

CHAPTER 8

Faculty Civic Engagement

*New Training, Assumptions, and Markets Needed
for the Engaged American Scholar*

KERRYANN O'MEARA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores the evolution of the scholarship of engagement and institutional barriers for faculty involvement. In doing so, I discuss three major accomplishments of advocates of the scholarship of engagement in higher education. Next, I consider three barriers to faculty engagement that seem to receive less “air time” in our discussions but that are at the center of faculty professional work and careers. Finally, I examine current and future trends in the appointment types, roles, and rewards of faculty work and where community engagement might find future traction. Throughout the discussion, I draw a distinction between what Cuban (1988) calls “second-order changes”—that is, accomplishments and barriers that touch institutional culture and policy as well as daily practices of faculty, students, and community members—and more surface-level or first-order change.

One of the points made by the editors in framing this book is that the term “engagement” has assumed many meanings in higher education. While some researchers and commentators use the term to refer to student learning and interactions in and out of class, others use “engagement” to refer to theory-to-practice types of learning experiences such as internships, co-ops, or even studies abroad. For the professionals writing in this book, “civic engagement” and “community engagement” comprise a movement defined by teaching, research, and service with public purposes—and this is my intention as well. I am interested in engagement as learning, professional service, community-based research, and applied research that engage

professional or academic expertise in partnership and reciprocity with local expertise to address real-world issues (Driscoll and Lynton 1999; Elman and Smock 1985; Lynton 1995; Peters et al. 2005). This definition hinges on the idea that faculty civic engagement takes many forms, requires reciprocal partnership, and involves public work that contributes to our democracy (Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara 2008). Ernest Lynton (1995) first distinguished between faculty work that was proprietary in nature—wherein the process and products are essentially purchased as a private commodity—and faculty work wherein the process is intentionally open and inclusive, and the products are shared with community members and organizations that can use them for the public good. The term “scholarship” in “scholarship of engagement” builds on the work of Boyer (1990); Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997); and O'Meara and Rice (2005) to refer to faculty work that draws on expertise and knowledge, is disseminated and shared, and can be assessed for its impact, rigor, and relevance. As Sandmann (2008) points out, civic engagement as scholarship often integrates teaching, research, and outreach roles while inviting reciprocal interactions with partners in knowledge production. Though there have been several evolutions in the construction of the scholarship of engagement (such as from application to reciprocal engagement), changes in traditional scholarship suggest that “the distinction between traditional scholarship and engaged scholarship is becoming less bifurcated” (p. 98).

One final note on definitions of faculty civic engagement: my research on exemplar engaged faculty suggests that while there is relative agreement in the field about good principles of service-learning and community-based research practice, and the importance of reciprocity in partnership work, even those most engaged may not fully understand what it means for faculty work to be tied to public purposes. The very nature of faculty training, appointments, and workload is embedded in a somewhat technocratic understanding of faculty expertise (Boyer 2008). If faculty work were to truly become more public, there would potentially be profound implications for the governance of institutions, and the dominant coin of the realm would not be promotion and tenure but proven relevance and consequentiality.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

Several effective attempts have been made to record the history of the civic engagement movement overall (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz 1999; Hartley and Hollander 2005; Hollander and Hartley 2000). While historians have traced the beginnings of service missions in higher education back to colonial higher education and to the land-grant era (Peters et al. 2005), Hartley and Hollander (2005) observe that the movement in which most of the authors of this book have been involved is a more recent history beginning with the work of the National Society for Experiential Education in 1978, the International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership in 1982, the National Youth

Leadership Council in 1983, the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) in 1984, and Campus Compact in 1986 (see Table 1.2 in Chapter 1 of this volume). Individual students and groups of students played a key role in the early history of this movement (1978–1991), pushing campuses to establish support for community service and for faculty to integrate service-learning into their courses. The second wave of major events in the movement from the early 1990s to around 2003 seems to have emphasized integration of service-learning into curriculum as a permanent pedagogy and part of institutional mission. Faculty roles and rewards have been a major focus of disciplinary associations and national higher education associations and collaboratives. These groups tried throughout the late 1990s to the present to make faculty engagement more legitimate and central to faculty socialization, workload, and reward systems. One observation that can be made is that this history has prioritized faculty civic engagement through teaching over other forms of public work. This makes sense because students first pushed for faculty to become involved through coursework—the most central activity of the majority of faculty appointments. Teaching is also perhaps the faculty role around which it is easiest to develop models to export to other campuses, as many similar courses are taught across different institutional types. Indeed, most faculty whom we count today as engaged in public work do so more through their teaching than research, and they have concrete opportunities through institutional grant programs to develop connections between their classes and community partners.

There is, of course, a proud history of community-based research in many disciplines, especially in fields such as anthropology, sociology, social work, education, women's studies, African American studies, and professional schools of law and medicine. While the focus early on may have been on tangible field experiences for students and research opportunities for faculty, the field of community-based research (and faculty involved in such work) has acquired its own set of ethics, values, and skills for public scholarship in communities (Strand et al. 2003).

Likewise, there have long been relationships between university and college professors and public organizations and schools for activities like program development, professional development, technical assistance, and grant writing that serve the public good (Lynton 1995).

Yet only since Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), published twenty years ago, has the academy begun to consider these three types of faculty work—service-learning, community-based research, and professional service—as potential sources of scholarship for the purposes of faculty evaluation.

