© Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, Volume 28, Number 2, p. 23, (2024)
 eISSN 2164-8212

Bridging the Gap Between Faculty Motivations and Institutional Aspirations Using the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment Rubric

Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Kevin G. Guerrieri, and Colton C. Strawser

Abstract

This article examines faculty motivation to integrate community engagement (CE) into teaching and research, in relation to faculty identity, rank and status, experience, and faith. Building upon previous research that focused on intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, our study also examined the role of an institutional definition of CE with clear criteria, as outlined by the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) rubric, in the motivational cycles of faculty reflection on current and aspirational aspects of CE. Surprisingly, our results illustrate that even when colleges and universities support CE across the institution, faculty may not be significantly motivated by this expressed valuing of CE. Importantly, our findings indicate that faculty would like to achieve the aspirational status on all criteria, pointing to the potential for the rubric to bridge the gap between institutional mission and individual faculty motivations. Enhancing this alignment may increase sustained and meaningful impact on the community.

Keywords: community engagement (CE), faculty motivation, institutional assessment, CEIA rubric, faith-based institution

Higher education's commitment to public purposes and the common good is manifested in many different actions, including community engagement (CE), which can be conceptualized using a wide range of taxonomies, spectra, and matrices within any given institution (Holton et al., 2015; Janke & Medlin, 2015; Starke et al., 2017). Similarly, at the individual level, community-engaged faculty members' trajectories can be extremely diverse, given the plethora of fields, disciplinary paradigms, and departmental cultures that collectively comprise the academic institution, especially at larger universities. Moreover, it is not uncommon that a faculty member's degree of involvement in CE varies at different stages of their career and throughout professional and personal life transitions. For these reasons, the university's efforts to develop a collective understanding of CE must be continual, expansive, and inclusive—in order to support faculty in their varying positions, positionalities, and unique circumstances—while also defining guiding principles of CE and a developmental path that align with the institutional identity, mission, and vision.

This article is part of a broader ongoing exploration of the spaces between, on the one hand, institutional discourses and practices of CE and, on the other, the diverse range of motivations that lead individual faculty members to commit to, implement, and carry out the work over the long term. Ultimately, in general terms, CE's potential for sustained and meaningful positive impact in the community, aimed at contributing to structural and systemic change through a social justice lens, inevitably depends on a critical mass or scalability. Likewise, the same applies to the need to support a wide range of methodological approaches and disciplinary frameworks for the work of CE. Accordingly, a greater understanding of motivations can potentially strengthen the recruitment, professional development, and support of faculty in this work.

Literature Review on Faculty Motivations

Some important research on faculty motivations has been conducted previously. For example, in their research focused on exemplar engaged scholars, which utilized a document analysis of Erlich nominee essays, O'Meara (2008) determined seven categories of faculty motivation: (1) to facilitate student learning and growth; (2) to achieve disciplinary goals; (3) personal commitments to specific social issues, places, and people; (4) personal/professional identity; (5) pursuit of rigorous scholarship and learning; (6) a desire for collaboration, relationships, partners, and public-making; and (7) institutional type and mission, appointment type, and/or an enabling reward system and culture for community engagement (p. 14). The author emphasized that these categories were often interrelated, had areas of overlap, and included internal aspects that required disentangling (pp. 23–24). In their revision of a previously designed Faculty Engagement Model from 2009, Demb and Wade (2012), in turn, identified 23 different factors that influence faculty engagement, which they organized into four broader dimensions: (1) institutional (mission, type, leadership, budget, etc.); (2) professional (tenure status, faculty rank, etc.); (3) personal (race/ethnicity, gender, personal values, etc.); and (4) communal (socialization, department support, discipline support, etc.). In their discussion, the authors underscored that "faculty choice about participation needs to be understood as a multidimensional phenomenon, which balances the multiple roles they are asked to perform" (p. 364). Building upon studies such as these, Morrison and Wagner (2016) emphasized the need to base faculty typologies and classifications on the "participants' own internal perceptions and their overall perspective rather than their responses to the researcher's specifically defined and operationalized variables" (p. 8). In order to achieve a more nuanced understanding of faculty motivation and perhaps challenge existing conceptualizations, the authors proposed using Q methodology, in which the participants themselves sort each of the multiple factors in relation to the others, such that varied points of view are captured and the complexity of faculty engagement is not oversimplified.

In response to the challenge of managing the complexity of multiple factors, Darby and Newman (2014) followed a different approach to examining faculty engagement: applying Bandura's (1997) motivational theory led them to view "motivation not as a sum of factors that encourage or discourage faculty members' persistence in the pedagogy, but as a cyclical process that continually influences faculty members' motivation with each academic service-learning experience" (p. 117). In their coding of interview transcripts, the researchers identified four themes—"(1) faculty members' goals, (2) faculty members' expectations, (3) faculty members' perceived successes, and (4) faculty members' perceived challenges"—and then created a model aimed at illustrating "how faculty members' motivation is contingent on a cycle of reflection that occurs before and after an academic service-learning course" (pp. 98–99). A key finding from this study, which is directly related to the present article, is that "anticipatory cognitive motivators, in the form of cognized goals and outcome expectancies, fueled their motivation to pursue the academic service-learning experience and provided a framework through which to examine its successes and failures" (p. 100). This observation points to two key underlying questions: How can the motivational cycles of individual faculty members be better aligned with institutional objectives, and how is CE collectively understood at the institutional level?

