

Faculty Role Integration and Community Engagement: Harmony or Cacophony?

Alan H. Bloomgarden and KerryAnn O'Meara
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Colleges and universities that aim to sustain or expand community partnerships and institutionalize civic engagement face important faculty challenges. Faculty adoption of community-based pedagogies and research approaches, in turn, faces important practical and conceptual barriers, as engagement activities appear in competition with expected teaching, research, and service roles. Semi-structured interviews with 29 faculty members at one private liberal arts college, all of whom engaged in teaching, research, and/or service in their local community within a broadly supportive institutional environment, explored whether and how faculty achieved integration among teaching, research, and community engagement roles within local expectations for high teaching and research achievement. Findings reveal three faculty orientations toward integration of teaching, research, and community partnerships—an “integrated” view, an “if only...” view, and a “non-integrated” view. Faculty development strategies that seek intentional integration of these three roles may facilitate and improve faculty research and teaching and institutional impact in the community.

Scholars widely maintain that institutionalizing civic work in higher education and creating sustainable community partnerships requires colleges and universities to go beyond dependence upon student volunteer service and to connect communities with faculty teaching and research (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Furco, 2001). Creating ties to the “academic core” (Lombardi, 2001) means connecting civic work to pedagogies, academic programs, and research agendas. It is easy to see the advantages to this approach. While student volunteers may come and go, faculty members, courses, and programs persist. Community service initiatives exclusively tied to students can be poorly resourced or short-lived. Academic-community partnerships gain access to more substantial resources and more sustainable relationships if civic needs are connected to faculty teaching and research.

Assisting faculty members to develop community-based teaching and research projects that serve civic ends presents common faculty development challenges. For faculty prepared to embrace civic pedagogies or scholarship, the question of *how* to incorporate it into teaching and research can loom as large as the question *why* might for others less oriented to community-based projects. While advancing community-based efforts among faculty requires development of relevant syllabi, appropriate pedagogical and research approaches, equally important and perhaps more complicated is the challenge of weaving community-

based teaching and research into the traditional core roles of faculty as teachers and scholars. Faculty involvement (or uninvolvedness) in community-based pedagogies and research projects will be decided by their perception of role compatibility between teaching and scholarship and civic engagement.

How do community-based projects “fit” with existing teaching and research roles? Are they perceived to be in harmony or in competition with these roles? Studies suggest faculty often seek and find overlap and integration among roles (Colbeck, 1995, 1998, 2002a, 2002b, 2004; Neumann, 1992, 1996). Across disciplines, faculty “integrators” aim for and sometimes achieve synergy between roles. The pursuit of balance among competing roles is a frequent faculty work theme (Bess, 1998; Menges, 1999). Berberet (1999) argues that “an integrative professional paradigm” that brings community service into alignment with teaching and research is both critical and promising for faculty and institutions. Some of the highest quality community-based research and service-learning (as illustrated by Campus Compact Ehrlich Award and NERCHE Lynton Award winners) is found in teaching, research, and community service that is seamless and integrated (Benson, Harkavy & Puckett, 1996; Campus Compact, 2006; NERCHE, 2006; Reardon, 1998). This work led us to study how faculty members who pursue community-based pedagogies and research agendas incorporate these approaches into or align them with existing

professional responsibilities. Our research question is, do those who pursue civic teaching and/or research find integration and overlap among their roles?

The answer to this question could redress common concerns about how to find practical or intellectual fit among varied professional responsibilities for new faculty, faculty new to community-based practice, and colleagues skeptical about the alignment between community work and scholarship. Successful integration models could facilitate adoption and institutionalization of engaged practice among faculty, and encourage higher quality, more adaptive, and sustainable institutional-community relationships that consistently and reciprocally benefit student learning and the community. Enabling faculty members to identify and enhance opportunities for overlap and synergy among community and scholarly roles may help individuals and their departmental colleagues overcome the simplistic view that community-based projects cost more than benefit, or distract more than enhance, scholarly work.

Relevant Literature and Conceptual Framework

Increasing demands on faculty time have been well documented (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). As colleges and universities compete for external resources and students, they also increase expectations for faculty research productivity, even in institutions with primary teaching missions (Aldersley, 1995; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2003). Concurrently, many institutions have tried to improve their responsiveness to surrounding communities, attempting to better connect faculty teaching and research to community needs (Ward, 2003). However, faculty work life in college environments becomes stressful when institutions and individuals try to “be all” and to “do all.” Two recent studies of chief academic officers in four-year institutions suggests that a primary concern of faculty is the expectation to excel simultaneously in teaching, research, and outreach (O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005).

Both competing roles and heavy workloads characterize faculty responsibilities (Bess, 1998; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). Decisions about how to approach various work roles are influenced by doctoral socialization, discipline, career stage, personal preferences, and the nature of the work (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Choices are made also based upon how successful faculty believe they will be and on what they perceive is institutionally valued (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

Understanding how and why faculty integrate roles

is still an emerging area of research. Studies examining correlations between research and teaching quality and productivity (Braxton, 1996; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; McCaughey, 1994) suggest that many faculty find meaningful connections between skills and content in the two activities. Braxton found that whether research reinforces teaching depends on faculty traits and abilities, institutional contexts, and how faculty view their work. Colbeck (1995) found that “faculty sometimes combined their work activities to achieve multiple purposes at the same time” (p. 19) and that faculty conceptions of varied roles are “constrained by socially constructed elements of their university, departmental, and disciplinary contexts” (p. 21). Nonetheless, Colbeck's later work (1998) found faculty integrate teaching and research about one-fifth of their time, and that the capacity to do so is dependent upon local expectations about rigor, compatibility, and performance. Integration is aligned with levels of disciplinary paradigm consensus, and dependent on teaching purposes—“classroom teaching” or “research training.” Colbeck (1998) reflected:

Integration of classroom-oriented teaching and research appeared to be facilitated by low levels of disciplinary paradigm consensus, horizontal and expansive knowledge structures, a broad university definition of research, and faculty participation in decisions about course assignments. Integration of research training and research appeared to be facilitated by disciplinary norms for collaborative work. (p. 666)

In other words, this finding suggests that integration of teaching and research is more likely in disciplines fostering diverse approaches to research method and practice, and informed by varied rather than singular philosophies and non-hierarchical or non-cumulative learning structures.