Responding to critiques in the late 1980s that higher education, and especially large research universities, were abdicating their responsibilities in the areas of teaching and service in favor of narrow research agendas, Boyer (1990) tried to reframe the conversation in terms of what faculty were contributing and in what ways. In 1990, Boyer advocated in the landmark Carnegie

report *Scholarship Reconsidered* that campuses transform their reward systems to align mission and evaluation in order to acknowledge multiple forms of scholarship, including discovery, teaching, integration, and application of knowledge. In subsequent work, “application” was changed to “engagement” to consider the reciprocal nature of relationships and knowledge flow (Boyer 1990; O’Meara and Rice 2005). This framework, which built directly on earlier work by Gene Rice, resonated with provosts, deans, and department chairs struggling with academic cultures that did not seem to be rewarding teaching and service, much less community engagement. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) followed the initial report with *Scholarship Assessed*, which provided actual criteria for assessing excellence in the four forms of scholarship. These criteria include clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. Hundreds of campuses adopted the Boyer framework and incorporated it into their promotion and tenure and related reward systems and evaluation policies (O’Meara and Rice 2005). Yet the framework was adopted by more baccalaureate and master’s campuses than research universities. Likewise, it was adopted by institutions that might be considered in the middle or toward the lower end of traditional prestige ladders. For example, very few of the 25 to 30 institutions Bloomgarden (2008) classifies as prestige-oriented liberal arts campuses have formally adopted the framework in faculty evaluation. Additionally, while it has been cited by organizations such as MLA and Imagining America, the framework and concept of multiple forms of scholarship is more familiar to faculty in education and the social sciences, to provosts and those in academic affairs and faculty development than to faculty in the hard sciences.

Alongside and contemporaneous with the movement to redefine scholarship came a movement around the idea of the scholarship of engagement—how to do it, how to document it, and how to assess it for promotion and tenure (Driscoll and Lynton 1999; Driscoll and Sandmann 2001; Giles 2008; Lynton 1995; O’Meara and Rice 2005; O’Meara 2002; Sandmann 2004, 2006; Sandmann and Weerts 2007; Sandmann 2008; Ward 2003). For over two decades, the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, and many disciplinary journals have been publishing articles on helping faculty develop their public work as scholarship and submit it for promotion and tenure. Likewise, the Outreach Scholarship Conference, the former American Association for Higher Education Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, and many efforts by Campus Compact have been directed at faculty development toward these same goals. Giles (2008) observes that as this movement has progressed, many definitions of “scholarship of engagement” have been used. These definitions emphasize different aspects of the work such as institutional mission, public or civic dimensions, ties to scholarly expertise, or integration of teaching, research,

and service (Giles 2008). Regardless, Giles concludes, and I agree, that this work has in fact “arrived” and is present in many different disciplines and institutional types. We do not want to “impose academic imperialism” on what is still an emerging field of theory and practice (Giles 2008, p. 98) but instead want to learn from the accomplishments of the movement and from the nuances in how faculty and administrators are defining the work and acting in practice and rhetoric, and how the work is being integrated into academic cultures.

The next section of this chapter describes three particular accomplishments of faculty, administrators, and policy makers who have been working to move faculty engagement from a peripheral activity (first-order) to a core faculty activity (second-order).

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MOVEMENT TO ADVANCE THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGAGEMENT

Accomplishment 1

There is more of it. As we consider what might be thought of as the top three accomplishments of the recent civic engagement movement, I think the first one, most plainly, is the increase over the last twenty-five years in the number of institutions that have made a commitment to this work, the number of faculty reporting that they are engaged in service-learning and community engagement research, and the number of opportunities campuses now have available for students to become involved in engagement with their communities.

Many argue, and I agree, that there was much “service-learning” and “action research” occurring before the movement adopted and began promoting these terms—particularly in professional schools in education, social work, public policy, legal and medical clinics, as well as through campus ministries and fraternities and sororities. Over the last twenty-five years, as this movement has spawned new offices of community service, new careers as directors of service-learning (O’Meara 1995), new faculty development opportunities in service-learning, new funding sources, and new partnerships with community service, there is, simply put, just much more going on now. Indeed, Zelda Gamson’s 1995 tag line that “service-learning has hit higher education big time” could read today “faculty and student engagement is here, there is a lot of it, and it isn’t going anywhere soon” (p. 4). The continued support of the Corporation of National Service and its AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America Programs, the expansion of Campus Compact to over 1,100 institutions, and the continued interest among students in service-learning in their courses all suggest that, like the use of technology in classrooms, the increased use of post-tenure review in reward systems, or the increasing diversification of the student body and faculty, service-learning is now a part of the permanent landscape of higher education. It is important to distinguish between

research-based and teaching-based public work because, while an argument will be made later that more disciplinary associations have advocated public-oriented research and there are new organizations popping up every day to connect faculty research to public purposes, such research-based work seems much less prevalent than faculty connections with teaching and community organizations.

Although it is important to recognize that most research universities and elite liberal arts colleges have not embraced faculty engagement in their reward systems, we must also acknowledge that there is no institutional type—public, private, liberal arts, or comprehensive—untouched by the service-learning and engagement movement. And while perhaps not embraced, many reward systems accommodate civically oriented service-learning and community-based research quite well. In 1986, there were 113 institutions in Campus Compact; today there are over 1,100, with all institutional types represented. Four-year institutions are better represented in Campus Compact than two-year institutions, yet the American Association of Community Colleges observes that over 60 percent of its campuses are engaged in service-learning, which is significant considering that almost half of all undergraduates begin their degrees at community colleges.

After establishing that the engagement movement has been successful in extending the number of students, faculty, and institutions involved, we must ask, “But involved in what?” As noted above, faculty and institutions define engagement differently according to discipline, faculty member, and institution. Thus, while we know we have more of “this” going on, we do not know exactly what “this” is. Many campuses are engaged in what Keith Morton (1995) refers to as “thin,” as opposed to “thick,” engagement, wherein there is minimal time committed, little integration of engagement with learning, and only nominal reflection or attention to reciprocal university or college partnerships (p. 21).

Most importantly, researchers and practitioners have no idea how much of the current engagement movement is actually enhancing student civic agency, making institutions more democratic places, and enhancing the civic capacity of community partners and citizens.

