

From Rhetoric to Reality: A Typology of Publically Engaged Scholarship

Diane M. Doberneck, Chris R. Glass, and John Schweitzer

Introduction

Across higher education, we lack a common understanding of the language of public service. A confusing myriad of terms has arisen, and the rhetoric of public service is not clear to everyone. . . . [T]he lack of clear and comparable definitions and terms such as service, public service, professional service, community service, service learning, internships, practica, and so on . . . constrain[s] faculty involvement and . . . make[s] effective documentation and evaluation difficult (Holland, 1999, p. 39).

Barbara Holland's words still ring true in 2010—scholars and practitioners of outreach and engagement continue the never-ending search for a shared language to describe faculty work that addresses society's practical concerns. In the decade since Holland's observation, a confusing myriad of terms has proliferated as various institutions, associations, and disciplines have defined and interpreted publicly engaged scholarship for their specific audiences and contexts (Barker, 2004; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Kellogg Commission, 1996, 1999, 2000; Sandmann, 2008; Schomberg & Farmer, 1994).

Although it is beyond the scope of this article to provide a comprehensive overview of all of the language used to describe publicly engaged scholarship, a few examples serve to illustrate the range of terminology used in different disciplines. First, in *Imagining America's Tenure Team Initiative Report (2008)*, based on a multi-year study of engagement in the arts, humanities, and design fields, Ellison and Eatman use a variety of terms, including *publicly engaged academic work*, *public scholarship*, *public engagement*, *public scholarly and creative work*, *community partnerships*, *publicly engaged humanists*, *civically engaged scholars*, *civic agency*, *civic professionals*, and *community engagement* to describe engaged scholars and engaged scholarship in the arts, humanities, and design fields. In contrast, the rhetoric of publicly engaged scholarship in health and medical fields often uses the term *clinical and translational science*, a type of *translational research* that bridges the gap between laboratory discovery and practice,

otherwise known as the “bench to bedside interface” (Feldman, 2008). Finally, in the social sciences, the language of publicly engaged scholarship includes *participatory research*, *community partnerships*, *public scholarship*, *public information networks*, and *civic literacy*, to name just a few terms (Barker, 2004). Each of these phrases has been used to describe the scholarly contributions faculty members make to the public good. On one hand, this rhetoric signifies a welcome maturing and deepening of the engagement movement in the disciplines. On the other hand, the expanding terminology leaves institutional leaders, faculty members, and scholars of engagement without a “set of precise terms to describe and capture the community-oriented activities of faculty that are closely associated with core research, teaching, and service roles of the professoriate” (Wade & Demb, 2009, pp. 13–14).

The lack of a language for publicly engaged scholarship poses a problem for institutional leaders, especially in light of

“Communicating the value of publicly engaged scholarship to key external stakeholders. . . requires a clear understanding of the types of publicly engaged activities in which faculty members are involved.”

public criticism concerning their institutions’ contributions to the greater good of society (Boyte, 2005; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005; Matthews, 2006). In this demanding climate of public accountability, institutional leaders are challenged to move beyond the rhetoric of engagement to detail the contributions their faculty members make to better society. Communicating the value of publicly engaged scholarship to key external stakeholders—including legislators, funding agencies, foundations, alumni, and prospective

students—requires a clear understanding of the types of publicly engaged activities in which faculty members are involved.

In addition, the wide variety of terms creates a challenge for institutional leaders who want to strengthen publicly engaged scholarship on their campuses. Recent research has shown a disjuncture between administrators who promote publicly engaged scholarship at institutional levels and faculty members who collaborate with communities as part of their scholarly practice (Moore & Ward, 2008, p. 20). In short, the generalized way publicly engaged scholarship is described by institutional leaders does not resonate with many faculty members. Similarly, the ways in which faculty members conceptualize and enact their community-

engaged scholarship are strongly influenced by disciplinary discourse, reflecting approaches that are seldom universal enough to embody faculty activities in the entire institution (*Diamond & Adam, 1995; Diamond & Adam, 2000; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Kagan, 2009*). This leads to a disjuncture between the rhetoric of institutional leaders and the reality of engaged scholars. Needed is a way of describing publicly engaged scholarship that makes sense both to institutional leaders and to faculty members—a kind of middle ground where different types of publicly engaged scholarship are described in enough detail that faculty members may see their own scholarship reflected in the language, but in a language that is universal and avoids the specificities of disciplinary rhetoric.

To address these challenges, the researchers framed this study as an exploratory, qualitative inquiry to discover and name types of publicly engaged scholarship based on empirical data. Instead of analyzing the rhetoric promoted by institutional leaders, the researchers focused on understanding the reality of publicly engaged scholarship as described by faculty members themselves. Through this bottom-up approach, they sought to develop a typology that was both reflective of the faculty experience and useful at the institutional level.

“Instead of analyzing the rhetoric promoted by institutional leaders, the researchers focused on understanding the reality of publicly engaged scholarship as described by faculty members themselves.”

Research Design

The study’s purpose was to discover the types of publicly engaged scholarship in which faculty members are involved, and to develop a typology based upon faculty descriptions of engaged scholarship. Successfully promoted or tenured full-time faculty members at Michigan State University (MSU) provided consent for the researchers to use their promotion and tenure forms as this study’s initial source of data. A standard institution-wide promotion and tenure form is the one part of faculty members’ tenure dossiers that is kept on file with MSU’s Office of Academic Human Resources after the promotion or tenure decisions are rendered. As a result, the promotion and tenure forms were the only official institutional records available to the researchers for this study.

In addition to promotion and tenure forms from MSU, the researchers incorporated a second source of data into the analysis.

Documents generated by faculty members at other research-intensive institutions about types of publicly engaged scholarship served as a second source of data in the refinement of the typology that emerged from the MSU promotion and tenure data. This second step in data analysis ensured that the typology was not bound strictly by institutional characteristics specific to Michigan State University.

Research Questions

Relying on both sources of data, the researchers organized this exploratory, qualitative study around the following research questions:

1. What types of scholarly activities do faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship?
2. What typology of publicly engaged scholarship emerges from faculty descriptions of publicly engaged scholarship?