However, the benefits of role integration and how they are achieved is still relatively underexamined in the literature. Neumann (1992, 1996) found that a three-level “nexus” characterizes faculty members' views on the relationships between teaching and research activities—levels that describe “tangible,” “intangible,” and “global” benefits arising from reciprocal reinforcement of the two efforts. Tangible benefits enable transmission of, and learning based on, current, advanced knowledge and facts; intangible benefits emerge from developing among students an attitude of inquiry toward knowledge; and global benefits describe the benefits to departments, disciplines, and colleges (i.e., scholarly dialogue about both research and pedagogy). Intentionally seeking those benefits, and integrating teaching and service, teaching and research, or research and service could reduce work overload, enrich each role, improve

chances for promotion and tenure, and foster improved institutional work. Brew and Boud (1995) argue that it is the shared concern for “learning” and processes of inquiry that provide overlap and synergy among teaching and research purposes. But they suggest that it is traditional conceptions of teaching as “imparting knowledge” and positivist measures of research as quantifiable “outputs” (p. 267) that thwart meaningful correlations between the two activities.

Engaged academic work—particularly “community-based learning” (CBL) and “community-based research” (CBR)—can be challenging and consuming (Holland, 1999). Establishing and pursuing community partnerships for research, teaching, or multiple academic and service purposes demands skills and commitment for building and managing off-campus relationships, preparing unconventional syllabi and learning exercises, attending to benefits and responsibilities among students, researchers, and community partners that are equitable and reciprocal, and assessing and documenting student learning. Such work demands supporting both academic and community goals in ways that may or may not match doctoral training, professional skills, responsibilities, and personal, departmental, disciplinary, or institutional priorities. Civic engagement can involve interdisciplinary work, work perceived as outside faculty comfort zones, additions to full work loads, roles beyond those for which faculty are hired, and/or as competitors to other areas of productivity and performance. The Campus Compact annual survey has overwhelmingly identified “faculty time pressures” as the most significant obstacle to the expansion of service-learning (Campus Compact, 2003).

Faculty may be discouraged from participating in civic teaching and research if their reward systems prioritize traditional scholarly products (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly books) over products more commonly resulting from community-based efforts (e.g., reports, presentations, position papers, curriculum and professional development materials, grant applications) that may not be so readily considered “scholarly” (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Lynton, 1995; O’Meara, 2005). Case study research supports the contention that faculty involved in the scholarship of teaching (Colbeck, 1998; Huber, 2004) and faculty and departments involved in engagement as a form of scholarship (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 1996; Lynton, 1995; Peters, 2000; Peters, Jordan, Adamek, & Alter, 2005) do better work in their disciplines and in their communities because they integrate roles. Taken together, research on faculty role integration and management, and literature on the nature of faculty civic engagement roles, raises the question of whether individuals perceive synergies between their existing

teaching and research responsibilities and community-based learning pursuits.

We, thus, employ faculty role integration as a conceptual framework that facilitates not only analysis of the interrelationship among faculty roles, but also as a framework identified as essential to encouraging faculty civic engagement (Colbeck & Michael, 2006). Growing interest in the idea that teaching and research should be more effectively brought together is emerging even among off-campus, societal constituencies who seek to increase the transparency of higher education’s research roles, to better understand the purposes and findings of scholarly work, and to encourage greater connectivity between the university and the “outside” (Brew, 2003). Given potential benefits to faculty performance, productivity, career progression and satisfaction, institutional-community relations, and community work, it is important to understand whether, how, and where integration occurs, what facilitates or deters it, and how varied conceptions of scholarly roles and products affect perceived overlap and integration among teaching, research, and community service roles (Brew, 1999; Colbeck, 2002a; Colbeck & Michael, 2006).

Liberal arts colleges are widely understood to be challenging work-life environments because expectations for involvement with students and campus life are as high as those for research and for student-centered teaching (McCaughy, 1994; Ruscio, 1987; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2003). They are also places likely to foster a greater correlation between teaching and research (Hattie & Marsh, 1996). Liberal arts colleges that foster commitments to local communities add additional challenges. Of all the faculty roles, engagement is the least celebrated in almost every college context (Astin, Antonio, & Cress, 1997; O’Meara, 2002; Ward, 2003). Furthermore, some selective liberal arts colleges have supported increased expectations regarding scholarly productivity (Astin & Chang, 1995; McCaughy, 1994). In such contexts, engagement may only be possible for pre-tenure faculty if integrated with more central and rewarded faculty roles of teaching and research. Yet we know little about whether and how integrated work becomes possible given these circumstances.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether faculty who pursue community-based teaching or research do or do not find integration—what we might consider harmony or cacophony—among their teaching, research and engagement roles. We set out to explore faculty perceptions in a selective liberal arts college context where relatively equal local teaching and research expectations make choices about time allocation difficult and put faculty roles in competition. In this context, we aim to understand

whether faculty integrate, how they integrate, and if not, then why.

Method

Qualitative interviews were particularly well-suited to explore these questions. Miles and Huberman (1994) emphasize that qualitative study can gain a "holistic" (comprehensive, systemic, integrated) understanding of context, while capturing data on participant perceptions "from the inside" (p. 6) about options, pressures, choices, and turning points. Interviewing within the boundaries of a selected "case study" is an ideal vehicle to examine faculty decision-making and the complexity of faculty work and inter-relationships between and within work roles and experiences. "By concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity (the case), the research aims to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon...particularly suited to situations in which it is impossible to separate the phenomenon's variables from their context (Merriam, 1998, p. 29)."