Accomplishment 2

Faculty civic engagement has reached disciplinary associations and developed a research base, well-established networks, discourse communities, and invisible colleges. Over the last twenty years, the movement to advocate for the scholarship of engagement has produced new journals, national associations, and invisible colleges and networks, as well as a research base. In the last five years, for instance, many disciplinary and interdisciplinary associations have advocated for the scholarship of engagement through national conferences or by adopting written policies supporting assessment of engagement for promotion and tenure. By no means comprising an exhaustive list, the following

associations, reports, and journals are illustrative of the amount and quality of disciplinary activity happening around the scholarship of engagement:

- The American Historical Association’s “Public History, Public Historians, and the American Historical Association: Report of the Task Force on Public History” (www.historians.org/governance/tfph/TFPHreport.htm)
- Public Anthropology (www.publicanthropology.org)
- The American Sociological Association (www.asanet.org)
- Queen’s University’s *International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering* (<http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/ijisle/index>)
- The Modern Language Association’s “Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion” (http://www.mla.org/tenure_promotion)
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (<http://www.depts.washington.edu/ccph>)
- Imagining America’s Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship (<http://www.imaginingamerica.org/TTI/TTI.html>)

The Modern Language Association’s 2007 “Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion” concludes that institutions and departments affiliated with the MLA need to do a better job of connecting institutional mission and reward systems, and amending reward systems to acknowledge broader forms of and new venues (e.g., media) for scholarship. The report acknowledges the importance of the “applied work of citizenship,” wherein faculty members partner with public organizations, and recommends that this work be better included in reward systems.

Likewise, in 2007 the American Sociological Association (ASA) recognized the longstanding contributions of sociologists to the public’s understanding of, and ability to act on, the social issues of our time by convening a task force to develop guidelines for the evaluation of public sociology for promotion and tenure. The report, titled “Standards of Public Sociology: Guidelines for Use by Academic Departments in Personnel Reviews,” was submitted by the Task Force on the Institutionalization of Public Sociology and suggests guidelines for defining and assessing what public sociology is and contains. Specifically, the report notes that public sociology builds on previous literature, is research-based, upholds rigorous methodological standards, is subject to peer review, includes or should include an expanded definition of “peer,” and demonstrates how portfolios can be used to display and evaluate public sociology.

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Collaborative (CPHC), under the auspices of Cathy Jordan (2007), developed the Community Engaged Scholarship Toolkit, which, while applicable to faculty in many disciplines, provides very concrete tools for faculty in the health fields to define their community engagement for promotion and tenure and develop

a portfolio that demonstrates rigor in both teaching and research aspects of community engagement.

Last but certainly not least is Imagining America's 2008 Tenure Team Initiative report, "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design," created by Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman. This report advocates for the recognition and assessment of a "continuum of scholarship" (iv), which includes work created with specific publics and communities outside academe and thereby embraces multiple products and expanded notions of peer review. The report also gives concrete examples of public engagement in the arts, humanities, and design. These are only a few examples of a sea shift of attention by disciplinary associations to issues of faculty public work.

It is important to note that as the currency of service-learning has risen and become more mainstream within higher education, it has done so alongside a greater legitimacy for action research and an increasing acknowledgment of how the ways in which we discover and disseminate knowledge are changing (Holland and Hollander 2006). That the disciplines have begun advocating in very concrete ways for engagement bodes well for its integration into the core of these different fields. What needs to be interrogated, however, is whether the approach will be largely instrumental and technocratic or democratic. That is, do these efforts argue for engagement as a way to change the world or to show the world why the discipline is still relevant—that is, how important it is? Do recent efforts by disciplinary associations to integrate engagement into promotion and tenure allow for epistemological shifts in what those disciplines consider rigorous contributions to knowledge, or are disciplines being encouraged to integrate engagement into existing belief and value systems around promotion and tenure?

Accomplishment 3

There has been significant attention to structures and processes for supporting faculty, students, and institutions in this work. The service-learning and civic engagement movements have come a long way since the early 1980s, when most administrators were directing community service while serving concomitantly as (for example) director of campus ministry, student activities, or honors programs; fraternity or sorority director; or faculty advisor to student groups (O'Meara 1995). There has been a steady growth in centers of service-learning, with an attendant increase in the number of directors of service-learning. In 2015, 86 percent of Campus Compact institutions had community service or service-learning offices to coordinate campus-based service work (Campus Compact 2010). In addition to budget allocations for full-time positions (the most valuable resource in organizations whose budget is 60 to 80 percent personnel), most of these centers or offices have permanent operating budget allocations, though small in most cases, to facilitate student and faculty involvement in community engagement.

Within the last ten years alone, many prestigious liberal arts colleges have had centers for service-learning endowed by large gifts from alumni (e.g., Tufts, Amherst, DePaul, and Duke). Similarly, many colleges and universities have moved engagement into the provost's or faculty development office, symbolizing the centrality of engagement to faculty roles and growth (O'Meara 2008d).

Thousands of directors of service-learning and individual faculty have likewise participated in Campus Compact and discipline-specific professional development workshops held by higher education associations (such as AACSCU, CIC, AAC&U, and APLU) that provide strategies for institutionalizing engagement on campus and developing reciprocal university-community partnerships off campus. Such efforts range from integrating service-learning into general education, getting engagement to "count" within reward systems, and semester-long service-learning communities for faculty.

Of course, a valid critique of such efforts is that differences in academic cultures and historic relationships between universities and communities make one-size-fits-all approaches less helpful. Yet there is certainly more scaffolding in place than before to support engagement with communities, in terms of bridge personnel, coordination, and even transportation.

Yet a critical question that we must ask is, does increased service-learning or community-based research necessarily mean enhanced student, faculty, or community civic agency? Are all of the resources supporting faculty and student civic engagement also enhancing community capacity for participation in a democracy? Are there aspects of the structures and processes we have set up to facilitate student learning that are either improving or limiting the potential of the public partners to fully invest in and benefit from the work?

In summary, the engagement movement has made at least three first-order changes that have the potential to become second-order if advocates are more reflective and intentional about goals and purposes related to civic engagement. We have more engagement, and it has invaded disciplinary associations and found a foothold in terms of structures and processes to support it. With this traction, the movement now needs to focus more intently on how the disciplines and structures supporting engagement work can be re-envisioned to enhance democracy.