The existing literature on faculty members' publicly engaged scholarship focuses predominantly on institutional influences that enable or prohibit faculty engagement (e.g., mission, culture, reward systems, institutional leadership); personal characteristics of engaged faculty (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, motivation, age); or professional influences on faculty members' engaged scholarship (e.g., discipline, rank/status, length of time in academe) (*Wade & Demb, 2009*).

To date, few researchers have addressed the characteristics or qualities of the work faculty members conduct as their engaged scholarship (*Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Colbeck, 2002; Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Schomberg & Farmer, 1994; Wade & Demb, 2009*). When they have examined the faculty work of engagement, researchers have typically been interested in a single type of publicly engaged scholarship, such as service-learning (*Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Hammond, 1994*) or campus-community partnerships (*McNall, Reed, Brown, & Allen, 2008; Phillips & Ward, 2009*). Little research has focused on understanding the full spectrum of activities in which faculty members are involved as part of their publicly engaged scholarship. This study and its resulting typology of publicly engaged scholarship rooted in the daily practice of engagement, and grounded in the faculty experience, represent a significant contribution to understanding the characteristics or qualities of engaged scholarship.

Definitions

At MSU, outreach scholarship is defined as “a scholarly endeavor that cross-cuts teaching, research [and creative activities], and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions” (*Michigan State University, Provost’s Committee on University Outreach, 1993*). The researchers framed this study using MSU’s definition of outreach scholarship because it emphasizes three commonly agreed-upon elements of publicly engaged scholarship. Engaged scholarship (1) is expressed in all three land-grant traditional university missions (instruction, research, and service); (2) is both informed by and generative of scholarship; and (3) is for the public good of society.

Based on this definition and the report by the Provost’s Committee on University Outreach, the researchers further delineated what would and would not be considered publicly engaged scholarship in this study. Community service and volunteering were excluded when they lacked a scholarly foundation or connection to the faculty member’s disciplinary expertise. Private consulting (or outside work for pay) was also excluded when it fulfilled individual, not unit or university, missions. Faculty contributions to university, college, or department committees were not included because they do not directly benefit audiences external to the university. In addition, faculty contributions to scholarly and professional associations were typically excluded, again because they do not directly benefit audiences external to the university. However, in instances where the scholarly and professional associations served practitioners as well as academics, faculty members’ service to these organizations was considered to be publicly engaged scholarship.

The researchers interpreted MSU’s definitional phrase *for the direct benefit of external audiences* broadly to encompass publics or communities beyond the usual geographic communities defined by the physical boundaries of place, such as neighborhoods, cities, or regions. The researchers used a definition of community that included communities of identity (e.g., communities of individuals who share race, gender, or other individual characteristics); communities of affiliation or interest (e.g., groups of people who feel connected to one another through a common set of values they act upon together); communities of circumstance (e.g., communities that form around a common experience such as surviving a flood or managing a specific disease); and communities of faith, kin, or profession (e.g., communities organized around specific practices) (*Fraser, 2005; Ife, 1995; Marsh, 1999; Mattessich & Monsey, 1997*).

Not only does this definition draw upon contemporary scholarship in the community development field, but it also ensures that the study does not value some community partners over others. The researchers did not want to exclude, by definition, community partners naturally associated with some disciplines such as business and engineering, which tend to be underemphasized in the institutional rhetoric; or to highlight community partners associated with other disciplines such as health and social sciences, which tend to be overemphasized in the institutional rhetoric about engagement. For example, faculty members in business or engineering might use their disciplinary knowledge or expertise to improve management or manufacturing practices in industry. Industry may be a more natural public for these disciplines than a community-based nonprofit organization, human services organization, or city government—the community partners usually considered in engaged scholarship. As the typology developed, the researchers were mindful of the different disciplinary expressions of publicly engaged scholarship, and wanted to ensure from the outset that the emerging typology was pluralistic and equitable in its scope.

Site of the Study

Because little was known about types of publicly engaged scholarship, the researchers framed this research as an exploratory, qualitative study, and purposefully limited data collection to one institution (*Creswell, 1998, p. 118*). The researchers chose a study site where faculty members could be expected to provide rich, detailed descriptions of a broad range of publicly engaged scholarship. Michigan State University was selected as the study site because it is (1) a land-grant university with an institutional mandate to serve society; (2) a research-intensive university where faculty members are expected to achieve excellence in research and creative activities, instruction, and service; (3) a campus where senior faculty members and institutional leaders have led significant initiatives to define, promote, and support scholarly outreach and engagement; and (4) a university designated as a Carnegie Classified Community Engagement institution. Michigan State University is also a place where the researchers had little difficulty gaining access to the institutional data needed for the study.

Limitations of the Study

There were two limitations related to this study's research design. First, the study was based on faculty data from one institution—a research-intensive, land-grant university. Although a single

site was deemed to be an appropriate research design choice for an exploratory study, the specific nature, history, and characteristics of the institution where the study was conducted may have influenced the emergence of the types of publicly engaged scholarship. To address this limitation, the researchers expanded data analysis to include data from institutions other than the main study site. During the second phase of data analysis, the researchers incorporated scholarship generated by faculty members at the Pennsylvania State University (*Chang, 2000; Hyman, Ayers, Cash, Fahnline, Gold, Gurgevich, Herrmann, Jurs, Roth, Swisher, Whittington, and Wright, 2000*); North Carolina State University (*2010a, 2010b*); University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (*2007*); University of Saskatchewan (*2006; McLean, 2005*); University of Buffalo (*2005*); Middle Tennessee State University (*2010*); University of Wisconsin–Madison (*2010*); and University of Indiana/Purdue University, Indianapolis (*2010*). These institutions were selected for this study because their faculty members have published institutional documents or other scholarship defining types of publicly engaged scholarship.