The main sources of data for this study were 29 semi-structured interviews with faculty at a selective, private liberal arts college. We employed a single case study design to examine the degree and nature of integration of faculty roles in one particular context (Yin, 1994). The name of the institution has been changed to fictitious "Wayne College" and participant names and specific fields of expertise have been additionally masked to ensure anonymity. The semi-structured interview protocol explored faculty experiences of balancing and integrating teaching, research, and community projects within this private, liberal arts college context. Interviews were completed during summer 2004 and spring 2005 and ranged from 40-70 minutes each.

Wayne administrators provided us with lists of all faculty tenured since 1994 when the College began extensive community partnership initiatives, and of faculty members who had developed a community-based course or research project in that same time period. Of 29 participants, 17 (59%) were women, 12 (41%) were men; 10 were in the Humanities, 8 in the Social Sciences, and 11 in the Sciences; 8 were lecturers, 3 were assistant professors, 17 associate professors, and 1 full professor. All participated in a community-based teaching, research, or service project during the last decade; most have sustained their community involvement. Faculty responded to email and phone invitations to participate in interviews. All interviews were transcribed and analyzed using the constant comparative method of data analysis that involved mining the data for categories and themes related to integration of faculty roles and civic engagement (Merriam, 1998).

Data collection and analysis utilized the qualitative techniques of triangulation, thick description, and audit trail to ensure trustworthiness (Denzin, 1978; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1980). Triangulation was sought by both authors collecting data, conferring continuously about emerging themes, and examining data and themes from multiple perspectives vis-à-vis participant statements and language. Although Wayne College is near to the authors' home institutions, neither author had previous or current collaborative relationships with participants, or had "inside" knowledge of the institution's practices or culture prior to this study. The authors' very different home institutional experiences (one at a private liberal arts college, the other at a public research university) enabled careful critique and testing of the interview questions and protocols prior to the research, and also examination of the data with consideration for presumptions about local values and culture we might each bring to the project. We, thus, aimed to best enable participants to define in their own terms the language and values locally assigned to teaching, research scholarship, and community projects, especially as they related to teaching and research roles and expectations.

Wayne College is a small, predominantly undergraduate liberal arts college in the northeastern United States. Wayne considers itself selective in regards to its standard of admissions and faculty recruitment and promotion. Despite significant executive administrative turnover in the last decade, the College has sustained community engagement as an institutional priority. Wayne is a "high-high" institution (Astin & Chang, 1995), supporting high faculty expectations about student-centered teaching and learning and scholarly productivity. The teaching load is five courses per year, but there is continuing campus dialogue about reducing this load, as peer institutions have done, to support an increasing emphasis upon faculty scholarship. Most Wayne faculty members are actively engaged in teaching and research; we found this to be true even among the "lecturers" in our sample who were often also in administrative positions as interdisciplinary or cross-departmental program directors with vital roles facilitating community-based learning and research projects.

Findings

Interviews yielded data regarding perceived relationships between teaching, research and community work, in a context of institution-wide community engagement. Approximately one-third of participants were individuals we define, within the specific context of Wayne College's institutional initiative to engage in its community, as "highly involved." These

individuals spoke at length about commitment to teaching and research with a community or service-orientation. This group included those whose involvements over time were also consistent or consecutive, during the decade or so of Wayne's enhanced community programming, and in some cases these were involvements that pre-dated the emphasis on outreach since the mid-1990s. The remaining two-thirds were more "moderately involved," including individuals who had taught a community learning course or introduced a course component, or who participated in one or more discreet community activities (such as giving lectures at a public school, participating in community partnership programs, etc.) and who expressed support for/interest in community work.

Overall, participants articulated three general positions related to the integration they found or could imagine between their roles. The first position was that teaching and research are fundamentally interrelated forms of scholarly work, and this group viewed community work as embedded and integrated within teaching and research roles. We refer to this as the "integrated" view, which we found expressed among approximately 25% of participants. The second position was that roles were separate but that they (a) sometimes overlapped or (b) would have benefited from overlap. We refer to this position as the "if only..." view, expressed among the majority of participants (approximately 60%). The third position was that roles were and should remain disparate, compartmentalized, and perhaps inherently competing. This is the "non-integrated view," found among the smallest number of participants (approximately 15%). We note that there is some fluidity among these categories, as individuals expressed overlapping perspectives.

It is important to also note that while all 29 participants included here were highly or moderately involved in community work, and although our interviews focused on integration between that community work and faculty teaching and research roles, participants frequently interpreted our questions about "integration" and "overlap" as opportunities to discuss the broader context of professional work. Some turned discussion rapidly to challenges of balance and "fit" among all facets of their professional obligations as a "liberal arts college faculty member." This suggests that they view their roles in a holistic manner, in a way that may have made it difficult to reflect upon integration and overlap in civic work as a matter separate from or different than reflecting on integration and overlap across their full range of personal and professional activities.

The Integrated View

Participants who took the integrated view articulated a picture of role integration that we discuss first as a matter of general teaching-research interactions, and then as integration between these roles and community-based efforts. However, both perspectives ultimately speak to the central question of role integration and community engagement, because the context for these interviews was discussion of faculty members' initiatives in Wayne's community. Interview questions prompted specific examples of integrative activities, such as undergraduate involvement in faculty members' research or scholarly presentations, or community partnership work leading to publications or course development. Initially, even participants who took the integrated view responded negatively—they had not yet encountered research opportunities they believed promising for involving undergraduates or emergent from community projects; they thought they had found them but became disappointed at the results; or they so firmly discounted the possibility of benefit that they had not seriously pursued such opportunities.

Yet, after momentary reflection, participants cited examples of interrelationships between their teaching and research that afforded mutually reinforcing intellectual experiences. One said,

I have found that my intellectual interests in general...put me on the lookout for other things I wouldn't have been looking for. Some of the things I need to teach here...have brought up research questions that I'd like to pursue. In that sense, teaching and research are integrated. The research I'm doing feeds back into the courses, but not in a sustained way—it's more the other way: the focus on certain teaching questions leads me to want to pursue those questions in a research venue.