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

With the above accomplishments in mind, this next section addresses three barriers to advancing faculty engagement. Each of these barriers, if addressed, would contribute to second-order change and connect higher education with public purposes.

The process, products, and socialization of doctoral education, which emphasizes competitive individualism, without attention to the consequentiality of research for public purposes. There is a long and insightful literature on graduate education and its importance to future faculty professional identity and

graduate student development as teachers and scholars, as well as more recent attention to these subjects (Austin 2002; Colbeck, O'Meara, and Austin 2008; Golde 2008; Weidman, Twale, and Stein 2001). For example, Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) apply socialization theory to the understanding of preparation for the professoriate. They find, as others have, that if graduate students do not have an apprenticeship of sorts in engagement, (Golde 2008) and if they do not develop professional identity as engaged scholars (Colbeck 2008), they will not develop the knowledge, skills, and professional orientation (Austin and McDaniels 2006) to truly become engaged scholars (O'Meara 2008c). What is needed are specific opportunities or "critical experiences" in masters and doctoral programs for graduate students to develop the knowledge, skills, and orientation most relevant to their future engaged work (O'Meara 2008c; O'Meara and Jaeger 2007).

As such, the problem for the future of faculty community engagement regarding graduate education is twofold. First, as mentioned above, graduate students who do not have opportunities to practice engaged scholarship, either in their teaching or research, are unlikely to feel prepared to do so later as faculty. Second, students who do not experience engagement in graduate education are less likely to gravitate toward it later as a core part of their work. There are simply too many competing demands. For example, Sweitzer (2008) and Colbeck (2008) have used professional identity theory (Stryker 1968) to understand how future faculty balance their teaching interests with an environment that strongly emphasizes research. According to Stryker (1968), individuals organize their identities in a hierarchy that affects the likelihood that one identity will be more salient than others. Salience is determined by commitment to each identity. Students will develop a commitment to a specific identity (e.g., teacher, researcher, engaged scholar) based in large part on the work they do in graduate school, the network they develop, their chosen commitments, and the degree to which the environment around them confirms or rejects these commitments (Colbeck 2008).

I have written elsewhere about the many exciting movements of community engagement within graduate education (O'Meara 2008c, 2007a; O'Meara and Jaeger 2007). Of particular note are efforts initiated and led by graduate students within disciplines and the critical work of disciplinary associations and major conferences (such as the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, the Imagining America graduate networks, and the Outreach Scholarship Conferences) to create concrete and formative experiences for graduate students in community engagement (O'Meara 2007a).

It is impossible, however, to ignore that most faculty are educated in research and doctoral-granting universities that remain more focused on research as traditionally defined than engaged teaching and engaged scholarship. The bottom line of research universities is that they continually strive for prestige in *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, for external grant funding, and for faculty to be ranked in the top group of researchers (as more narrowly

defined) by their disciplines (O'Meara 2007a). As strategic planning and goal setting trickles down to actual graduate program and department planning, there is pressure for faculty and doctoral students to focus less on teaching and development of community partnerships and more on quantifiable indicators of success. For research university faculty this means numbers of articles and books written for top-tier journals and presses: for doctoral students, it means placement after graduating in top postdoctoral and junior faculty positions. As such, the central work of doctoral students—the dissertation—is focused on individual, as opposed to collaborative, work that is more likely to be read by other academics—that is, more private than public in its focus. While many natural sciences engage graduate students in collaborative lab work for dissertations, there is still hierarchy in terms of where names appear on papers. As in other fields, the process often does not connect faculty with public purposes.

The dissertation process itself seems to be at odds with the very values of public, engaged scholarship as collaborative, jointly owned, and interested from its start in impact (O'Meara 2008c). Engaged scholarship engages community partners and publics on what research will be done, involving partners when possible in projects and getting results into the hands of those who can use them immediately and with high priority. The current process of dissertation writing, however, does not have this set of priorities. Rather, most dissertation writing is done alone with the supervision of a dissertation chair, with the purpose of adding to academic knowledge, and most dissertation findings remain with academic audiences.

In sum, while many graduate students are creating new service-learning classes and beginning engaged scholarship as doctoral students, engaged scholarship has not systematically spread throughout graduate education and across disciplines. This is a second-order problem and, if addressed, would move higher education toward more and higher quality public work.

The foundation of faculty work as private in nature. Moving from graduate socialization into the structures and cultures of higher education institutions, one finds another pervading barrier to faculty engagement: though differing by institutional type, the pedestal or foundation upon which faculty do much of their work is considered by most to be innately private (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009). While many have written about the prized and valued autonomy of faculty members in pursuing their work, there are structural disadvantages to the way in which engagement fits into many faculty appointments and careers.

For the sake of illustration, imagine an umbrella—the handle and long stick at the center, with spokes branching out and supporting the top material. The central stick and spokes in this metaphor represent the foundation of a faculty career, such as one's appointment in a discipline or unit of a college or university. This appointment is made with an understanding of accountability to an essentially private interest—the effective running of that department or unit,

and, in a broader way, the college (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009). The more research-oriented the unit, the more it will call upon disciplinary peers outside the institution to make sure that person's work is accountable to the unit's interest—that that person is cutting-edge in their research in the field. The more teaching-oriented, the more that unit will hold the faculty member accountable to teaching evaluations from “private, paying students” and advising and service work to the unit. In any case, though, the unit holds the faculty member accountable to its own interests through reappointment to contracts, tenure, and promotion. It then becomes in that faculty member's self-interest to be reappointed and promoted by serving the interests of that unit. This encourages the spokes that emanate from the central stick—that is, the teaching, research, and service—to be more private activities, in that they are accountable only to the interests of their units (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009).