The study's primary source of data, promotion and tenure documents, was another limitation. These data may not have been robustly reflective of publicly engaged scholarship due to the possibility that faculty members intentionally underreported publicly engaged scholarship during their promotion and tenure process. For example, at some institutions, pre-tenured faculty may be encouraged to postpone reporting engaged scholarship, especially more innovative or experimental community-based activities, until after they have achieved tenure (*Ellison & Eatman, 2008*). It is possible that these unreported activities affected the development of the typology. To address this limitation, the researchers incorporated non-promotion and tenure data sources into the second phase of analysis. These additional sources of data included the following: institutional documents defining outreach and engagement written by members of faculty task forces; promotion and tenure guidelines written by faculty committees; conference presentations about types of engaged scholarship given by faculty teams; and program planning documents written by members of faculty curriculum committees.

Despite these limitations, this study's research design and data represent a significant departure from past studies that have made use of promotion and tenure data for research related to publicly engaged scholarship. Past studies have employed designs with small sample sizes, such as the single autoethnographic case study (*Smith, 2003*) or the recent analysis of 25 promotion and tenure packets from around the country (*Moore & Ward, 2008*). For this study, the

researchers intentionally emphasized breadth and depth through the analysis of 173 promotion and tenure forms from multiple colleges within one university, and strengthened that analysis with documents generated by faculty members at other institutions.

Faculty Demographics

This study included data from tenure-track faculty members who successfully completed promotion and tenure review beginning in 2002, the year after Michigan State University's promotion and tenure instructions and form were revised to encourage the reporting of publicly engaged scholarship. Based on the availability of promotion and tenure forms, the researchers analyzed data from successful faculty members, and excluded tenure-track faculty members who underwent third-year reappointment reviews; were unsuccessful in promotion and tenure review; were no longer employed at the university; and/or no longer held tenure-track appointments at the university. In the 2002–2006 study period, 376 tenure-track faculty members met the study's eligibility criteria. The researchers received informed consent from 46% of those faculty members. Table 1 summarizes the demographic and appointment data for the faculty members in this study.

<i>Gender</i>		<i>College of Primary Appointment</i>	
Male	69%	Agriculture & Natural Resources	26%
Female	31%	Arts & Letters, including Music	12%
<i>Ethnicity/race</i>		Business	4%
White	80%	Communication Arts & Sciences	2%
Nonwhite	20%	Education	5%
Black	5%	Engineering	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	10%	Human Medicine	4%
Hispanic	2%	Social Science	13%
American Indian/Alaska Native	3%	Natural Science	18%
<i>Current Rank</i>		Nursing	2%
Assistant professor	62.5%	Osteopathic Medicine	3%
Associate professor	37.5%	Veterinary Medicine	3%
		Other primary tenure home	3%

Using chi-square analysis, the researchers determined that this study's faculty members were representative of the full-time, tenure-track faculty at Michigan State University during the 2002–2006 study period.

Data Sources, Collection, and Analysis

Data Sources

In 2001, Michigan State University's promotion and tenure instructions and form were revised to encourage administrators and faculty members to report publicly engaged scholarship. The university-wide committee charged with making revision recommendations to the provost decided to embed opportunities to report scholarly outreach and engagement throughout the form, instead of creating a separate category dedicated to engaged scholarship. This decision reflected the institution's emphasis on the crosscutting nature of scholarly outreach and engagement (*for a full description of revisions to the promotion and tenure form, see Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2009*). Because publicly engaged scholarly activities are reported throughout the form, the researchers read, coded, and analyzed each faculty member's promotion and tenure form from beginning to end.

MSU's promotion and tenure forms can be found at <http://www.chmfacultyaffairs.msu.edu/promotion.htm>. The forms comprise three sections: a cover sheet with demographic and appointment data; a section completed by university administrators (e.g., college deans, school directors, and/or department chairs); and a section completed by faculty members. Faculty members also include a personal statement and their curriculum vitae as an official part of their promotion and tenure packages (*MSU Office of the Provost, 2001*).

Because faculty descriptions of publicly engaged scholarship were this study's focus, the researchers limited the analysis to the faculty section of the promotion and tenure form, personal statements, and curricula vitae. The faculty section of the form comprises five parts: instruction; research and creative activities; service within the academic and broader community; additional reporting; and grant proposals.

- The **instruction** section contains five questions, relating to undergraduate and graduate credit instruction; noncredit instruction; academic advising;

instructional works; and other evidence of instructional activity.

- The **research and creative activities** section requires information in four categories, including a list of research/creative works; the quantity of research/creative works; the number of grants received; and other evidence of research/creative activities.
- The part pertaining to **service within the academic and broader community** consists of three sections, including service to scholarly and professional organizations; service within the university; and service within the broader community.
- The **additional reporting** section calls for information in three categories, including evidence of other scholarship; integration across multiple missions; and other awards/evidence.
- The **grant proposals** section comprises four areas, including grants for instruction; research/creative activities; service to the academic community; and service to the broader community. Faculty members reported scholarly outreach and engagement activities in all five faculty sections of the form as well as in their personal statements and their curricula vitae.

Data Collection and Analysis


After receiving informed consent from participants, the researchers accessed faculty members' promotion and tenure forms at the Office of Academic Human Resources. The researchers scanned the documents electronically for ease of storage but coded the data by hand in order to attend to the nuanced language used by faculty members in describing their publicly engaged scholarship. The researchers followed data analysis practices guided by interpretive content analysis, which is well-suited for the analysis of large volumes of unstructured data, especially when content does not have singular or shared meanings, and when the context of the given text influences the interpretation of its meaning (Krippendorff, 2004). For example, in faculty descriptions of their publicly engaged scholarship, a plant biologist may use the word *community* to refer to a grouping of species in an ecosystem, while a social worker may use it to refer to individuals who attend a support group associated with a particular disease or situation. In other words, the word

community may have a completely different meaning depending on the context in which the faculty member uses it. Interpretive content analysis allowed the researchers to take nuanced meanings into consideration as they coded and analyzed the data. They developed a systemic coding scheme to make judgments about the meanings of words based on their contexts both reliable and consistent.