With regard to institutional type, broadly speaking, O'Meara (2008) echoed previous studies (Holland, 1999; O'Meara 2002b; Ward 2003) in affirming that "strong preexisting service missions at the institutional level favorably influence faculty engagement," and of the engaged scholars whose essays she analyzed, "50 percent noted motivations for their service-learning and engagement related to institutional type and mission" (p. 22). The interplay among an institution's type and mission; its reward systems; and faculty members' work allocation, motivations, and involvement in service-learning and CE has long constituted a fundamental space for examination and reform. For over three decades now, since Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, there have been calls for expanding definitions of scholarship, reconfiguring hierarchies of knowledge production, and institutionalizing CE, all of which is reflected in many studies that focus on interrelated aspects of these broad efforts (for example, Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Eatman et al., 2018; Furco,

1999, 2002; O'Meara, 2002a, 2005, 2006; Saltmarsh et al., 2019).

Although some advances have been achieved in this transformation, Eatman et al. (2017) underscored that "many faculty members who identify as publicly engaged scholars are often discouraged and made vulnerable by existing tenure and promotion policies" (p. 363). Formal policy reforms may help candidates feel more comfortable about emphasizing CE in their applications, but, as O'Meara (2005) suggested, "without necessarily changing their chances of success at the decision point" (p. 507). This contradiction is a persistent and deep-rooted challenge: In an article published a decade later, O'Meara et al. (2015) continued to highlight that "even at institutions that are among the most engaged in their local communities, reform of tenure and promotion guidelines has not accomplished much more than the incorporation of definitional and valuing language" (p. 56). Finally, it must be emphasized here that, as Sdvizhkov et al. (2022) have argued, the reform of these guidelines and recognition for community-engaged scholarship and public engagement also have diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice implications for faculty in non-tenure-track ranks and other employees. It follows that, although the institution type—referring here to those with an explicit service mission or ones considered or classified as more engaged—may influence faculty engagement positively, vital gaps remain in their reward systems across campus.

Also in relation to institution type, the question arises as to the role of faith-based missions and identities in faculty motivation. Specifically in reference to faith-based institutions, Demb and Wade (2012) asserted that the "research seems to be fairly consistent and shows that private, two-year and religiously affiliated institutions are more likely to engage with the community" (p. 342) and "faculty at private universities, Catholic, or religious institutions had higher levels of engaged scholarship as compared to those at public universities" (p. 343). Some faculty and CE professionals at faith-based institutions conceive of their work and faith as intertwined and inseparable in that their professional work is a lived expression of their faith (Green et al., 2020). Similarly, the faith-based values of some institutions are inextricably linked to both students' overall education and their role in service to others and in response to injustice; this connection is exemplified in the stated principles of Jesuit higher education (Sweetman et al., 2020).

Nonetheless, tensions exist in the context of CE at faith-based institutions. Some approaches to engagement that are implemented may reflect or be driven by opposing perspectives, such as, for example, a charity-based or volunteer service-oriented paradigm that may (inadvertently) contribute to maintaining the status quo, on the one hand, and social justice frameworks designed for systemic change, on the other. In this context, Ray (2017) underscored that differences within religions—comparing "liberal" and "conservative" Christians, for example—also influence how likely people are to engage in social change and social justice work (p. 44). Additionally, faith-based institutions may assume amnesic attitudes and apolitical or ahistorical postures rather than confronting their faith-based traditions' complicity in past colonialism and ongoing oppressive practices. The ways that the personal experiences, beliefs, and values of individual faculty members interface with these tensions is an important area of exploration for analyzing motivations in critical CE.

A salient aspect of many studies on faculty motivations to participate in CE consists of the acknowledgment that the term itself can be broad, ambiguous, and interpreted very differently. O'Meara (2008) stated, for example, that "further research directed at ascertaining motivations needs to more carefully examine the types of community engagement faculty are talking about. The term 'community engagement' is a big tent" (p. 25). Similarly, Demb and Wade (2009) indicated that their "exploration of faculty engagement behaviors clearly revealed a spectrum of definitions whose complexity could undermine further research until those definitions are made specific and explicit" (p. 14). In a later article, the same authors underscored once again that the "most important aspect of future survey research will be the explication in the survey instrument, of specific definitions of different types of outreach and engagement activity" (Demb & Wade, 2012, p. 363). To date no study has specifically sought to bridge the gap between faculty motivations and the articulation of a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of CE at the institutional level. This question is located precisely at the foreground of the present article.

Study Context, Purposes, and Research Questions

This research project builds upon a previous study designed to develop a tool that provided a clear vision and expectations for CE at the institutional level, which led to the creation of the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) rubric (Sgoutas-Emch et al., 2021). This rubric contains four primary criteria areas: (1) democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships; (2) societal issues and the common good; (3) critical reflection; and (4) civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values. In the application of the CEIA rubric during a previous pilot study of course-based CE, the results revealed a significant divergence between faculty perceptions and the vision projected in the rubric, which suggested the need for building a more collective understanding of CE and exploring faculty motivation for doing this work.