Thus, even when faculty engage in excellent public work, it is in many ways also private work. That is, the faculty members decided to do this work and may have public partners in it, but they are not accountable for it at the core of their appointment. Rather, it is considered something “nice” that they do as social entrepreneurs (of sorts) on top of or in addition to their appointments (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009). In such instances, public work is not considered central to their appointments.

As a result of this structure, the public comes to think of 90 percent of what faculty do as private work (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009): “Faculty educate someone else's children, or mine only, because I am paying them as I would a financial adviser for a service.” Research is considered something faculty do to get tenure, not an activity that relates to real problems with the economy, war, or global warming.

Clearly, an argument can be made that as nonprofit institutions, the interests of departments, especially those in public state institutions, are not just private; they are also the interests of the state and region. Do citizens of the state not want a leading research university or top-ranked program? Teaching influences the preparedness of the workforce; however, for most citizens who live near a college or university, it does not seem that faculty are available to serve public purposes. Many doors and windows to faculty work are closed. Most colleges and universities do not have vehicles to disseminate research to local community partners, either in person or electronically. Very few academic programs invite alumni or local citizens onto advisory boards to comment on curriculum and relevancy to current issues. Rarely do faculty try to instill civic agency by opening their classrooms so community partners can see what is happening. Public discourse sheds much more light on faculty unions attempting to accrue better benefits and salaries, and on problems with tenure, than on what faculty are learning about and contributing to public issues.

In sum, the governance of most institutions does not hold faculty accountable to public interests or open up their work for viewing or participation from local partners.

I say this realizing that much of the creativity and inspiration found in excellent faculty engagement work stems from the autonomy the faculty member had to envision and construct the project without interference or oversight from university administrators or even peers (O'Meara qtd. in Barker and Brown 2009). Indeed, the autonomy many faculty have in their public work does provide excellent fertilizer for social entrepreneurship. But the fact that even public faculty work can have an essentially private foundation (i.e., the faculty member could just decide not to do this work anymore and there would be no public accounting for that), does seem to be at the crux of the issue of why more faculty are not involved in public work. It is a bigger and more complex issue than the often-mentioned complaint that "it doesn't count" for promotion, tenure, contract renewal, or merit pay. The issue is more about how the structures and cultures in our institutions have shaped us to view the purposes of our work and what makes it meaningful.

Different markets and assumptions for faculty civic engagement versus more traditional scholarship. Shaffer (2008) observes that the "metaphor of the market" has become the organizing concept of our time. This is to say that most arguments for higher education today, as well as for other major aspects of our society (e.g., health care and public safety), pose higher education as a solution to a private interest—the capacity to get a good job and join or stay in the middle or upper classes.

Positioning higher education as a private good simultaneously poses faculty work as private, as noted above. Likewise, as organizational theorists have pointed out, each of the institutions in which faculty work have their own political and cultural economy. This is particularly relevant when considering how institutional type influences faculty roles and rewards. For example, while Boyer's framework was used by many at research and doctoral universities to advocate for greater attention to teaching, in many baccalaureate institutions it became a way to encourage faculty participation in any form of scholarship, though most often teaching scholarship (O'Meara 2005). As such, while the chief barriers to greater civic engagement in research universities might be inhospitable reward systems and pressures for publications and grants, in more teaching-oriented institutions high teaching and advising loads may be the major barrier (O'Meara 2005). Yet there are also issues that cut across institutional type to influence academic cultures and their acceptance of faculty public work. Beyond the purely technical issues of needing bridge personnel to help cultivate relationships with community, supports like vans to transport students, and curricular structures and centers to house these experiences, there is a marketplace in every institution of higher education. Within this marketplace, some activities are more valued commodities than others, depending on institutional goals, institutional leadership, faculty goals and leadership, workload, and past practice. When faculty bring certain aspects of their work to this marketplace (such as external grant funding, a book published with a competitive press, or a research award) they are

rewarded with both tangible and intangible currency. This currency may take the tangible form of tenure or promotion and merit pay or the intangible form of greater respect by colleagues or persuasive power in shared governance. Similar rewards might accrue to the winner of a college-wide teaching award in a very teaching-focused college.

The problem that faculty who are involved in public work face is that it is harder to gain distinction for this work within institutional marketplaces, for at least three reasons. First, very few institutions have marketplaces where engagement is considered a prized commodity. Even in institutions that have made civic engagement a commitment, civic engagement in and of itself is not considered as valuable, even in its best forms, as other potential currencies. Second, it is harder to distinguish oneself or demonstrate excellence within the institutional marketplace for engagement. In part, this is because the values and priorities of engagement are in conflict with the values and priorities of more traditional research, and thus excellence looks different. Because of the diversity of civic engagement projects across institutions, there are few norms that can be easily established for quality or quantity of work for faculty to clearly rise above.

Third, establishing legitimacy and excellence involves witness of the work within a specific context or community. In the case of the institutional marketplace, faculty have their research witnessed through their disciplinary associations, university presses, and top-tier journals, and they bring their assessments back to the institutional community. Those judging the research are considered “of the university,” and their recognition brings prestige back to the institution. While there are national teaching awards and programs, most teaching excellence is witnessed “in-house” by students, colleagues, and alumni, and therefore it is legitimized there. It is given currency for its immediate value to institutional goals and recognized through internal measures of teaching evaluations and rewards. Institutional marketplaces are, of course, influenced by the national higher education system, which uses the acquisition of prestige—by increasing selectivity or research productivity and improving *U.S. News and World Report* rankings—to try to acquire greater resources to support their activities (O’Meara 2007b).

Engagement unfortunately faces a triple threat in the academic and institutional marketplace. While the other two major forms of faculty work—traditional research and teaching—are providing the marketplace tangible outcomes that add to either the prestige or direct betterment of its members (students, faculty, institutional goals, and reputation), civic work often has as its goal the improvement of conditions for citizens not associated with the university. Likewise, at least some of the “witnesses” that count most to civically engaged scholars are community partners who are often not formally organized in ways that allow them to evaluate excellence or in any way distinguish the work for the institutional marketplace. Finally, the greatest impact of the work is often not a contribution to theory or even to student learning (though both may be present), but the amelioration of a social, political, educational,

or economic problem. While an institution may praise faculty in their efforts to end global warming or impact local economic development, we can also see why the work itself may not add much to faculty currency in the institutional marketplace.