Some interpreted the overlap between roles in ways that mingled the practical benefits of that eased time management with the intellectual benefits of reciprocal gains made through multi-purpose work. Two science faculty members, whose teaching and research projects both extensively involved students in community-based projects conducting fieldwork in local environmental studies efforts, presented an overarching conceptual framework for professional role integration:

When I do the committee work and the research, I don't see myself as just teaching but also learning. I think you have to integrate them. I think if you compartmentalize them, and let one fall and play catch-up, personally I would find a lot more anxiety in that. You would always know something is going wrong somewhere because you're letting it fall off to the side. And you know that at some point in the future you've got to get that

back on track. This way, if you can kind of integrate everything and keep it flowing—there is an ebb and flow: there are some semesters where I think everything is just going perfect, and some semesters I think my teaching...I should probably be shot. But I try to keep all of them [my roles] going and overlap.

This response articulated the view that there are perhaps intangible yet important intellectual and practical benefits from conceptualizing work in multiple areas in coherent, inter-related terms. His colleague put it in a similar fashion:

My courses incorporated methodologies of my research and included some of the collaborative work we were doing. Being on [the research committee] took advantage of my research experience and allowed me to exist in the same sort of realm of scholarly activity as a service component. The general education course I developed was a very easy, low stress course to develop and teach, and it drew on my experience in research in [my field].

That these opportunities for overlap can and should emerge not just in teaching and research but also in institutional service activities is something reflected by comments from a social scientist, who articulated a “gray area” between teaching and service that captures activities such as student advising, program and curriculum development, and maintaining presence or representation on inter-departmental committees. She pointed to the importance of

Making the service work, by making it interesting, useful, constructive for your work. [Colleagues should] *ex post facto* make sense of their service commitments and present them as intentional to show how one can be deliberate, cumulative, in order to present a picture of yourself as developing a leadership role.

This requires some level of role integration of work conceptualization and practice. Most importantly, this view suggests that faculty members can benefit from being strategic about the choices they make in participating in institutional service activities, because the alignment between them and existing teaching and research ventures can serve to provide both greater intellectual satisfaction, and a more coherent, outward picture of intentionality to one's career path.

Several participants who held an integrated view were more specific about interrelationships between their professional roles and community work. These faculty discussed how personal commitments to community service could be pursued through teaching and research projects. In some cases this was described as a cyclical process that brought scholarly

rewards from the community relationship. For example, one faculty member cited a collaboration with a local health organization as an example of marriage between learning and community goals. The health organization aimed to conduct a needs assessment involving interviews in a minority community, and this participant described the mutual benefit by remarking, “what I call a pedagogical exercise, they call transcription.” However, what made this not simply an example of productive community-based learning but also an example of work integration was the attribution of a subsequent research grant to this experience. Bringing this research and teaching relationship to fruition for both students and the community organization advanced personal knowledge of, and experience with, ethical challenges in minority and community health research, and enabled a subsequent National Institutes of Health research grant. Similarly, an economist cited productive cost benefit analysis work with local nonprofit organizations as the basis for “relationships with these organizations that have led to research and professional engagement. I have worked with individuals on research ideas.”

Others made reference to specific links between their community-based teaching experiences and discovering new direction for their research agendas. For example, a faculty member in a foreign language and literature discipline initiated a new and immediately oversubscribed senior-level course involving students with a local immigrant community.

I'm already presenting at [her disciplinary national conference] a talk on the idea of community, specifically related to this class...theorists like Nancy, Agamben, and Joseph who critique the whole concept of “community” as an impossible endeavor. I'm looking at the discourse on community that takes place at Wayne, and we've been critiquing the whole idea of community learning by asking about when one speaks the word community at Wayne, one automatically is separating Wayne from the rest. While [the word “community”] might pretend to bridge gaps, it quite often reinforces walls. In my own scholarship I see a new direction going off there from the types of questions that have arisen through the class.

Widespread participation by faculty members in Wayne's first-year seminar (FYS) program was apparent, and these were often prime examples of teaching-research integration connected to community work. Some cited examples of extremely creative seminars that employed participants' research focus or area of expertise in tandem with a current issue or some other contextual setting that connected

with community partner needs. Examples included research collaborations on local crime and environmental science and justice issues, in particular as related to area minority communities. Whether these integrations conserved time is far from clear—preparation for the curriculum was often demanding and the payoff of direct or indirect student contribution to research activity wasn't always clear. Nonetheless, participants almost universally reported intellectual growth as a significant benefit from course-based consideration of research related topics, and personal satisfaction from relating either or both teaching and research activities involving Wayne resources to community challenges.

The "If Only..." View

Participants reflected upon the matters of integration, compatibility, synergy, and overlap among their various work and community activities and concluded, more or less, that this would be nice but that this is more ideal than real or beneficial for them. For example, teaching in an area of one's own disciplinary expertise seems a natural vehicle for integrating teaching and research. Many of the participants had happily found such course opportunities to come readily at Wayne. Some reported concrete benefits from the process, reporting the opportunity to discuss works they were reading for a scholarly project in class, to gain from student interpretations or questions raised by such material, or even to find student research assistants.

However, few of these opportunities translated into what faculty members would readily consider meaningful or sophisticated advances to scholarly progress. Even where science students were working in labs or in fieldwork on problems associated with faculty members' research agendas, their contributions did not always make producing a publishable paper or a scholarly conference presentation any easier. Overlap and intellectual synergy was there, but it rarely helped higher order scholarship to happen or to happen any faster. Faculty members frequently voiced limitations, including constraints on student access to material due to language barriers (where research involved advanced translation skills, for example), risks and hazards (in the case of the sciences with regard to chemicals), or intellectual accessibility of advanced materials. With regard to community-based research projects in particular, several participants identified the related challenges of "getting students off description and onto analysis" when they were sent out into field study, or "investing enough training and supervisory time within the constraints of semester-bound projects" to enable student contributions from community-based field research to advance personal scholarship.