The researchers selected the scholarly engagement activity as the unit of analysis. They took care to code each unique scholarly engagement activity reported by faculty members regardless of the level of detail the faculty member used to describe the activity (e.g., sometimes the descriptions were paragraphs long, and other times the activities were mentioned as a single line on a faculty member's curriculum vitae). This variation in the amount of descriptive detail was not salient given this study's research questions, which were focused on the identification of types, and not the evaluation of the quality or enumeration of the described activities.

The researchers developed the coding scheme inductively using the constant comparative method over the course of three iterations (Glaser, 1965; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). During the first iteration, the researchers independently reviewed a subsample of the promotion and tenure forms and recorded as many potential types of publicly engaged scholarly activities as possible, as reported in the faculty sections, personal statements, and curricula vitae. Based on this surface coding, the researchers compared the activities, discussed differences and similarities, and agreed upon an initial set of types. During these meetings, the researchers worked to identify types that were mutually exclusive and clarified the coding rules to ensure consistency. As the researchers moved from surface coding to pattern coding in the second iteration, they coded the data until the types reached the saturation point (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Eleven types of publicly engaged scholarship reported by faculty members emerged from the promotion and tenure data. The researchers assigned each type of publicly engaged scholarship a label, and wrote a detailed definition to specify the characteristics of the type (Boyatzis, 1998). The researchers also developed rules for inclusion and exclusion, and continuously updated the codebook to improve intercoder agreement among team members (MacQueen, McLellan, Kay, & Milstein, 1998; Mayring, 2000).

Figure 1. Mapping the emergence of types of publicly engaged scholarship through three iterations of data analysis



Existing Scholarship as a Second Source of Data

To strengthen this study, the researchers turned to existing research as a second data source. Initially, the researchers focused on other empirical studies about types of publicly engaged scholarship. Discovering only one such study (*Schomberg & Farmer, 1994*), the researchers expanded this phase of analysis to include other scholarly (but not empirical) materials that addressed publicly engaged scholarship, including institutional documents defining outreach and engagement written by members of faculty task forces; promotion and tenure guidelines written by faculty committees; and conference presentations about types of engaged scholarship given by faculty research teams (*Bargerstock, Church, Joshi, & Zimmerman, 2004; Chang, 2000; Checkoway, 1998; Frank, 2008; McLean, 2005; North Carolina State University, 2009; Schomberg, 2006; Schomberg & Farmer, 1994*). The researchers used interpretive content analysis and the constant comparative method to incorporate information from the literature review into the typology. At the conclusion of this third phase of analysis, the researchers expanded the number of types from 11 to 14. The three additional types—nontraditional audiences, managed learning environments, and cocurricular service-learning—were subdivisions of existing types and represented a more nuanced understanding of the publicly engaged scholarship conducted by faculty. The researchers documented the emergence of the final typology in Figure 1 (*Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002*).

Findings: A Typology of Publicly Engaged Scholarship

Combining the analysis of promotion and tenure data with the existing scholarship, the researchers identified 14 different types of activities that faculty members are involved in as publicly engaged scholarship (see Table 2). These types fell into four broad categories—publicly engaged research and creative activities (four types); publicly engaged instruction (five types); publicly engaged service (four types); and publicly engaged commercialized activities (one type). This section continues with detailed descriptions of each type, including definitions, examples, and exclusions. The researchers have illustrated the types with examples from the promotion and tenure data (paraphrased to ensure the confidentiality of the faculty members' identities).

Table 2. Sample of the Program's Weekly Schedule

Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Activities
1. Research—business, industry, commodity, group funded
2. Research—nonprofit, foundation, government funded
3. Research—unfunded or intramurally funded applied research
4. Creative activities
Publicly Engaged Instruction
5. Instruction—credit—nontraditional audiences
6. Instruction—credit—curricular, community-engaged learning
7. Instruction—noncredit—classes and programs
8. Instruction—noncredit—managed learning environments
9. Instruction—noncredit—public understanding, events, and media
Publicly Engaged Service
10. Service—technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice
11. Service—cocurricular service-learning
12. Service—patient clinical, and diagnostic services
13. Service—advisory boards and other discipline-related service
Publicly Engaged Commercialized Activities
14. Commercialized activities

Publicly Engaged Research and Creative Activities

Publicly engaged research and creative activities are associated with the discovery of new knowledge, the development of new insights and understanding, and the creation of new artistic or literary performances and expressions—in collaboration with community partners, broadly defined. Researchers and community partners may collaborate in defining research questions, deciding on the research design, gathering data, analyzing and interpreting data, and disseminating the results (*Stanton, 2008*). Types 1, 2, and 3 are related to research, discovery, and inquiry, while Type 4 is related to creative activities. At some institutions, this broad category is called outreach-research and focuses on the generation of knowledge conducted in collaboration with community.

Type 1. Research-business, industry, commodity, group funded.

Business, industry, or commodity group funded research includes sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from businesses, industries, trade associations, or commodity groups (e.g., agricultural or natural resource groups)

that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences. General examples include market analysis; consumer research; sales analysis; software research and development; engineering and manufacturing research; advanced materials science; field trials and tests; food quality, production, and safety research; improvement of postharvest and postproduction processes; improved facility design; gene mapping and genomic research; prevention and management of crop and animal diseases; and other scholarship to generate new knowledge to solve practical problems experienced by business, industry, trade associations, or commodity groups. Research conducted to advance an academic field (e.g., basic research), or that is shared solely with research audiences is excluded.

Business, industry, or commodity group funded examples from the promotion and tenure data include a multi-business-funded center to study the effects of direct delivery to customers; research sponsored by the national pork producers on biosensors to determine pathogenic contamination; and a study of depression treatment in nursing homes funded by a major pharmaceutical company.

Type 2. Research-nonprofit, foundation, government funded.

Nonprofit, foundation, or government funded research includes sponsored research or inquiry supported through grants or contracts from community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, foundations, or government agencies that generates new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences. General examples include community-based participatory research; public policy analysis; evaluation research; community needs assessments; applied research; educational research; research conducted collaboratively with community partners; community assessments and evaluations; and other scholarship to generate new knowledge at the direct request of, or in conjunction with, a public (nonuniversity) audience, including neighborhoods, agencies, schools, museums, park districts, towns, cities, counties, regional governments, state or federal governments, or professional associations. Research conducted to advance an academic field (e.g., basic research) or that is shared solely with research audiences is excluded.