Table 8.1 extends this concept of the barrier of markets to something deeper—the assumptions that guide the markets. A foundation for this idea of assumptions was Gene Rice’s (1996) pivotal work “Making a Place for the New American Scholar,” which described how, after World War II, an “assumptive world of the academic professional” that prioritizes certain types of faculty work over others emerged. While Rice recognized these priorities will vary by institutional type and across disciplines, he noted that they tend to establish a set of expectations at the top of the prestige hierarchy, which has reverberations throughout the system. This assumptive world of the academic professional guides many reward systems in American higher education and prioritizes empirical research and dissemination of peer-reviewed research to academic audiences. In my own research (O’Meara 2002) on the evaluation of community engagement as a form of scholarship for promotion and tenure, I also found such traditional values, beliefs, and assumptions of the academic professional working against the positive valuation to engagement. A few notes about Table 8.1:

- For effect, I have intentionally contrasted two sets of assumptions (one based on the academic professional Rice [1996] wrote about—the more traditional research university model vs. the engaged American Scholar) as if they were polar opposites. I do not personally know any faculty member engaged in public work who doesn’t maintain a foothold in at least some aspects of both sets of assumptions simultaneously.
- Likewise, a faculty member may have a very traditional set of assumptions about teaching and a seemingly opposite set regarding public work. While we know that many faculty members integrate their personal and professional work and different work roles, we also know that many compartmentalize for different reasons.
- I have added the term “American” to the phrase “engaged scholar” in the same tradition of Rice’s “new American scholar.” Rice points out that in the vision of the engaged American scholar, “theoretical reflection and practice are mutually reinforcing, each enriching the other” (1996, p. 16). While pragmatism and utility are by no means solely American virtues, it does seem to me that the visions we have of democracy and civic work of faculty are influenced by our national context. As in Rice’s earlier work, the point is not to be nationalistic but to acknowledge that the call for greater faculty civic work in the United States is influenced by contexts that are local and woven into traditions in American higher education. In the best possible sense, the engaged American scholar employs the

TABLE 8.1 THE ASSUMPTIVE WORLD OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ENGAGED AMERICAN SCHOLAR

<i>Assumptions about Goals and Purposes of One's Work as a Professional</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Research is the central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life (Rice 1996).	Impact, whether found in classrooms, with community partners, in policy making, or in dissemination of research, is a central professional endeavor and focus of academic life.
Knowledge is pursued for its own sake (Rice 1996).	Knowledge is pursued to improve the world.
The distinctive task of the academic professional is the pursuit of cognitive truth (Rice 1996).	The distinctive task of the academic professional is the pursuit of learning that has consequence.
<i>Assumptions about Approaches to the Pursuit of Knowledge</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
The pursuit of knowledge is best organized according to disciplines and departments (Rice 1996).	The pursuit of knowledge is best organized according to problems, understood in local context.
Scholarship is completed apart from practitioners, and often for them (O'Meara 2002).	Scholarship is completed with those who will use it, in collaborative knowledge construction. (O'Meara 2002).
The methods used to create knowledge should be as scientific, reliable, objective, and devoid of error and bias as possible.	The process used to make knowledge should be as transformative, democratic, and inclusive as possible; engaged scholars are attentive to their own locations in higher education institutions, and the social capital and resources therein, and have a heightened sensitivity to cultural literacy and relevancy (O'Meara 2008a).
<i>Assumptions about How to Judge the Quality of One's Work and about Rigor</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Reputations are established through national and international professional associations (Rice 1996).	Reputations are established through relationships and through creation of knowledge with consequence.
Quality in the profession is maintained by peer review and professional autonomy (Rice 1996).	Quality is maintained by peer review by academic and nonacademic peers and is also found in impact.
Writing is scholarly because of where it is, not what it is (O'Meara 2002).	Scholarship is a process as well as a product, one best informed by expertise as well as local context. It has many potential products and outcomes that are disseminated and shared widely.
Scholarship is empirical research disseminated to the academic community (O'Meara 2002)	

TABLE 8.1 THE ASSUMPTIVE WORLD OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ENGAGED AMERICAN SCHOLAR (*Continued*)

<i>Assumptions about the Products of Scholarship</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Scholarship should be published in places that reach other academic professionals in a field or discipline (peer-reviewed journal articles and academic presses).	Engaged scholars value disseminating the products of their work in the places where it will have the most impact (O'Meara 2008a).
<i>Assumptions about Partners in Knowledge Production</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Partners need to be informed; they lack expertise and knowledge.	Partners have critical knowledge and can solve the problems of their own community. Engaged scholars give credit to community partners for collaborative work (O'Meara 2008a).
<i>Assumptions about Reward Systems</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who persistently accentuate their specialization (Rice 1996).	Professional rewards, but more importantly meaning, purpose, and a sense of consequence accrue to individuals that emphasize relationships and capacity building in solving problems.
<i>Assumptions about the Most Important Contributions of Faculty to Society</i>	
<i>Post-WWII Academic Professional</i>	<i>Engaged American Scholar</i>
Scholars' most important contribution to society is the application of expertise to the discovery and dissemination of knowledge.	Scholars' most important contribution to society is their ability to bring values and skills of academic professionals as well as expertise to partnerships with students, community partners, and knowledge circles to solve problems.

This table takes statements from Rice (1996) and O'Meara (2002, 2008a.) and was furthermore influenced by ideas in Strand et al. (2003) and Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton (2009).

best of the German research university model and the best of the extension land-grant and community college models of higher education, wherein theory and practice are both relevant and in conversation with each other as opposed to polar opposites.