As these are common challenges faced by researchers at undergraduate institutions regardless of whether community-based projects are a priority or not, it was interesting to find examples of adaptations made by faculty members in response. For example, as one scientist explained that "what I try to do is find situations that are environmentally friendly, and I do that for two reasons—one is safety working with undergraduates..." As if on cue, a loud "CRASH!!!" of glass smashing on the floor emerged from the lab adjacent! "See—you just heard that crash? So I was trying to find a project that was safe, but still important..." His particular challenge was thus to find the intersection of practicable and appropriate scientific research avenues that crossed disciplinary pursuits with teaching and community goals. Likewise, others felt that, while the contributions students could make to community-based research projects were limited by a lack of knowledge or skills, they could constrain their expectations and focus research activities for undergraduates upon the goal to teach methods of inquiry first and foremost. The vast majority of participants referred at one point or another during the interviews to the broader benefits of teaching modes of inquiry as key benefits to experiential learning in the community, far more important as pedagogical benefits to students than as research benefits to faculty scholarship. Such adaptations to research and teaching practice reflect an acknowledgement of limited integrative avenues.

Most interesting within this position was the effect of the interview itself, where conversation about interaction and overlap among activities that began with participants largely dismissing the interrelationship between teaching, research, and community projects wound up with reflection and reconsideration about achievements in this area. Many found that, on reflection, the simultaneous pursuit of teaching, research, and community goals did yield practical or intellectual synergies they had not previously realized. Some participants voiced the insight, in response to this conversation, that advance consideration of integrative or overlapping benefits might enable integration to happen in future efforts. Barriers may not be inevitable or insurmountable. Two participants who characterized their teaching, research, and service as "unrelated and separate" expressed clear regret that they find this is the case. Both voiced interest in pursuing avenues to addressing what they see as an unfortunate bifurcation:

I've just had a difficult time trying to integrate them. I don't know if it's because I work with [toxics], so it's hard to bring them into the classroom. Or if it's just that I haven't been creative enough in trying to develop ways to do that. But I do think if I could ever find the time to really

dedicate to trying to develop more integration, that I could develop some integration. Definitely more than I have, and I would like to achieve that.

Another articulated the separation as a result of limitations on what is possible with Wayne students, based on student academic culture at the College:

With regret, I think of them as separate, because of the capabilities of the students. Also, I have some colleagues at other schools—Williams, Claremont Colleges—who are able to involve students in research projects, students who are really at much higher level and a much closer to—they publish in well-known journals. It's a difference not only in the quality of the students, but in the ethos and expectations of the students. Yes, definitely Williams students are better than Wayne students. But they're not that much better. It's the culture of what they're expecting to do.

The question of whether faculty members found integration or what Braxton (1996) identifies as “complementarity” seems largely a matter of degree, related to practical obstacles within that discipline, or a matter of perspective. For some, there's an unspecified or tenuous relationship between roles that has some value, but that value has clear limitations. For example, one participant stated:

When I teach, I basically teach the way I write, it's just less intensive or not as in-depth as when I do my research. So from that point of view, it's not as helpful to my research because you can never get into the subject sufficiently at a sophisticated in-depth level that would help you in terms of writing on a subject in a way that's going to contribute scholarship on a subject. But I don't think of them as separate – it's analogous to ‘is walking the same as running?’ Is it the opposite? It's like teaching is like walking, doing your research is like running.

For others, the challenge appeared more a matter of conceptualizing one's personal goals for professional satisfaction, and aligning them with similarly individual views about civic responsibility:

I haven't really figured out how to connect [community work] to my own scholarship. I feel like when I make the connection, it's more about being civically responsible—I like to feel connected in the community. I taught in [an outreach program] for four years, which was a lot of fun—a monthly lecture series at [a city] elementary school... The fun thing was that I could talk about the same things I did with my Wayne students. The challenge was to translate the material into a language they could comprehend or work with—but a lot of the same questions,

ideas, to get them to think critically, ask questions, challenge assumptions—in some ways it felt like the same work.

Thus, faculty holding the “if only...” view were often able to see potential benefits from integration, but found obstacles to realizing them. The most common obstacle cited was simply the time to reflect on synergies and to plan routes to achieving them. It is essential to note, however, that whereas faculty participants were, as reported above, able to reflect upon integrative relationships between their teaching and research, their reflections commonly did not turn back to specifically examine the roles played by community projects in enabling or obstructing that integration. Overall, participants discussed overlap among roles from a position of elevated observation—perspective on their own work from an altitude that took in the whole landscape of their teaching and research, yet which put out of focus the particular role of the community projects all were involved in (as “highly” or “moderately” involved participants in Wayne College initiatives).

The Non-Integrated View

A small number of participants emphasized firm boundaries among their teaching and research roles, and their community involvements. They attributed these predominantly to the nature of their scholarly interests, to limitations in Wayne's undergraduate student skills or capabilities, or to limits to any undergraduates as research partners. A “highly involved” natural scientist described intensive involvement in researching issues of child development in partnership with a local pre-school and kindergarten. An explicit aim was to assist educators to improve understanding and practice, one that extended this purpose beyond a typical field study for a scientist. However, she cited the project as a conflict with her “ambitious research agenda,” and repeatedly articulated the limitations on student involvement in the community project and the discreet nature of their role as examples of how her teaching, research, and service projects were parallel efforts and competing priorities.

Another “highly involved” participant, whose community engagement even pre-dated Wayne's institutional initiatives, gave a lengthy description of several extensive, long-term, and meaningful community-based learning and service projects she coordinated with local partners focused on socioeconomic justice issues (including fair housing, equal opportunity and access, etc.). Her record of scholarship included books on related social movements, yet when asked if the projects related she said:

No! My first book was on [x], my second book was on [y], my third book was on [z]. No, I

mean, it has nothing to do with this. If you ask me personally, it's tremendous—I'm engaged politically and committed to getting students engaged politically. So it's been incredibly gratifying and great to bring more 'firepower' to groups I already worked for, but in terms of my research, there's nothing to do: I'm a historian, I work in the past.