Nonprofit, foundation, or government funded examples from the promotion and tenure data include the establishment of a

stroke surveillance system, funded by the Michigan Economic Development Corporation; a study about children of battered women, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health; and a participatory action-research project on integrated farming systems and rural transformation, funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Type 3. Research-unfunded or intramurally funded applied research.

Unfunded or intramurally funded applied research includes community-responsive or community-based research or inquiry that is not funded by a community partner but instead is pursued by faculty members through intramural support or as financially unsupported research or inquiry. The focus is on generating new knowledge to address practical problems experienced by public or practitioner audiences. General examples include pilot studies; applied research; community-based participatory research; public policy analysis; program evaluation research; process design and improvement; needs assessments; and other scholarship to generate new knowledge at the direct request of or in conjunction with a public (nonuniversity) partner. Research conducted to advance an academic field (e.g., basic research), or that is shared solely with research audiences is excluded.

Unfunded or intramurally funded applied research examples from the promotion and tenure data include internally funded (Extension, and university outreach and engagement) research on increasing nutrition literacy through interactive technology; an unfunded, experimental evaluation of a residential “tagged” abatement program; and a study funded by a Michigan State University business-incubator grant to examine racial, socioeconomic, and geospatial cancer incidence in Detroit.

Type 4. Creative activities.

Creative activities are original creations of artistic, literary, fine, performing, or applied arts and other expressions or activities of creative disciplines or fields that are made available to or generated in collaboration with a public (nonuniversity) audience. General examples include musical compositions, literary performances, artistic performances, and curatorial activities. Excluded, for example, is the presentation and maintenance of a collection of artifacts or materials in a managed learning environment (see Type 8).

Creative activity examples from the promotion and tenure data include the recitation of original poetry at community poetry

night; free and publicly available software designed to generate poetry; and a new English singing translation of an Italian composer's comic opera.

Publicly Engaged Instruction

Publicly engaged instruction is organized around sharing knowledge with various audiences through either formal or informal arrangements. Types of publicly engaged instruction vary by the relationship among the teacher, the learner, and the learning context. Types 5 and 6 are related to credit instruction. Types 7, 8, and 9 are related to noncredit instruction and public understanding generally. At some institutions, this broad category is known as outreach-teaching and focuses on the transmission of knowledge to and from audiences external to the university.

Type 5. Instruction-credit-nontraditional audiences.

The nontraditional audience type includes classes and instructional programs that offer student-academic credit hours and are designed and marketed specifically to serve those who are neither traditional campus degree seekers nor campus staff. Such courses and programs are often scheduled at times and in places convenient to the working adult. General examples include weekend or evening degree programs; off-campus degree programs; for-credit offerings available through distance technology to nontraditional audiences; and online credit-bearing, certificate programs. Excluded are faculty or staff development programs, and for-credit experiences, either campus-based or community-based, for traditional degree seekers (see Type 6).

Examples of publicly engaged scholarship for the nontraditional audience from the promotion and tenure data include teaching an online course to students at the Industrial Design Center at Mumbai, India; teaching a two-week, for-credit music learning theory certificate summer workshop for teachers; and the development of a five-week, web-based module for the professional M.S. program in food safety offered by the National Food Safety and Toxicology Center.

Type 6. Instruction-credit-curricular, community-engaged learning.

Curricular, community-engaged learning refers to classes and curricular programs in which students learn with, through, and

from community partners, in a community context, under the guidance and supervision of faculty members. Structured reflection on the connection between the experience of working with community members and the content of the academic experience is expected. These experiences may be credit-bearing, or may be organized by a curricular program such as the Honors College. Examples include academic service-learning; community-based research; overseas study or international engagement with service-learning in a foreign country; student research for industry or other community partners as part of a credit-bearing course; and clinical instruction and supervision in medical, veterinary, or other clinics. Excluded are forms of experiential education, such as internships, career-oriented practica, and cooperative placements in which the emphasis is on learning career skills, or reflection on the connections between practice and content is not required; service-learning experiences that are nonacademic or not-for-credit (see Type 11); and most study abroad programs.

Curricular, community-engaged learning examples from the promotion and tenure data include industry-sponsored projects in a capstone course in computer science and engineering; service-learning courses focused on getting out the vote; community-based research for local planning departments and environmental agencies; and clinical instruction and supervision in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Type 7. Instruction-noncredit-classes and programs.

Noncredit classes and programs include classes and instructional programs marketed specifically to those who are neither degree seekers nor campus staff. They are designed to meet planned learning outcomes for which academic credit hours are not offered. Workshops and conference presentations for practitioner (not academic) audiences count. In lieu of academic credit, these programs sometimes provide certificates of completion or continuing education units, or meet requirements of occupational licensure. General examples include continuing education; contract courses for specific individuals; short courses for practicing professionals; educational programs for alumni; precollege programs; personal enrichment programs; leisure learning tours; and noncredit, virtual university programs. Excluded are programs designed for and targeted to faculty and staff (such as professional development programs) or MSU degree-seeking students (such as career preparation or study skills classes); any credit-bearing class (see Types 5 or

6); and learning that takes place outside the classroom (see Types 8 and 9).

Noncredit classes and program examples from the promotion and tenure data include development and management of state-wide pesticide applicators' training; courses on pavement design, rehabilitation, management, and materials for the private sector and Department of Transportation engineers; and a three-day training session for national park staff on estimating the economic impact of national park visitors.

Type 8. Instruction-noncredit-managed learning environments.

Managed learning environments are scholarly resources designed for general public audiences that are often learner-initiated and learner-paced. General examples include museums, libraries, gardens, galleries, exhibits; expositions; demonstrations; and fairs. Excluded are collaborations with the general public to create new understanding (see Types 1, 2, or 3); original artistic or interpretive creations (see Type 4); formal presentations of scholarly materials to practitioner audiences (see Type 7); and translation of scholarship to general public audiences through media (see Type 9).