The CEIA rubric has been institutionalized at the University of San Diego (USD), in that faculty can apply to have their courses flagged with a "C" (community engagement) in the university-wide online platform of all courses offered. The searchable designation enables students and faculty to find courses with these components while also serving to acknowledge faculty who explicitly develop their courses with CE. The designation is also aimed at fostering a collective understanding of these activities at the institutional level in alignment with the university's mission, core values, and strategic plan, while simultaneously valuing a diversity of discipline-based approaches. Finally, as more courses receive the designation, it will be useful for helping to track the work at an institutional level, effectively assessing outcomes for both the community and student learning, and providing opportunities for collaboration across units and areas. It should be noted that two separate designations have been implemented at USD, community engagement (C) and public service (PS), based on the distinction between two broad categories in which the university contributes to the common good through course-based activities: Whereas "public service" is used to describe activities that are "relatively more unilateral and unidirectional in the sense that the university provides services to the public," the "community engagement" designation is based on the Carnegie Foundation definition and emphasizes the "reciprocal exchange of knowledge enacted through partnership" (Janke & Medlin, 2015, p. 129).

USD is a faith-based university with a well-established office of community engagement that has guided the work for over 30 years. The university received the community engagement classification from the Carnegie Foundation and is also an Ashoka U Changemaker campus. The transformation of CE at USD since the 1980s aligns with an ongoing tendency in this field across the nation to emphasize a more critical and intersectional approach aimed at confronting inequality and disrupting interconnected systems of power (Chupp & Joseph, 2010). Within this framework, CE is not only understood as a high-impact educational practice (Hoy & Johnson, 2013; Kuh et al., 2017), but also focuses on the work of antiracism and antioppression (Allen et al., 2023) and on developing collaborations within a paradigm of social justice (Mayhew & Fernández, 2007; Mitchell, 2007; Mitchell & Soria, 2016); positive community impact (Chile & Black, 2015; O'Mara-Eves et al., 2015); and equitable, democratic, and mutually beneficial university–community partnerships (Holland, 2005; LaDuca et al., 2020; Sgoutas-Emch & Guerrieri, 2020). USD recognizes partners as coeducators in students' learning process, which underscores a focus on relationship building and the collective determination of the institution's objectives and purposes, in which the wisdom and multiple ways of knowing beyond the walls of the academy are equally valued. The CEIA rubric seeks to reflect these aspects across the four criteria.

The previous pilot study was conducted to assess how faculty perceived the effectiveness of their CE within academic courses. Building on those results, the purpose of the subsequent study described here was to further validate the CEIA rubric, but this time specifically in relation to faculty motivations for participating in this pedagogy. We examined many of the same intrinsic and extrinsic motivators identified by previous researchers, but, most importantly, we also integrated a more detailed conceptualization of CE into the study through the CEIA rubric. In this way we were able to explore the four different components of the rubric itself as motivators for faculty to undertake this work. In this sense, the rubric could serve as a framework that faculty use in the development of anticipatory cognitive motivators—following Darby and Newman's (2014) motivational cycles here—that help

bridge the gap between the myriad factors that influence their work overall at the university and the institution's discourses and practices of CE.

In sum, the purpose of this exploratory research was threefold: first, to further validate the Community Engagement Institutional Assessment (CEIA) rubric (Sgoutas-Emch et al., 2021); second, to further understand faculty motivations for participating in CE efforts (course- and research-based) at their university; and third, to examine if the CEIA rubric can help bridge the gap between individual faculty members' numerous motivations for participating in CE and the university's institutionalized definition and understanding of CE. Our research team then broke these purposes down into the following more discrete questions to analyze:

1. What are the most significant motivators for faculty to integrate CE into their courses?
2. To what degree are the university's faith-based identity and faculty's personal faith linked to faculty motivation?
3. Does faculty status and demographics make a difference in motivational levels?
4. Can the CEIA rubric serve effectively as a framework for faculty to reflect on and evaluate their previous experience in community engagement?
5. Can the CEIA rubric serve an aspirational function as a framework to fuel future faculty motivation?

Methods

Participants

The participants were selected by working with USD's Mulvaney Center for Community, Awareness and Social Action to identify faculty who have participated in previous CE efforts. This process included identifying faculty who served on CE councils or had previously signed up for professional development workshops on CE, and compiling a list of faculty who had incorporated CE in their classes. We excluded all faculty members who had previously volunteered to participate in research on the CEIA rubric to minimize potential bias due to previous knowledge of the purpose and content of the rubric.

Materials

The online survey, created by the research team and distributed by email, was divided into four sections (see Appendix). All questions, with the exception of Section 4 of the survey, were on a 5-point Likert scale. Section 1 focused on motivating factors at the intrinsic and department levels. Section 2 focused on organizational and faith-based motivators. Section 3 had two parts: Participants rated both their perceived current (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic) and aspirational (in future courses) levels of engagement in CE as they pertain to each of the four criteria in the CEIA rubric. The last section of the survey contained demographic and occupational questions that could be used to examine any differences across variables such as gender, race, and faculty status levels.

Procedure

A list of 286 individuals was compiled, which contained a total of 100 viable candidates after eliminating duplications and candidates who did not meet the criteria for participation. Invitations to participate and surveys were distributed using university emails. We gave all potential participants a month to complete the surveys, and reminders were sent out after 2 weeks and during the final week. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Human Participant Research, and all those who participated completed an online consent form.