Some participants were keen to express their community service as distinctive from their professional work, describing it as outside of, or above and beyond, their professional obligations. Examples include a participant who said such work "has no connection to my scholarship—I am a mathematician by training. It does however have a huge connection to my other life as a Franciscan Brother." Several participants proudly discussed their civic work, in some cases work that directly benefited from the individuals' professional expertise, as commitments they made independent of their teaching and research agenda or obligations. "We all do things with the community... I've got my own links in the community, my links with institutions in the community are natural, there's no need to create this sort of structure—it's not something that I bought into." Expressing a commitment to community work in a form separate from professional responsibilities also emerged for some as a means to express the complaint that such work is not rewarded or valued within the system of promotion and tenure.

Discussion

Participants in all the categories we identified did not start out reflecting on either their teaching and research roles, or on their community-based activities, as a seamless professional continuum or as an integrated or overlapping set of scholarly responsibilities. However, their experiences suggest integration is both a matter of degrees, and a matter of perspective upon one's work, something entirely consistent with Colbeck's (1998; 2002b) rich observations from studying faculty perceptions. Some participants appeared to believe they could only consider this work "integrative" if the end result included a publication from the outreach or teaching experience. Others found that community learning served their growth as scholars simply by exposing themselves or their predominantly white, middle- or upper-class students to underrepresented communities, and enhancing cross-cultural understanding as a result. Many fell somewhere in between these extremes, reporting what Neumann (1992) referred to as "intangible" or "global" benefits to integration among roles, yielding a vague or broad sense of self-efficacy, or enabling individuals to position themselves for career advancement by portraying coher-

ence among disparate teaching, research, and service activities on or off campus.

Consistent with Colbeck's research (1998), involvement of undergraduates in research activity often did align with disciplinary paradigms and methodology, and with either of the two teaching "purposes" (classroom teaching or research preparation). But in contrast, research productivity out of collaborative work with students and communities appeared more dependent on individual factors, such as flexibility in faculty research interests and personal commitment levels to collaborative work. This was evidenced especially in reference to interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, and collaborative teaching seminars as significant opportunities for achieving intellectual and practical synergy. Here, those synergies provided a natural connection between research, teaching, and civic engagement goals.

There were not identifiable correlations between faculty members' experiences in achieving integration, and levels of involvement in community work. Both "highly involved" and "moderately involved" participants articulated achievements that can be described as an integrated view of their teaching, research, and community efforts, as well as communicating that they could find such synergy if only they had some time or assistance.

Participants did not generally articulate any special connection between community involvement and scholarly goals, except where those scholarly goals either (a) touched upon the margins of research interest in urban or minority community issues, or (b) pertained to the improvement of pedagogical or curricular benefit to students. Few of the faculty members interviewed, for example (including those we would consider "highly involved") cited examples of community research activities emerging from teaching-related or volunteer activities in the region. There was little evidence of a continuum for faculty that creates a pipeline from volunteer service activities, to teaching involvements, to research commitments emerging from the relationship-building that they or Wayne engages in with community partners. None of the faculty members interviewed for this study made a local community challenge an agenda item for their research. None of the participants engaged in community-based research that led to published or presented scholarship in disciplinary fields. Two individuals reported presentations concerning teaching with community components, but just one of these was a presentation for a disciplinary audience that the participant believed would contribute to a scholarly portfolio. All of this was true despite the fact that this institution has gained national recognition for its commitment to engagement.

Connection between community efforts and peda-

gogical or curricular goals was far more common than connections to research goals. Involved faculty members at both levels framed their active or passive interest in community connections as interests in enhanced student learning through connections with the "real world." Individualized conceptions of social responsibility and engagement seemed to most drive interest in participation in community initiatives. By and large, the main vehicles by which participants integrated community work to professional responsibilities were as pedagogical innovations, in topical, first-year or interdisciplinary seminars, or as activities they sought to define in various ways as personal or institutional service in relation to Whayne's outreach initiatives.

Limitations

As exploratory research, this study is focused upon the experiences of engaged faculty at only one liberal arts college. The aim is to build theory about how community-based faculty work fits with existing teaching and research roles and responsibilities, and apply that to faculty development to facilitate and encourage high quality community-based teaching and research. We make no broad claim to the applicability of findings and conclusions to other institutions, institutional types, or faculty in general. Furthermore, although the sample provides relative balance across gender and across liberal arts disciplines, practical limitations constrained our capacity to ensure comparable representation across career stages (pre-tenure, post-tenure, non-tenure tracks). Additional study across these characteristics and across institutional types might strengthen the generalizability of the findings and the recommendations for faculty development, and enhance general understanding about faculty role integration.

Additionally, we focused this inquiry into the interrelationship among professional work roles and community-based teaching and research. As a consequence, we did not construct research or interview questions regarding otherwise relevant work-life management issues (such as balance of work and family). Yet life balance appeared to some participants as an integral concern regarding the decision to engage in community work; the question looming for many individuals is, "how can I consider adding substantial community project commitments when I can barely balance my job and family life as is?" Thus, life balance issues crept into the interviews, as participants reflected inevitably on the multifaceted challenges of managing career and personal responsibilities. But we elected to limit our study to the matter of "fit" between community projects and teaching and research, thus excluding analysis of this wider contextual issue. We direct readers instead to other

research into this related line of inquiry (e.g., Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2003), and furthermore identify this as a promising avenue for additional work as it specifically relates to decision-making about faculty community involvement.

Conclusions and Implications

We draw two major conclusions from this work. First, faculty beliefs about the efficacy or even the possibility of integration depended on individual and environmental factors, including the nature of their discipline, research method, course content, and community engagement activity; work/family balance issues; and knowledge of or imagination about how roles and activities might support one another. In this study, a perception that the reward system would not value integration and that rigorous research meant specialized, disciplinary inquiry worked against integration. Conceptions regarding the purposes of research, teaching, and civic engagement were highly relevant to whether faculty could imagine benefiting from finding overlaps and synergies among roles.