Managed learning environment examples from the promotion and tenure data include the management of educational programming in the Michigan 4-H Children's Garden, and a museum exhibition about Native American warriors at a local community-based resource center.

Type 9. Instruction-noncredit-public understanding, events, and media.

The public understanding, events, and media category concerns the creation of scholarly resources designed for the general public that are accessible through print, radio, television, or web media. General examples include self-paced educational materials and products (e.g., bulletins, pamphlets, encyclopedia entries, educational broadcasting, CD-ROMs, software, and textbooks for lay audiences); dissemination of scholarship through media (e.g., speakers' bureau, TV appearances, newspaper interviews, radio broadcasts, web pages, and podcasts, if scholarly and readily available to the public); and popular writing in newsletters, popular press, or practitioner-oriented publications. Excluded are collaborations with the general public to create new understanding (see

Types 1, 2, or 3); original artistic or interpretive creations (see Type 4); formal presentations of scholarly materials to practitioner audiences (see Type 7); and presentation of scholarly materials in managed learning environments (see Type 8).

Public understanding, events, and media examples from the promotion and tenure data include a free, publicly available digital library of African resources; an annual statewide public event to introduce Michigan residents to opportunities for enjoying and sustaining natural heritage; a pocket guide for identifying pests on small fruit trees, distributed through Cooperative Extension; and popular press writing to explain breakthroughs in science to the public.

Publicly Engaged Service

Publicly engaged service is associated with the use of university expertise to address specific issues (ad hoc or longer term) identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This type is not primarily driven by research questions (though research may be of secondary interest). Types 10, 11, 12, and 13 are related to ways in which university students, graduate students, staff, and faculty members use their knowledge in service to individuals, organizations, or communities. In Types 10, 11, and 13 members of the university usually attend to community concerns *in* the community, whereas in Type 12 members of the community usually physically come to the university for assistance. Types 10, 11, and 12 address a specific short- or medium-term issue or need, while Type 13 is often related to an ongoing type of assistance or advice. At some institutions, this broad category is known as outreach-service, and focuses on the application of knowledge to address specific community issues or identified needs.

Type 10. Service-technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice.

Technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice includes the provision of university-based knowledge, or other scholarly advice, through direct interaction with nonuniversity clients who have requested assistance to address an issue or solve a problem. General examples include technical assistance, expert testimony, legal advice, and organizational management consulting (e.g., strategic planning, human resources consulting). Excluded are activities where research questions drive the process or relationship with the public (see Types 1, 2, and 3); service on advisory boards, government commissions, or task forces (see Type 13); and

indirect provision (e.g., websites or bulletins) of university expertise or knowledge to solve community problems (see Type 9).

Technical assistance, expert testimony, and legal advice examples from the promotion and tenure data include an on-call advisory service about swine reproduction; consultation and translation of a lesser-spoken language for a movie company; and technical advice to several community-based organizations on asset mapping.

Type 11. Service-cocurricular service-learning.

Cocurricular service-learning refers to service-learning experiences that are not offered in conjunction with a credit-bearing course or academic program, and do not include reflection on community practice or connections between content and the experience. General examples include service-learning organized by student organizations (e.g., service fraternities or sororities); alternative spring break programs (as long as they are not associated with for-credit classes); and faculty members serving as advisors to student groups who perform community or volunteer service. Excluded are individual volunteerism unrelated to disciplinary expertise; and for-credit service-learning experiences (see Type 6).

One cocurricular service-learning example from the promotion and tenure data is the development of a statewide judging competition for students, industry representatives, and faculty members involved in the dairy sciences.

Type 12. Service-patient, clinical, and diagnostic services.

The patient, clinical, and diagnostic services category includes services offered to human and animal clients, with care provided by university faculty members, or professional or graduate students, through hospitals, laboratories, and clinics. General examples include medical/veterinary clinical practice, forensics laboratories, genetic testing clinics, counseling clinics, or crisis center services. Excluded are activities that are primarily for clinical instruction of medical and graduate students as part of their professional education (see Type 6).

Patient, clinical, and diagnostic service examples from the promotion and tenure data include forensic investigations performed at a campus lab; clinical services provided by a campus-based pediatrician; and rehabilitation counseling services offered to individuals with disabilities.

Type 13. Service-advisory boards and other discipline-related service.

Advisory boards and other discipline-related service pertains to contributions of scholarly expertise made by MSU faculty members, staff members, and students at the request of nonuniversity audiences on an ad hoc or ongoing basis. General examples include serving on advisory committees, government boards, task forces, or nonprofit boards of directors, where disciplinary knowledge is expected. Excluded are contributions to departmental, college, or university committees, task forces, or academic governance (because this service does not benefit communities external to the university); service to scholarly, disciplinary, or professional organizations (except when those organizations serve both practitioners and academics); and individual volunteerism or community service unrelated to the individual's scholarly area of expertise.

Advisory board and other discipline-related service examples from the promotion and tenure data include serving as a member of an advisory group to a corporate foundation or on a business management research team at an accounting firm; serving as a board member at a local educational outreach center with exhibits relating to Native American people; and providing leadership and assistance to the Fisheries Division of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

Publicly Engaged Commercialized Activities

Publicly engaged commercialized activities are associated with a variety of projects in which university-generated knowledge is translated into practical or commercial applications for the economic benefit of individuals, organizations, or communities.

Type 14. Commercialized activities.

Commercialized activities involve the translation of new knowledge generated by the university to the public through the commercialization of discoveries. General examples include copyrights, patents, and licenses for commercial use; innovation and entrepreneurship activities; technology transfer; new business development and entrepreneurship activities; and community and economic development activities such as university-managed business incubators or technology parks. Excluded are applied research or inquiry that forms the basis for commercialized activities (see Types 1, 2, 3, or 4), and individual consultations conducted by faculty members outside work-for-pay (consulting as part of assigned unit or university responsibilities is included).

Commercialized activity examples from the promotion and tenure data include patents associated with subsequent business venture lasers and spectrometry; development of multiple FDA-cleared products to use in human patients to repair rotator cuffs; development of surgical implants to use in veterinary orthopedic applications; and patents for the use of a form of copper as a wood preservative.