Results

Participants

Forty-one faculty completed at least the first half of the survey, which focused on the motivations behind their CE work. Only 31 faculty completed the entire survey, which included questions about the rubric. The majority of the sample identified as female (65.9%) and Caucasian (80.5%); 7.3% of the sample identified as African American, and the same percentage identified as Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian. Only one faculty member identified as Native American and one as Asian American. Most respondents (73.2%) reported being full-time tenure-track/tenured faculty, and 26.8% identified as nontenured/tenure-track faculty. The majority of the faculty (53.7%) came from the College of Arts and Sciences, followed by 22% from the School of Business,

14.6% from the School of Nursing and Health Science, and 9.7% from the School of Leadership and Educational Sciences.

The sample was diverse with regard to years of experience, with 19.5% having less than 10 years of college teaching experience, 17% with 10–14 years, and 39% with more than 15 years experience (24.5% of the sample did not answer this question). As for years of experience with implementing CE, almost half the sample reported less than 10 years experience (48.8%), with 9.8% reporting 10–14 years, and 21.9% reporting more than 15 years experience (19.5% of the sample did not answer this question). Furthermore, faculty reported being engaged in nonacademic community service: 31.7% reported contributing more than a few times per year, and only 9.8% reported never participating. With regard to donations, none of the faculty stated that they never donate to charitable organizations: 41.4% indicated that they donate a few times a year, and 34.1% reported donating monthly. Finally, 41.5% reported that they participated in CE as undergraduates and 43.9% during graduate school.

Spearman Correlations

Table 1 displays the correlation between general motivation factors and specific factors related to their institution. Ratings are from 1 = *extremely unlikely* to 5 = *extremely likely*. No significant relationships were found between the likelihood that a faculty member would include CE in their courses and any of the other motivation questions. Faculty ratings for CE in their scholarship were related to their perceptions that CE work is valued in their discipline and that the university provides enough resources for CE work.

Table 2 presents the correlations between the CEIA rubric ratings (both current and aspirational) and the main question of whether the faculty member plans to include CE as part of their courses. Faculty perceptions of their current ratings for critical reflection and civic learning were significantly related to whether they would include CE in their courses. No significant relationships were found for the current ratings on partnerships and societal issues. Alternatively, significant relationships were found between the likelihood to include CE and all criteria aspirational ratings. The data suggests that faculty who are motivated to reach higher levels on all criteria on the rubric are more motivated to include CE in their courses.

Comparisons Across Groups

Years of Experience Employing CE

Independent *t*-tests were employed to compare less than 15 years experience with CE versus 15 years or more experience with CE across the responses on the motivation questions. Those with more experience did report they were more likely to include CE (M = 4.44) compared to the less experienced faculty (M = 4.00); however, this difference

Table 1. Spearman Correlations Between Ratings of Motivation and Institutional Specific Factors

	Likely to include CE in course	CE in scholarship	CE valued in discipline	CE valued in rank and tenure	University values CE work	CE as a way to serve others
CE valued in discipline		.62** (40)		.52** (40)		
University values CE work			.37* (31)			
Adequate resources		.36* (32)			.45** (40)	
Catholic identity						.38* (40)

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 2. Spearman Correlations Between Likelihood to Include CE as Part of Their Courses, Current and Aspirational Ratings, Across the Four Rubric Criteria

	Partnerships		Societal issues		Critical reflection		Civic learning	
	Current	Aspirational	Current	Aspirational	Current	Aspirational	Current	Aspirational
Likelihood to include CE	NS***	.45* (31)	NS***	.39* (31)	.45* (31)	.59** (31)	.63** (31)	.55** (31)

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***NS = Not significant.

was not significant. Additionally, no other motivators were significantly different across these two groups. It is important to note, however, that only nine faculty fit into the more experienced group, compared to 24 in the other group. The same results were found when comparing years of experience in teaching overall. The same faculty ended up in both groups.

Faculty Status

Comparisons across non-tenure-track (NTT) and tenured and tenure-track (TT) faculty indicated a significant difference for likelihood to implement CE in their courses, with $t(39) = -2.03$, $p < .05$. TT faculty were less likely to state that they would implement CE ($M = 4$, $SD = 1.11$) compared with NTT ($M = 4.73$, $SD = .65$). Significant differences also were reported for the extent to which the university provides adequate resources, with $t(39) = -2.40$, $p < .02$. Again, NTT faculty reported that they perceived the university providing more resources ($M = 3.91$, $SD = .83$) compared with TT ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .99$). This means that, overall, NTT faculty are more likely than TT faculty to implement CE and to see the university as providing adequate resources. That being said, one NTT participant stated that precisely their status as NTT required them to be much more proactive in seeking resources to support their CE work.

Educational Experience With CE

In order to examine whether past experience with CE as an undergraduate and graduate student made a difference on motivation to implement CE, chi-square analysis showed no significant differences. Moreover, no differences were found across gender for any of the measures. No analysis was completed across race because of the low numbers of BIPOC faculty, which in itself constitutes an essential area for further research.