In the assumptive world of the academic professional described by Rice and that we all know as more standard practice, we see an epistemology that gives greater currency to work that is done alone, is more theoretical and separated from practice, and whose end result is a brick on a disciplinary wall of knowledge, as opposed to a change in practice. By contrast, in the example of the American engaged scholar we see an epistemology that gives greater

currency to work that matters to society, is more comfortable merging theory and practice, and whose end result is actionable knowledge. Another way to look at assumptions in regard to markets is that while traditional scholarship assumes an audience in the academic community and therefore does not have to develop one, engaged scholarship actively works to develop, as Peters et al. (2005) has observed, “publics” for their work.

Higher education marketplaces clearly pose a barrier for engaged scholars because the higher education system as a whole does not typically share the same assumptions and values about their work and scholarship. Faculty take many different approaches to this problem. Bloomgarden’s (2008) research in a set of prestigious liberal arts colleges illustrates that some faculty compartmentalize their civic work into a service category and do not try to have it evaluated as scholarship, essentially accommodating the assumptions of traditional work and bringing that to bear when looking for institutional rewards. Some faculty make the best case possible, using many of the models mentioned earlier by think tanks and disciplinary associations. Still others use hybrid approaches, not engaging in the work until after tenure, integrating it into their teaching but not their scholarship, and making the case for the work in some arenas but not others. Many of these faculty are successful regardless of their chosen path, as they often bring with them other “currency” (e.g., being highly rated teachers, external grants) to reward systems that interact for positive affect.

In summary, doctoral education, the structural foundation of faculty appointments as private, and the different sets of market assumptions of civic engagement and more traditional faculty work act as significant barriers to the movement to expand and improve faculty civic engagement efforts. Though a lengthy discussion is not possible here, I do also think we could do a better job providing role models and descriptions of civic work with real consequence in different disciplines. This would provide faculty with more visible examples of cases of faculty civic work that is political and democratic *and* rigorous and engaged. I also believe we need to emphasize the skills and competencies faculty employ as academic professionals that are not based on expertise (see O’Meara 2008b).

One piece of positive news related to these barriers is that most studies with exemplary engaged faculty (Boyte 2004; O’Meara 2008c) suggest that faculty are motivated to be involved in civic engagement for intrinsic reasons. This provides a buffer to the lack of graduate socialization (as it can be adopted later in career), to the structure of the academic career as private, and against market interests (as intrinsic motivation can occur outside of and in direct conflict with reward systems). Engagement seems to pull faculty toward students, their colleagues, and the public, whetting their appetites for engaged work. In addition to its intrinsic good in terms of providing a sense that the work matters, engagement offers an alternative to “lone ranger,” isolated departments and ways of being (Boyte 2004; O’Meara 2008c; Peters et al. 2005; Rice 1996).

LOOKING AHEAD

Looking ahead, those interested in supporting and extending the civic work of faculty need to find ways to make the distinctly political and democratic components of the work and its impact more visible. Likewise, we need to look at how the sea change in faculty appointments might be harming faculty capacity to become involved in civic work. For example, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) have shown that the greatest number of new positions are now emphasizing teaching—and are less likely to have well-financed, structured opportunities for faculty growth—such as sabbaticals, professional development programs, and learning communities (O’Meara, Terosky, and Neumann 2009). The new frontier for faculty engagement with democratic purposes will surely mean both making campuses more democratic and fair for nontenure-track and tenure-track faculty and creating hospitable environments for these faculty to link their work with public purposes. This will be particularly difficult in appointments without any research focus. At the same time, Generation X and Y faculty are joining faculty positions looking for opportunities to have impacts in their communities and for balance and meaning in their work lives. Whether in tenure-track or nontenure-track appointments, these will be exceptionally well-educated and prepared scholars who are able to find just what they are looking for in civic work. Faculty development aimed at developing civic agency (O’Meara 2008b) and new reward systems that include this work for nontenure-track appointments will be key to these efforts.

REFERENCES

- Austin, A. E. 2002. “Creating a Bridge to the Future: Preparing New Faculty to Face Changing Expectations in a Shifting Context.” *Review of Higher Education* 26 (2): 119–144.
- Austin, A. E., and M. McDaniels. 2006. “Using Doctoral Education to Prepare Faculty to Work within Boyer’s Four Domains of Scholarship.” In *Delving Further into Boyer’s Perspectives on Scholarship*, ed. J. M. Braxton, 51–65. New Directions for Institutional Research 129 (Spring). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barker, W. M., and D. W. Brown, eds. 2009. *A Different Kind of Politics: Readings on Democracy and Higher Education*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Bloomgarden, A. 2008. “Prestige Culture and Community-Based Faculty Work.” PhD diss., University of Massachusetts–Amherst.
- Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyte, H. C. 2004. *Going Public: Academics and Public Life*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- . 2008. “Against the Current: Developing the Civic Agency of Students.” *Change* 40 (3): 8–15.
- Campus Compact. 2010. “2010 Annual Member Survey.” Available at <http://www.compact.org/about/statistics>.
- Colbeck, C. L. 2008. “Professional Identity Development Theory and Doctoral Education.” In *Educating Integrated Professionals: Theory and Practice on*

