with faculty, documentation and recognition of faculty integration and publication in the scholarship of engagement field, and a myriad of developmental conversations that both challenged and guided outcomes toward shared teaching and learning goals for academically based community engagement at William and Mary.

# References

Barge, J. Kevin, et al. (2008). A practitioner view toward engaged scholarship. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 245-250.

Barge, J. K., and Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). Engaged scholarship and the creation of useful organizational knowledge. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 251-265.

Bolman, L. and Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York: Wiley, John and Sons, Inc.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. B*ulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*, 18-33.

Briggs, C.L. (2007). Curriculum collaboration: A key to continuous program renewal. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(6), 676-711.

Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Holland, B. (2007). Conceptualizing civic engagement: Orchestrating change at a metropolitan university. M*etropolitan Universities, 18*(3), 57-74.

Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Clayton, P.H. (2007). The scholarship of civic engagement: Defining, documenting, and evaluating faculty work. *To Improve the Academy, 25*, 257-179.

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of engagement in higher education*. NY: Palgrave.

Colbeck, C. and Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 105,* 17-26.

Collier, P. J., and Williams, D.R. (2005). Reflection in action: the learning-doing relationship. In Cress, C.M., Collier P.J., Reitenauer and Associates (eds.), *Learning through serving* (pp. 83-98). Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Creswell, J. W. (2004). *Qualitative research and design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think. A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process,* (rev. ed.). Boston: D.C. Heath.

Doberneck, D.M., Glass, C.R. and Schweitzer, J.H. (2009). Scholarly out reach and engagement reported by successfully tenured faculty at

Michigan State University, 2002-2006. Retrieved from http://nc sue.msu.edu/files/typology-092509.pdf

Driscoll, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirminghigher education's role in community. *New Directions for Higher Education, 147*, 5-12.

Driscoll, A. and Sandmann, L. (2004). Roles and responsibilities of academic administrators: Supporting the scholarship of civic engagement. In M. Langseth & W. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning* (pp. 51-68). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Glass, C.R., Doberneck, D.M., Schweitzer, J.H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*, 7-29.

Holland, B.A. (2006). Levels of commitment to community engagement, characterized by key organizational factors evidencing relevance to institutional mission.
Retrieved from http://irt2.indstate.edu/nca2010/assets/pdf/se/com mitment.pdf

Huber, M.T. and Hutchings, P. (2007). *Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Hutchings, P. and L. S. Shulman. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change 31*(5), 10–15.

Keckes, K. (2008). Creating engaged departments: Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of community engagement in academic departments. Retrieved from http://www.pdx.edu/sites/ www.pdx.edu.cae/files/Engaged%20Department%20RUBRIC%20 -%20Kecskes%202009-paginated.pdf

Keckes, K. (2008). Engagement in the disciplines. *The Department Chair, 18*(3), 16-18.

Kuh, G. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Ramaley, J.A. (2007). Reflections on the public purposes of higher education. *Wingspread Journal, 5*-10.

Sandmann, L.R., Kiely, R.C., and Grenier, R.S. (2009). Program planning: The neglected dimension of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(2), 17-33.

Weerts,  D.J. and Sandmann, L.R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 81*, 632-657.

## Appendix A: Qualitative Summary of the Scholarship of Engagement in Structured, Academic Programs with Community Engagement at W&M, 2006-10[8]

| Year and Program | Course | Nature of Scholarship |
|---|---|---|
| **2006** | | |
| **Sharpe Program** | Course1 | Integration/Teaching |
| | Course2 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course3 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course4 | Integration/Teaching |
| | Course5 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| **2007** | | |
| **Sharpe Program** | Course6 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course2 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course4 | Integration/Teaching |
| | Course7 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course3 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| **2008** | | |
| **Sharpe Program** | Course2 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course8 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course1 | Discovery/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course3 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| **2009** | | |
| **Sharpe Program** | Course6 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course2 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course9 | Integration/Teaching |
| | Course10 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course3 | Integration/Teaching |
| **Community Studies Minor** | Course6 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course2 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| **2010** | | |
| **Sharpe Program** | Course6 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course8 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course13 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course10 | Application/Integration/Teaching |
| **Community Studies Minor** | Course11 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course12 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |
| | Course14 | Discovery/Application/Integration/Teaching |

# Appendix B: First-Year Assessment of Community Studies Minor at W&M, 2009-2010

| Student Learning Outcomes | Faculty Teaching, Research, Governance |
|---|---|
| Faculty recognized student needs and challenges in making research progress and forming authentic community partnerships particularly in early stages of development in entry level courses. | Curriculum and program development required attention to content and student progress; an advisory committee and core course professors agreed to require sequential outcomes from one course to the next (e.g., literature review and faculty sponsorship for students) prior to their enrollment in the Method s course. |
| In advanced courses in the Minor, faculty found that students with an established concentration major offered the additional advantage of working with other disciplines to match faculty advisors for students' progress toward sustained community engaged research. | As an Interdisciplinary minor, Community Studies requires broad knowledge across disciplines (in teaching and research) in order to facilitate appropriate student advising and applied expertise in fields that require specified knowledge. |
| Community partnerships presented a vulnerable dynamic for students (and faculty), requiring extensive cultivation and tending in order to move students beyond exploratory phases to more directed research productivity. | Faculty in the core courses were required to engage in extensive advising with students on a variety of topics, partnership, and research skills; faculty advising requires collaboration with other departments and sometimes community practitioners in order to sustain timely progress for students developing engaged scholarship. |

## Author

**Monica D. Griffin, Ph.D.,** is Director of Engaged Scholarship and the Sharpe Community Scholars Program at the College of William and Mary. Griffin has over 15 years of teaching experience in higher education and nearly a decade of experience in facilitating student learning in community-based partnerships and settings.  Griffin's research interests include integrative teaching and learning dynamics in higher education (with attention to community engagement); race, class, and gender studies; and community health. Griffin also directs the Community Studies program at the College.