Current Versus Aspirational Rubric Score Comparisons

Paired t-tests were employed to compare the current ratings on the CEIA rubric to the aspirational scores—scores faculty indicated that they would like to achieve—for each criterion on the rubric. Significant differences were reported across all four criteria, with the aspirational ratings being significantly higher than the current ratings. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and t-scores for each criterion. Ratings are from a range of 1–4: 4 = *exemplar*, 3 = *emerging*, 2 = *basic*, and 1 = *below basic*.

In terms of current perceptions, faculty collectively scored partnerships as the lowest criterion and societal issues as the highest rated criterion aspirationally. For all four criteria, however, faculty reported they would like to achieve emerging to exemplar ratings. These data suggest that faculty are motivated to reach higher ratings on all criteria, and faculty report that they still have work to do to achieve these goals.

Discussion

In response to our first research question, focused on determining the most significant motivators, overall, the data suggest that intrinsic motivators were the factors most closely related with faculty's likelihood to implement CE. Many of the survey respondents stated that they elected to include a CE component within their course or scholarship because it was rewarding to them personally and professionally. Previous research in the area of faculty motivation (Demb & Wade, 2012; O'Meara, 2008) indicates that tenure and promotion, for example, consis-

Table 3. Descriptive and Paired *t*-test Statistics for Current Versus Aspirational Ratings Across the Four Rubric Criteria

Rubric Criteria	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Partnerships					
Current	2.55	.77	−6.06	30	<.001
Aspirational	3.22	.78			
Societal issues					
Current	2.87	.88	−4.81	30	<.001
Aspirational	3.45	.62			
Critical reflection					
Current	2.71	.82	−5.44	30	<.001
Aspirational	3.35	.71			
Civic learning					
Current	2.71	.74	−6.04	30	<.001
Aspirational	3.26	.68			

tently appear as a key motivator for faculty participation in specific programs, conducting engaged research, or incorporating CE pedagogical approaches. In the case of this study, the connection between faculty implementing CE and rank, tenure, and evaluation processes was positive. Furthermore, the correlation between a faculty member's perception that their discipline supported CE and that their department valued CE in rank, tenure, and evaluation processes was significant. However, in their comments some faculty did point to the persistent gap between the expressed support of CE at the department or academic unit level and CE being undervalued in the rank and tenure process. It is important to note here that we articulated the question of faculty evaluation in an inclusive manner for both tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty, given that the performance of these two groups tends to be assessed through different processes. Overall, a salient conclusion drawn here is that support at the departmental level for CE appears to be a stronger motivator for faculty participation than support at the university level.

Some important results emerged in the second research question, which explored the degree to which the university's faith-based identity and faculty members' personal faith motivated their CE work. Although faculty did report a link between the faith-based mission of the institution and the value they place on the importance of serving others, they did not indicate a strong relationship between that institutional mission and their implementation of CE. Faculty may be less aware of the importance of CE at an institutional level than in more intimate and immediate settings, such as their departments and community organizations, in which they engage regularly and have direct experiences. Many nuances remain to be explored with regard to how faculty conceptualize their own faith traditions, the faith-based identity of the institution, and the intersection of these factors and how they may be embodied through the work of CE. It is significant that faculty may not be highly likely to link institutional faith-based values with rank and tenure expectations and other faculty evaluation processes. However, this finding does align with O'Meara and Niehaus's (2009) study in which only three cases, out of 109 faculty narratives analyzed, "explained their service-learning from an explicitly religious perspective" (p. 26). This outcome suggests that, broadly speaking, institutions need to do a better job—both discursively and through concrete practices—of helping faculty make the connections among their

faith-based and other institutional core values, faculty evaluation and status, and CE, as a key part of fulfilling their missions.

Another goal of this study, as reflected in the third research question, was to observe if faculty status and demographics played a role in the types of motivators related to CE work and the CEIA rubric. Years of experience with CE, as well as past engagement with CE as former students, were not significant factors. Interestingly, nontenured faculty were more likely to see the institution as providing more resources for CE and were more likely to indicate that they would include CE compared with tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is also important to note that no significant differences were seen across gender, race, or type of school, because of our small and skewed sample. Determining if these are important factors in motivation is an area for future research with a larger and more diverse sample.

Our fourth and fifth research questions should be discussed together, given that they focus on key aspects of the motivational cycles of faculty members, as they reflected through the lens of the CEIA rubric, first on their past and present CE and then on their aspirational CE. Comparisons between current and aspirational ratings on the rubric confirmed that faculty were motivated to rank higher across the four criteria. Aspirational ratings were positively related to the question of how likely faculty were to include CE in their work. Furthermore, faculty reported the desire to work on reaching emerging or exemplar levels of practice. In particular, faculty were most inspired to improve their ability to teach about societal issues. These data are promising, as they illustrate the respondents' awareness that they can dive deeper, especially regarding societal issues, into improving the overall effectiveness of their CE efforts. Similarly, developing democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships, a fundamental element of CE, was elevated in faculty's awareness through their reflection and continues to be a central imperative. The potential to develop such awareness is evident, for example, in O'Meara and Niehaus's (2009) analysis of narratives written by exemplary faculty practitioners of service-learning, some of which reflected a unidirectional approach to university–community partnerships: "In cases where the service mission of the institution was emphasized, the discourse seemed to situate the institution as the major player and the community as the recipient of its gifts" (p. 28). The findings in the present study illustrate the importance of having institutional-level metrics for assessing past and ongoing CE and providing parameters for partnership development, as well as for guiding future work with clearly defined expectations that are inclusive of different approaches to CE and yet provide a framework that helps align individual faculty motivations with the mission of our institutions.