By contrast, we found several participants who have encountered significant practical and intellectual integration among teaching purposes, research interests and scholarly growth, and community efforts via first-year seminar courses. This confirms the view that such problem-focused, interdisciplinary, and frequently community-based vehicles present golden opportunities to achieve important professional, personal, and pedagogical synergies. Fostering these kinds of teaching and learning opportunities at other levels of the undergraduate curriculum, and involving intentional pairings or groupings of cross-disciplinary faculty participants as collaborators might serve these purposes as well as simply enhancing an institution's curricular offerings.

Second, most of the participants expressed strong desires to integrate professional and civic roles, often as a direct response to the discussion of the intellectual and practical relationships among work and community roles sparked by this study, and to the reflective opportunity afforded them. Even where they had not initially believed it happened or was possible, many participants came to see integration as potential benefit or value. We believe that the "elevation" of altitude that was achieved via the conversation about role integration enabled faculty to view their work in its entirety rather than as compartmentalized activities, and as a consequence, this helped them to see opportunities for interrelating teaching and research where they may not have before. The complexity of factors influencing integration, and the strong desire among faculty to integrate, lead us to suggest a professional development response.

Integration was reported as a source of satisfaction and improved practice among those who found it. Prior studies of faculty have found both that satisfaction influences actual performance, and that anticipating efficacy is significant to faculty introduced to new pedagogies, modes of research, or related professional roles (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Additionally, when integration among community and scholarly roles was reported as impossible or unlikely, this perception was closely aligned with narrow and specific definitions of scholarship, namely the production of publishable, disciplinary-based research. However, even among those who perceived roles as non-integrated for these reasons, the suggestion that faculty write about and present achievements in student learning or community benefits was readily and enthusiastically received.

This strongly suggests that purposeful interventions might help faculty development efforts to assist faculty to more deliberately conceptualize relationships among these roles, as well as to broaden their understanding of what constitutes “scholarship” (O’Meara & Rice, 2005). Providing faculty with opportunities for reflection aimed directly at the challenges of fostering (a) integrated views about seemingly disparate and/or competing professional responsibilities, and (b) connectivity between learning, research, and service projects based in the community and faculty professional roles can provide desired self-awareness and professional benefits to faculty in high-demand environments, and to institutional civic engagement initiatives (Colbeck & Michael, 2006). Benefits could readily accrue to both liberal arts college faculty development in general, and more specifically to faculty development that aims to improve and expand civic engagement. Integration of civic engagement with other faculty roles in such settings, and in particular in colleges experiencing rising expectations regarding faculty research productivity, might begin with the identification of overlaps with activities these environments most value: undergraduate research training and involvement in faculty scholarship; interdisciplinary seminars; externally-funded outreach activities.

We were somewhat surprised and disappointed at how few community relationships led faculty to new or expanded research projects they or their students undertook. We conclude that these disconnects most likely stem from: pressures on faculty to define scholarship narrowly; institutional valuation of certain research products and epistemologies over others (Schon, 1995); the lack of graduate students, infrastructure, and course-release time to systematically and sustainably pursue faculty-community collaborative research projects; and the impact of the “overloaded plate.” Nonetheless, the cumulative

impact was that Wayne appeared unable to most effectively capitalize on the personal and teaching relationships faculty built with community organizations to either advance faculty research agendas or to mobilize additional student research and service resources with greater campus and community impact. We did not probe more aggressively and specifically in our interviews the particular matter of connectivity between the community projects we knew each participant engaged in (they were identified for our study by this criterion) and the wide-ranging teaching and research projects they described. Though we might have justified being more purposeful in this regard, this might have compromised participants’ genuine responses. Nonetheless, the fact that nearly all of the participants turned the general discussion of integration away from referencing community projects and toward the relationship between teaching and research more generally suggests two things.

First, we know that the context of the “high-high” institution (Astin & Chang, 1995) is one where the interaction between teaching and research is an increasing feature of the discourse on faculty work. This context may now be particularly pervasive in this setting because ongoing debate rages over the levels of research expectations and the over the desired and unintended potential impacts on the traditionally learner-centered, undergraduate teaching environment. The teaching-research relationship is also an important feature of the conversation regarding institutional effectiveness in higher education (Brew, 2003). All participants referenced the increasing expectations of their departments and administrators concerning research productivity, and the “teaching-research” preoccupation (Hattie & Marsh, 1996) may be a preoccupation here too—one which leaves the status of community work uncertain, or worse, extraneous. So despite our interest in the ways that community projects did or did not support teaching and research goals, participants interpreted questions of integration in this narrower fashion.

Second, and related, it seems clear that despite Wayne’s overarching support for community engagement, and despite administrative efforts to encourage involvement among faculty by providing course development stipends and other infrastructural resources, little effort has been devoted to enabling academic departments and faculty members to conceptualize community work within existing frameworks of reward and promotion for scholarly teaching and research achievement. Community-based projects thus appear to a large extent still as “add-ons,” options to faculty just as volunteer service activities are options to students. But they are not yet integral features of the learning landscape at Wayne

College, essential pedagogical or curricular approaches, or common and equitably valued approaches to courses and research projects. However, we note that excellent faculty development are available which speak specifically to the issues of pedagogical aims, student learning outcomes, and other highly germane practices and purposes essential to undergraduate, liberal arts education (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1999; Strand et al, 2003). Considering the receptivity we found among faculty to reconceptualizing the boundaries and overlaps among these roles, more intentional faculty development using these and other resources to the ends of providing intentional connectivity between community projects and the learning and research purposes of the curriculum could be readily productive. Faculty participants embraced the basic idea of integration readily and quickly, and there is no reason to believe the more specific application to community projects, teaching, and research would be any less so.