Uses of the Typology: Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice

This article proposes a typology of publicly engaged scholarship: an empirical, systematic way of conceptualizing, documenting, and communicating about the scholarly contributions faculty members make to the public good. Encompassing the full gamut of faculty contributions across their research, instruction, and service roles, this typology may be used as the basis for future research and improved policy and practice.

Future Research Directions

The purpose of exploratory research, almost by definition, is to provide an empirical basis for continued inquiry into the issue of interest. This study is no different. The typology that emerged from this analysis should be considered a starting point for future research. The first two suggestions for future research concern continued development and refinement of the typology itself; the remaining recommendations include suggestions for coupling the typology with other analyses to advance understanding about faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship.

First, future researchers may be interested in conducting similar studies at other research-intensive, land-grant, or Carnegie Classified Community Engagement institutions. These studies may be framed emicly (with typologies emerging from data at the other institutions) or eticly (with the current typology used as a framework). Refinements based on this research would ensure the typology's utility for cross-institutional purposes by minimizing the limitations of a single-site study.

Second, researchers may seek to develop the typology at colleges and universities that do not share institutional characteristics with the study site. For example, research at liberal arts colleges might reveal more nuanced types of publicly engaged instruction, and research conducted at universities with campus-based teaching hospitals might reveal different points of emphasis in the publicly engaged service types. Whether conducted at similar or

dissimilar institutions, a worthwhile goal of future research would be to reduce the number of types from 14 to a number under 10 to improve the typology's overall usefulness.

Third, faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship is shaped by a complex interaction between personal and professional factors (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Wade & Demb, 2009). Most research has focused on the relationship between publicly engaged scholarship and personal factors (e.g. gender, race/ethnicity, age) or professional factors (e.g. rank, tenure status, appointment, discipline) (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Baez, 2000; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; O'Meara, 2002; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2005; Wade & Demb, 2009). The question of which faculty members become involved in what types of publicly engaged scholarship remains largely unexplored.

Fourth, the influence of the disciplines on faculty involvement in publicly engaged scholarship has been of long-standing interest to researchers interested in publicly engaged scholarship. Much of the macro-level disciplinary research has sought to ascertain which disciplines are more likely to have faculty members involved in publicly engaged scholarship (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000; Kagan, 2009; Vogelgesang et al., 2005; Ward, 2003; Zlotkowski, 2005). Other researchers have approached the question from a disciplinary perspective seeking deeper insight into what engagement looks like in a specific discipline or in disciplinary groupings (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Despite Schomberg's (2006) conclusion that "what was a preferred form of public service in one college was not in another," (p.81) few scholars, if any, have studied how different types of publicly engaged scholarship are more or less likely to be undertaken by faculty members in different disciplines.

Finally, the typology may be useful in future research about faculty members' motivations for involvement in publicly engaged scholarship. Existing research about faculty motivation has either focused on service-learning (a single type of publicly engaged scholarship) (Abes et al., 2002; Hammond, 1994; McKay & Rozee, 2004), or on faculty community engagement writ large (i.e., all types of publicly engaged scholarship combined) (Antonio et al., 2000; Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; O'Meara, 2008). As this line of inquiry—motivation for engagement—matures, a more nuanced understanding of why faculty members become involved in different types of publicly engaged scholarship will be of interest.

Implications for Policy and Practice

In addition to future research directions, the study's findings suggest several implications for policy and practice, including

cross-institutional comparisons, institutional responses to public accountability, more effective faculty development programs, and strategic decision-making by individual faculty members and graduate students.

First, the typology may be salient cross-institutionally. Since the mid-1990s, a number of national organizations and foundations have been interested in fostering cross-institutional conversations about ways to document publicly engaged scholarship for cross-institutional comparisons and national rankings. A number of organizations have convened national conversations about the significance and impact of publicly engaged scholarship, including the Committee on Institutional Cooperation's Committee on Engagement; two subcommittees of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU, formerly NASULGC), namely the Council on Engagement and Outreach, and the Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness, and Economic Prosperity; Campus Compact; the Kellogg Foundation; and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This typology, grounded in the daily practice of faculty members, may be of interest to these groups as they continue to find ways to promote engaged scholarship nationally, especially through standardized benchmarks and metrics.

Second, institutional leaders may benefit from the typology as well. In an age of increasing public accountability, institutional leaders are challenged to move beyond the rhetoric of engagement to detail the real contributions their faculty members make for the betterment of society. The lack of language that is both specific (not generalized institutional rhetoric) and encompassing (not couched in the discourse of any particular discipline) poses a challenge. This typology, when coupled with institutional data, may serve as the basis for institutional leaders to communicate with external stakeholders about the myriad ways faculty members collaborate with community partners to improve the world around them.

Third, the typology could be used as the basis for more effective faculty development programs. Instead of referring to publicly engaged scholarship as an ill-defined, monolithic set of activities, faculty developers could use the typology as a starting point for faculty conversations around different types of commonly accepted engagement in different departments and different disciplines. With these distinctions in mind, they may identify more effective and strategic approaches to skill building for publicly engaged scholarship. For example, the skills required for community-based learning are different from those needed for commercialization of research and creative activities.

Finally, individual faculty members and emerging engaged scholars may benefit from the typology as they make choices about their involvement in publicly engaged scholarship. Many young scholars, especially those trained at research-intensive universities, have found that their doctoral education did not prepare them for professional lives as engaged scholars (Applegate, 2002). The typology, especially when coupled with institutional and disciplinary perspectives, may be an effective way for young scholars to envision professional pathways to publicly engaged scholarship (Doberneck, Brown, & Allen, 2010).

Conclusion

Although the researchers certainly advocate for differentiating among different types of publicly engaged scholarship, they do not believe that any one type of publicly engaged scholarship is inherently more valuable than another. As The Research Universities Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN) advocates (Stanton, 2008), so too do the researchers support the idea that different types of publicly engaged scholarship are appropriate for and responsive to different contexts, mediated by community needs, faculty interests, institutional priorities, and disciplinary concerns. The researchers simply hope that this typology, based on empirical analysis of faculty work, allows institutional leaders, faculty members, faculty developers, emerging engaged scholars, and other researchers to begin sharing a common, concrete language, grounded in the faculty experience, unconstrained by disciplinary discourse, and free from institutional rhetoric.