Limitations

As mentioned earlier, this study was preliminary and included a number of limitations. Although the research questions included aspects that apply to faculty in most places, a subset that focused on motivating factors from one particular institution's mission and values may not be generalizable to other institutions. As our university is faith-based, for example, we were interested in examining the relationship that faith plays as a motivator for CE work but included only one question about faith in our survey. Previous research has shown a positive relationship between religion and involvement in civic engagement in the general public (Ray, 2017; Smidt, 1999). However, little is known as to how religion and spirituality act as motivators to engage in CE work in higher educational settings, even though these factors are important drivers of the missions of many institutions. Other limitations included the majority of participants being from the College of Arts and Sciences, so comparisons across different types of school—namely, between professional schools and the College—were not possible. In relation to these types of differences, Saltmarsh et al. (2019) suggested that examining the implementation of community-engaged scholarship at the college/school level can help close the gap between department- and institutional-level efforts. Furthermore, the sample was relatively small, given the total number of faculty who implement CE in their courses and the broad range of engaged scholarship at our institution. We also saw that only half of the participants completed the entire survey. In particular, the questions focused on the rubric and aspirations were not completed by all respondents, which further reduced the sample size for those questions. In addition, this study focused on faculty who already implement CE, which, in a sense, constitutes a self-selecting

group, albeit driven by a wide range of motivators. A much larger population of faculty on campus are not practitioners of CE, especially as it is conceptualized in the CEIA rubric. Accordingly, a redesigned study could target this broader faculty body to analyze both "unengaged" faculty's understanding of CE and the factors that discourage them from implementing CE.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The results from this study indicate that faculty are intrinsically motivated to participate in CE, but extrinsic motivation is primarily correlated with whether CE is supported by their academic department (i.e., often the group making tenure and promotion recommendations and closely involved in other faculty evaluation processes). Although colleges and universities can support CE across the institution, faculty may not be motivated by this perceived institutional commitment; however, the study found that faculty who perceive the value of CE within their discipline are more likely to implement it within their teaching or scholarship.

Historically, CE and the definitions surrounding it have been fluid, causing unclear guidelines as to what is and is not "effective" (Demb & Wade, 2009, 2012; O'Meara, 2008). By using a clear definition of CE organized into its principal areas—as in the CEIA rubric—as a point of departure, this study showcases how that definition can be applied in the motivational cycle in which faculty evaluate their previous or present CE by reflecting on clear criteria and assessment metrics, which then also serve as a framework for anticipatory cognitive motivators that guide future CE components, thereby linking institutional aspirations and individual faculty motivations.

Future research using the CEIA rubric is necessary in order to further understand its utility in different contexts. For example, the rubric will be used in collaboration with additional colleges and universities to explore how it can be utilized to enhance the definition and evaluation of CE at the institutional level in different higher education settings (large versus small campus, public versus private, etc.). The university's mission and values, and how faculty are perceiving them as manifested in their professional activities, should not be disconnected, especially in relation to the promotion and tenure process, the merit process and other incentives, and the onboarding of new faculty, given that all these factors influence a faculty member's likelihood to engage—and how they engage—with the local community through their research, teaching, and service. A comparison across different faith-based institutions, including those with specific orders such as the Jesuits or Franciscans, could help examine faculty motivation in relation to the nuances around personal meaning and purpose as related to faith traditions, as previously indicated in the discussion section. Similarly, a deeper dive is required around faculty's previous experiences in CE, volunteerism, and service-learning as youth and former students.

Although many institutions indicate a value for CE, a disconnect often appears between said value and the actual implementation of CE across the institution and in how faculty perceive the value. The alignment between the incentive structures and the faculty evaluation processes needs to be examined at the institutional, school or college, and departmental levels in order to be successful. Therefore, the espoused value (valuing CE) and the enacted value (incentive and recognition structure) are divergent. Further research is needed to pinpoint where this divergence is happening to address the tensions faculty face between institutional and departmental values.

As mentioned previously, the CEIA rubric has been adopted at the institutional level at USD for course designations. Therefore, a future direction of this research may explore different facets of this institutionalization through the analysis of the integration of the rubric into faculty development activities, the training of peer evaluators, cocurricular and extracurricular community-based activities, and institutional assessment and reporting requirements (e.g., Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement), among other areas. These data also suggest that the CEIA rubric—and other such rubrics adapted to or designed by other institutions—may be effective tools for developing more equitable recognition in the tenure, promotion, and merit processes at the university level for engaged scholars and teachers of all ranks, which can also advance the university's mission by bridging a key community engagement gap.