In a setting where undergraduate research experiences and graduate or professional school preparation have become highly valued aims, opportunities to connect students and faculty to community-based research via institutional civic engagement seem tailor-made. Infrastructure support and faculty development strategies oriented toward encouraging this “nexus” may be a prerequisite to improving impacts and benefits. With these investments, faculty and departments might well collaborate better with community organizations and more effectively address issues and challenges across the divides of bureaucratic roles and disciplinary boundaries with meaningful and relevant learning, research, and service results.

Note

The authors gratefully acknowledge the comments and suggestions of the reviewers for the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, and of Dr. Kelly Ward who served as discussant to this paper at the April, 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA. We are also grateful to staff and faculty of “Wayne College” who facilitated and participated in this study.

References

Aldersley, S.F. (1995). Upward drift is alive and well: Research/doctoral model still attractive to institutions. *Change*, 27(5), 50-56.

Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., & Cress, C. M. (1997). *Faculty motivations for integrating service learning*. Report to the Corporation for National Service (RAND subcontract). Higher Education Research Institute: University of California, Los Angeles.

Astin, A. & Chang, M. (1995). Colleges that emphasize research and teaching. *Change*, 27(5), 44-50.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J. (1996). Communal participatory action research as a strategy for improving universities and the social sciences: Penn's work with the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps as a case study. *Educational Policy*, 10(2), 202-222.

Berberet, J. (1999). The professoriate and institutional citizenship toward a scholarship of service. *Liberal Education*, 85(4), 33-39.

Bess, J.L. (1998). Teaching well: Do you have to be schizophrenic? *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(1), 1-15.

Blackburn, R., & Lawrence, J. (1995). *Faculty at work*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

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

Braxton, J. (1996). Contrasting perspectives on the relationship between teaching and research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 90, 5-14.

Brew, A. (1999). Research and teaching: Changing relationships in a changing context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 291-301.

Brew, A. (2003). Teaching and research: New relationships and their implications for inquiry-based teaching and learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(1), 3-18.

Brew, A. & Boud, D. (1995). Teaching and research: Establishing the vital link with learning. *Higher Education*, 29(3), 261-273.

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

Campus Compact (2006). Thomas Ehrlich faculty award for service-learning. <http://www.campuscompact.org/awards/ehrllich/>, accessed February 28, 2006.

Campus Compact (2003). Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey, 2003 http://www.compact.org/about/statistics/2003/service-learning_development, accessed January 4, 2007.

Colbeck, C.L. (1995). *It's all in how you look at things: Alternative constructions of professors' undergraduate education role*. Paper presented for the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Orlando, FL, November 1995).

Colbeck, C. L. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1998, 69(6), 647-671.

Colbeck, C. L. (2002a). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 114, 43-52.

- Colbeck, C. L. (2002b). *Balancing teaching with other responsibilities: Integrating roles or feeding alligators*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
- Colbeck, C. L. (2004). *Managing multiple roles: Time drain or creating energy*. Paper presented at the meeting of American Association for Higher Education, San Diego, CA.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Michael, P. W. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. A. Eberly & J. R. Cohen (Eds.), *Public Scholarship. New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (pp. 17-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Denzin, N.K. (1978). *Sociological methods*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D.E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Furco, A. (2001). Advancing service learning at research universities. In M. Canada & B.W. Speck (Eds.), *Developing and implementing service learning programs* (pp. 67-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hattie, J. & Marsh, H.W. (1996). The relationship between teaching and research: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 507-542.
- Holland, B.A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4(1), 37-43.
- Huber, M.T. (2004). *Balancing acts: The scholarship of teaching and learning in academic careers*. Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Lombardi, J. (2001). *Quality engines: The strategic principles for competitive universities in the twenty-first century*. The Center Reports, University of Florida, March. Available on-line at http://jvlone.com/UCV_ENG_1a.pdf, accessed February 8, 2005.
- Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- McCaughey, R. (1994). *Scholars and teachers: The faculties of select liberal arts colleges and their place in American higher learning*, New York: Conceptual Litho Reproductions, Inc. [Columbia University Press].
- Menges, R.J. (Ed.). (1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Milem, J.F., Berger, J.B., & Dey, E.L. (2000). Faculty time allocation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 454-475.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- NERCHE (2006). New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Ernest A. Lynton award for Professional Service and Academic Outreach. http://www.nerche.org/Lynton_Award/lynton_award.html, accessed February 28, 2006.
- Neumann, R. (1992). Perceptions of the teaching-research nexus - a framework for analysis. *Higher Education*, 23(2), 159-171.
- Neumann, R. (1996). Researching the teaching-research nexus: A critical review. *Australian Journal of Education*, 40(1), 5-18.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 57-80.
- O'Meara, K. (2005). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types, In K. O'Meara & E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 255-289). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- O'Meara, K., & Braskamp, L. (2005). Aligning faculty reward systems and development to promote faculty and student growth. *NASPA Journal*, 42(2), 223-240.
- O'Meara, K. & Rice, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Patton, M.Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Peters, Scott J. (2000). The formative politics of outreach scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 6(1), 23-30.
- Peters, Scott J., N. R. Jordan, M. Adamek, & T. R. Alter (Eds.) (2005). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Dayton, OH: The Kettering Foundation Press.
- Reardon, K. (1998). Participatory action research as service learning. In R. Rhoads & J. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 57-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rice, E., Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation, New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century, Inquiry #7*. Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education.
- Ruscio, K.P. (1987). The distinctive scholarship of the selective liberal arts college, *Journal of Higher Education*, 58(2), 205-222.
- Schön, D. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change*, 27, November/December, 27-34.

- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29(5).
- Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2003). *Academic life and motherhood: Variations by institutional type*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, Oregon.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Authors

ALAN H. BLOOMGARDEN is director of Faculty Grants and Government Relations at Smith College, and an Ed.D. candidate in higher education at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. In both roles he studies and supports higher education-community partnerships, liberal arts college faculty work, and community-based learning and research.

KERRYANN O'MEARA is assistant professor of Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst where she is founder and program coordinator for a new Master's Track in Service-Learning and Community Engagement in Higher Education. Her research explores faculty careers, academic cultures, reward systems, and community engagement.