- Preparation for the Professoriate*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning 113, ed. C. L. Colbeck, K. O'Meara, and A. Austin, 9–13. San Francisco: Wiley.
- Colbeck, C. L., K. O'Meara, and A. Austin, eds. 2008. *Educating Integrated Professionals: Theory and Practice on Preparation for the Professoriate*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 113. San Francisco: Wiley.
- Cuban, L. 1988. "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform." *Phi Delta Kappan* 69 (5): 341–342.
- Driscoll, A., and E. Lynton, eds. 1999. *Making Outreach Visible: A Workbook on Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Driscoll, A., and L. R. Sandmann. 2001. "From Maverick to Mainstream: The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 6 (2): 9–19.
- Ellison, J., and T. Eatman. 2008. *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University: A Resource on Promotion and Tenure in the Arts, Humanities, and Design*. Imagining America. Available at http://www.community-wealth.org/_pdfs/articles-publications/universities/paper-ellison-eastman.pdf.
- Elman, S. E., and S. M. Smock. 1985. *Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Gamson, Z. 1995. "Faculty and Service." *Change* 27, no. 1 (January/February): 4.
- Giles, D. E. 2008. "Understanding an Emerging Field of Scholarship: Toward a Research Agenda for Engaged, Public Scholarship." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12 (2): 97–108.
- Glassick, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Golde, C. M. 2008. "Applying Lessons from Professional Education to the Preparation of the Professoriate." In *Educating Integrated Professionals: Theory and Practice on Preparation for the Professoriate*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning 113, ed. C. L. Colbeck, K. O'Meara, and A. Austin, 17–26. San Francisco: Wiley.
- Hartley, M., and E. Hollander. 2005. "The Elusive Ideal: Civic Learning and Higher Education." In *Institutions of Democracy: The Public Schools*, ed. S. Fuhrman and M. Lazerson, 252–276. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holland, B. A., and E. Hollander. 2006. "Campus Compact's 20/20 Vision: Celebrating Our First Twenty Years and Planning for the Next Two Decades." Campus Compact. Available at http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/framing_essay.pdf.
- Hollander, E., and M. Hartley. 2000. "Civic Renewal in Higher Education: The State of the Movement and the Need for a Natural Network." In *Higher Education and Civic Responsibility*, ed. T. Ehrlich, 345–366. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Jordan, C., ed. 2007. "Community-Engaged Scholarship Toolkit." Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Available at <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/toolkit.html>.
- Lynton, E. 1995. *Making the Case for Professional Service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Morton, K. 1995. "The Irony of Service: Charity, Project and Social Change in Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2: 19–32.
- O'Meara, K. 1995. "Community Service Professionals: An Emerging Profession." Masters thesis, Ohio State University.

- . 2002. “Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship.” *Review of Higher Education* 26 (1): 57–80.
- . 2005. “Effects of Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship Nationwide and Across Institutional Types.” In *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, ed. K. A. O’Meara and R. E. Rice, 255–289. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 2007a. “Graduate Education and Civic Engagement.” NERCHE Working Brief 20, New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Boston.
- . 2007b. “Striving for What? Exploring the Pursuit of Prestige.” In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* 22, ed. J. C. Smart, 121–179. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- . 2008a. “Graduate Education and Community Engagement.” In *Educating Integrated Professionals: Theory and Practice on Preparation for the Professoriate*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning 113, ed. C. L. Colbeck, K. O’Meara, and A. Austin, 27–42. San Francisco: Wiley.
- . 2008b. “Making the Case for the New American Scholar.” Campus Compact Toolkit on Engaged Scholarship. Available at <http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/omeara-final.pdf>.
- . 2008c. “Motivation for Public Scholarship and Engagement: Listening to Exemplars.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12 (1): 7–29.
- . 2008d. “Taking Public Work Seriously: Enhancing Civic Agency Through Faculty Development.” Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL.
- O’Meara, K., and A. Jaeger. 2007. “Preparing Future Faculty for Community Engagement: History, Barriers, Facilitators, Models, and Recommendations.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 11 (4): 3–26.
- O’Meara, K. A., and R. E. Rice, eds. 2005. *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O’Meara, K., A. Terosky, and A. Neumann. 2009. *Faculty Careers and Work-Lives: A Professional Growth Perspective*. ASHE Higher Education Report vol. 34, no. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, S. J., N. R. Jordan, M. Adamek, and T. Alter, eds. 2005. *Engaging Campus and Community: The Practice of Public Scholarship in the State and Land-Grant University System*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Rice, R. E. 1996. “Making a Place for the New American Scholar.” Working Paper Series 1. American Association for Higher Education Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards.
- Saltmarsh, J., M. Hartley, and P. H. Clayton. 2009. “Democratic Engagement White Paper.” Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sandmann, L., J. Saltmarsh, and K. O’Meara. 2008. “Creating Academic Homes: An Integrated Model for Advancing the Scholarship of Engagement.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12 (1): 47–63.
- Sandmann, L. R. 2004. “Scholarship of Engagement: An Oxymoron?” In *Adult Education for Democracy, Social Justice, and a Culture of Peace: Proceedings for the Joint International Conference of the Adult Education Research Conference and Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education*, ed. D. Clover, 580–582. Victoria: University of Victoria.
- . 2006. “Scholarship as Architecture: Framing and Enhancing Community Engagement.” *Journal of Physical Therapy Education* 20 (3): 80–84.

- . 2008. “Conceptualization of the Scholarship of Engagement in Higher Education: A Strategic Review, 1996–2006.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12 (1): 91–106.
- Sandmann, L. R., and D. J. Weerts. 2007. “Reshaping Institutional Boundaries to Accommodate an Engagement Agenda.” Presentation at Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.
- Schuster, J. H., and M. J. Finkelstein. 2006. *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shaffer, M. 2008. *Public Culture: Diversity, Democracy, and Community in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Stanton, T., D. E. Giles, and N. Cruz. 1999. *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Strand, K., S. Marullo, N. Cutforth, R. Stoecker, and P. Donohue. 2003. *Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stryker, S. 1968. “Identity Salience and Role Performance.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 4: 558–564.
- Sweitzer, V. L. 2008. “Networking to Develop a Professional Identity: A Look at the First Semester Experience of Doctoral Students in Business.” In *Educating Integrated Professionals: Theory and Practice on Preparation for the Professoriate*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning 113, ed. C. L. Colbeck, K. O’Meara, and A. Austin, 43–56. San Francisco: Wiley.
- Ward, K. 2003. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 29, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weidman, J. C., D. J. Twale, and E. L. Stein. 2001. *Socialization of Graduate and Professional Students in Higher Education—A Perilous Passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 28, no. 3. Washington, DC: George Washington University.