About the Authors

Sandra Sgoutas-Emch *is a professor in the Department of Psychological Sciences and former director of the Center for Educational Excellence at the University of San Diego. Her research and teaching interests focus on community health and engagement and the psychosocial variables related to wellness. She received her PhD from the University of Georgia.*

Kevin G. Guerrieri *is a professor and former chair of the Department of Languages, Cultures and Literatures at the University of San Diego. His research, writing, and teaching interests focus on Latin American and Colombian literature and cultural production, human rights, social justice education, and scholarship of engagement. He received his PhD in Spanish from the University of California, Riverside.*

Colton C. Strawser *is the executive director of the North Texas Nonprofit Institute and adjunct professor at Louisiana State University–Shreveport. His research interests include community leadership, community engagement, and nonprofit capacity building. He received his PhD in nonprofit and philanthropic leadership from the University of San Diego.*

References

Allen, A., Abram, C., Pothamsetty, N., Jacobo, A., Lewis, L., Maddali, S., Azurin, M., Chow, E., Sholinbeck, M., Rincón, A., Keller, A., & Lu, M. (2023). Leading change at Berkeley Public Health: Building the anti-racist community for justice and social transformative change. *Preventing Chronic Disease, 8*(20), Article 220370. https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd20.220370

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy the exercise of control* (1st ed.). W.H. Freeman and Company.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED326149

Bringle, G. B., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(3), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.2307/2649291

Chile, L. M., & Black, X. M. (2015). University–community engagement: Case study of university social responsibility. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 10*(3), 234–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197915607278

Chupp, M. G., & Joseph, M. L. (2010). Getting the most out of service learning: Maximizing student, university and community impact. *Journal of Community Practice, 18*(2–3), 190–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2010.487045

Darby, A., & Newman, G. (2014). Exploring faculty members' motivation and persistence in academic service-learning pedagogy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(2), 91–120. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1116/1115

Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(2), 5–16. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.201

Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach & engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 337–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777247

Eatman, T. K., Cantor, N., & Englot, P. T. (2017). Real rewards: Publicly engaged scholarship, faculty agency, and institutional aspirations. In C. Dolgon, T. D. Mitchell, & T. K. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement* (pp. 359–369). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011

Eatman, T. K., Ivory, G., Saltmarsh, J., Middleton, M., Wittman, A., & Dolgon, C. (2018). Co-constructing knowledge spheres in the academy: Developing frameworks and tools for advancing publicly engaged scholarship. *Urban Education, 53*(4), 532–561. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918762590

Furco, A. (1999). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education* (Service Learning, General 127). https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/127

Furco, A. (2002). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Public Affairs, 6*(Suppl. 1), 39–67.

Green, P. M., Stewart, C. P., Bergen, D. J., & Nayve, C. (2020). Faith and community engagement at anchor institutions: Exploring the intersection and turning toward an engagement of hope. *Metropolitan Universities, 31*(3), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.18060/24784

Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 4*(1), 37–43. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/780

Holland, B. A. (2005). Reflections on community–campus partnerships: What has been learned? What are the next challenges? In P. A. Pasque, R. E. Smerek, B. Dwyer, N. Bowman, & B. L. Mallory (Eds.), *Higher education collaboratives for community engagement and improvement* (pp. 10–17). National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good. https://scholars.unh.edu/educ_facpub/4

Holton, V. L., Jettner, J. F., Early, J. L., & Shaw, K. K. (2015). Leveraging internal partnerships and existing data infrastructure to track and assess community engagement across the university. *Metropolitan Universities, 26*(2), 75–98. https://journals.iupui.

edu/index.php/muj/article/view/20979

Hoy, A., & Johnson, M. (2013). Future possibilities: High-impact learning and community engagement. In A. Hoy & M. Johnson (Eds.), *Deepening community engagement in higher education: Forging new pathways* (pp. 273–281). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137315984

Janke, E. M., & Medlin, K. D. (2015). A centralized strategy to collect comprehensive institution-wide data from faculty and staff about community engagement and public service. *Metropolitan Universities, 26*(2), 125–146. https://doi.org/10.18060/20981

Kuh, G., O'Donnell, K., & Schneider, C. G. (2017). HIPs at ten. *Change: The magazine of higher learning, 49*(5), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2017.1366805

LaDuca, B., Carroll, C., Ausdenmoore, A., & Keen, J. (2020). Pursuing social justice through place-based community engagement: Cultivating applied creativity, transdisciplinarity, and reciprocity in Catholic higher education. *Christian Higher Education, 19*(1–2), 60–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2019.1689204

Mayhew, M. J., & Fernández, S. D. (2007). Pedagogical practices that contribute to social justice outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education, 31*(1), 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2007.0055

Mitchell, T. D. (2007). Critical service-learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680701228797

Mitchell, T. D., & Soria, K. M. (2016). Seeking social justice: Undergraduates' engagement in social change and social justice at American research universities. In K. M. Soria & T. D. Mitchell (Eds.), *Civic engagement and community service at research universities: Engaging undergraduates for social justice, social change and responsible citizenship* (pp. 241–255). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55312-6_13

Morrison, E., & Wagner, W. (2016). Exploring faculty perspectives on community engaged scholarship: The case for Q methodology. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 23*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0023.101

O'Mara-Eves, A., Brunton, G., Oliver, S., Kavanagh, J., Jamal, F., & Thomas, J. (2015). The effectiveness of community engagement in public health interventions for disadvantaged groups: A meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health, 15*, Article 129. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1352-y

O'Meara, K. (2002a). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. Routledge Falmer. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315829371

O'Meara, K. (2002b). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57–80. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0028

O'Meara, K. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(5), 479–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-005-3362-6

O'Meara, K. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Influence on faculty work life. *Planning for Higher Education, 34*(2), 43–53. https://www.scup.org/resource/encouraging-multiple-forms-of-scholarship-in-faculty-reward-systems-influence-on-faculty-work-life/

O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 7–29. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/518/518

O'Meara, K., Eatman, T. K., & Petersen, S. (2015). Advancing engaged scholarship: A roadmap and call for reform. *Liberal Education, 101*(3), 52–57. https://dgmg81phhvh63.cloudfront.net/content/magazines/Archive/LE_SU15_Vol101No3.pdf

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is . . . How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 17–32. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0016.102

Ray, D. (2017). Religion and civic engagement: In pursuit of transformation. In C. Dolgon, T. D. Mitchell, & T. K. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning*

and community engagement (pp. 42–50). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011

Saltmarsh, J., Middleton, M., & Quan, M. (2019). Institutionalizing community engagement: The college within a university as a missing organizational link. *eJournal of Public Affairs, 8*(3), 6–34. https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/ejopa/vol8/iss3/2/

Sdvizhkov, H., Van Zanen, K., Aravamudan, N., & Aurbach, E. L. (2022). A framework to understand and address barriers to community-engaged scholarship and public engagement in appointment, promotion, and tenure across higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 26*(3), 129–147. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/2796

Sgoutas-Emch, S., & Guerrieri, K. (2020). Utilizing a model of social change to examine and foster equitable, democratic, and mutually beneficial networked community partnerships. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, 8*(1), Article 14. https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.18786

Sgoutas-Emch, S. A., Guerrieri, K., & Strawser, C. C. (2021). Perceptions and visions of community engagement: A pilot study for assessment across the institution. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 13*(1), 7–16. https://discovery.indstate.edu/jcehe/index.php/joce/article/view/625

Smidt, C. (1999). Religion and civic engagement: A comparative analysis. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 565*(1), 176–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271629956500112

Starke, A., Shenouda, K., & Smith-Howell, D. (2017). Conceptualizing community engagement: Starting a campus-wide dialogue. *Metropolitan Universities, 28*(2), 72–89. https://doi.org/10.18060/21515

Sweetman, L., Wassel, B., Belt, S., & Sokol, B. (2020). Solidarity, reflection, and imagination: Exploring student formation and community engagement from a faith-based, anchor institution perspective. *Metropolitan Universities, 31*(3), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.18060/23994

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement [Special issue]. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29*(5). https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.2905

Appendix

Survey Instrument

Survey format altered for publication.

Section 1
Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 (Extremely unlikely) to 5 (Extremely likely) as they pertain to the following questions:

- How likely is it for you to include community engagement as part of your courses?
- How likely is it for you to include community engagement work as part of your scholarship?
- How likely is it for community engagement to be valued within your discipline?
- How likely is community engagement work to be valued during the rank, tenure and evaluation process for your department/program?

Section 2
Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 (Not at all) to 5 (To a very great extent) as they pertain to USD specifically:

- To what extent do you believe the University values community engagement work?
- To what extent do you feel the University provides adequate resources for community engagement?
- To what extent do you believe the University's Catholic Identity and Mission align with community engagement?
- To what extent does a faith tradition motivate your community engagement work?
- To what extent do you see community engagement work as a way to serve others?

Please explain your above responses: (open-ended)

Section 3

RUBRIC—CURRENT LEVEL

The following survey has been designed to examine faculty motivations and perceptions about course-based community engagement. **Please answer each question with a particular course and community partnership prior to COVID-19 in mind.** The first set of questions will be based on the following rubric for community engagement. Please refer to the rubric when responding to the questions.

Upon reviewing the following categories, which best describes the community engagement occurring within your course(s) prior to COVID-19? (Below Basic, Basic, Emerging, or Exemplar)

- Democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships
- Societal issues and the common good
- Critical reflection
- Civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values

Please explain your above responses: (open-ended)

RUBRIC—ASPIRATIONAL LEVEL

Please indicate the level which you would personally like to see your community engagement achieve when you teach this course again in the future. (Below Basic, Basic, Emerging, or Exemplar)

- Democratic, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships

- Societal issues and the common good
- Critical reflection
- Civic learning, citizenship, and democratic values

Please describe any factors or circumstances that would be necessary in order to reach (or maintain) your aspirational level for each criterion of your community engagement course.

Section 4

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please help us further our analysis by providing some demographic information

Gender

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer
- Not listed (please specify)

Ethnicity

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Other

Academic Department/Program: (open-ended)

Academic Rank

- Instructor (part-time)
- Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Not Listed

Are you a tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty member?

- Tenured/Tenure-Track
- Non-Tenure-Track

How many years have you been teaching university level courses?

- 0–4
- 5–9
- 10–14
- 15–19
- 20+

How many of those years (in total) have you been utilizing some form of community engagement?

- 0–4
- 5–9
- 10–14
- 15–19
- 20+

How often do you volunteer with community (non-academic) organizations during your personal time?

- Weekly
- Monthly
- A Few Times A Year
- Once A Year
- Never

How many times a year do you make a charitable donation to support a nonprofit organization?

- Weekly
- Monthly
- A Few Times A Year
- Once A Year
- Never

Did you participate in community engagement activities as an undergraduate student?

- Yes
- No
- Do Not Recall

Did you participate in community engagement activities as a graduate student?

- Yes
- No
- Do Not Recall