Acknowledgments

The researchers thank MSU's faculty members, department chairs, school directors, and deans who granted consent for the inclusion of the promotion and tenure forms in this study. In addition to colleagues at the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement, the researchers acknowledge Diane Zimmerman and Robert L. Church (University Outreach and Engagement emeritus staff members), who worked to revise the form in 2001, and initiated this study five years later in 2006; Angela Hunt and Shelly Wells (Academic Human Resources staff members), who granted access to the promotion and tenure forms; and Kirk Riley, Lynne Devereaux, Cathy Gibson, Adina Huda, and Linda Chapel Jackson (University Outreach and Engagement staff members), who assisted with consent procedures, additional data collection, professional presentations, and editing.

References

- Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*, 5–17.
- Anfara, V. A., Jr., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher, 31*, 28–38.
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Higher Education, 73*, 582–602.
- Antonio, A., Astin, H., & Cress, C. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 23*, 373–398.
- Applegate, J. L. (2002). Engaged graduate education: *Seeing with new eyes* (Preparing Future Faculty Occasional Paper). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*, 363–391.
- Bargerstock, B. A., Church, R. L., Joshi, V., & Zimmerman, D. L. (2004, October). *Budget crisis? How to use outreach data to tell the institution's story*. Presentation at Outreach Scholarship Conference, University Park, PA. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsue.msu.edu/files/BudgetCrisis.pdf>
- Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 123–137.
- Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. A. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*, 5–18.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyte, H. (2005). *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Boyte, H., & Hollander, E. (1999). *Wingspread declaration on renewing the civic mission of the American research university* [Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI, December 11–13, 1998, and July 19–21, 1999]. Providence, RI: Campus Compact. Retrieved from ERIC database, <http://eric.ed.gov> (ED435370)
- Chang, Y. (2000). Evaluation of outreach for promotion and tenure considerations: Views from university faculty. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 48*, 5–13.
- Checkoway, B. (1998). Professionally related public service as applied scholarship: Guidelines for the evaluation of planning faculty. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17*, 358–360.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. In C. L. Colbeck (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance* (New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 114, pp. 43–52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Weaver, L. D. (2008). Faculty engagement in public scholarship: A motivation systems theory perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(2), 7–32.

- Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. A. Eberly and J. Cohen (Eds.), *A laboratory for public scholarship and democracy* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 105, pp. 17–26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing from among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (2000). *The disciplines speak II: More statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Doberneck, D. M., Brown, R. E., & Allen, D. A. (2010). Professional development for emerging engaged scholars. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: The contemporary landscape: Vol. 1. Community-campus partnerships*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Building partnerships for service learning* (pp. 20–41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Feldman, A. M. (2008). CTS: A new discipline to catalyze the transfer of information. *Clinical and Translational Science*, 1, 1–2.
- Frank, N. (2008). Measuring public service: Assessment and accountability to ourselves and others. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 27, 499–506.
- Fraser, H. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40, 286–300.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12, 436–445.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2009). Summary of the 2001 revisions to the reappointment, promotion, and tenure form at Michigan State University: Expanding the definition of scholarship to include engagement. *The Engagement Exchange*, 1. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 21–28.
- Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4, 37–44.
- Hyman, D., Ayers, J.E., Cash, E.H., Fahnline, D.E., Gold, D.P., Gurgevich, E.A., Herrmann, R.O., Jurs, P.C., Roth, D.E., Swisher, J.D., Whittington, M.S., and Wright, H.S. (2000). *UniSCOPE 2000: A Multidimensional Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century*. University Park, Pa.: The UniSCOPE Learning Community. Retrieved from http://www.outreach.psu.edu/files/UniSCOPE_Rprt.pdf

- Ife, J. W. (1995). *Community development: Creating community alternatives*. Melbourne, Australia: Longman.
- Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. (2010). *Dean of Faculties' Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers 2010-2011*. Retrieved from <http://faa.iupui.edu/newFaa/resources/2010PTGuidelinesCLEAN.pdf>
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy, 20*, 345–366.
- Kagan, J. (2009). *Three cultures: Natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities in the 21st century*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1996). *Taking charge of change: Renewing the promise of state and land-grant universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2000). *Renewing the covenant—learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kezar, A. J., Chambers, A. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (Eds.). (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- MacQueen, K. M., McLellan, E., Kay, K., & Milstein, B. (1998). Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis. *Cultural Anthropology Methods, 10*, 31–36.
- Marsh, G. (1999). The community of circumstance—a tale of three cities: Community participation in Lewisham, St. Kilda, and Knox. In D. A. Chekki (Ed.), *Research in community sociology* (Vol. 9, pp. 65–86). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1997). *Community building: What makes it work*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Matthews, D. (2006). *Reclaiming public education by reclaiming our democracy*. Dayton, OH: The Kettering Foundation.
- Mayring, P. (2000, June). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1*(2). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2386>
- McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service-learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*, 21–33.
- McLean, S. (2005, March 15). *A Typology and Illustrative Model for Outreach and Engagement* [draft]. Saskatoon, Canada: University of Saskatchewan. Retrieved from http://www.usask.ca/ip/inst_planning/docs/A_Typology_and_Illustrative_Model_for_Outreach_and_Engagement.pdf
- McNall, M., Reed, C. S., Brown, R. E., & Allen, A. D. (2008). Brokering community-university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 317–331.

- Michigan State University, Office of the Provost. (2001). *Recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure action (Form D)*. East Lansing, MI: Author. Retrieved from http://www.hr.msu.edu/hiring/facultyhiring/facultyhiring_docs/FacFormD.pdf
- Michigan State University, Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Middle Tennessee State University. (2010). *Middle Tennessee State University Policies and Procedures For Tenure*. Retrieved from <http://www.mtsu.edu/policies/pdfs/PoliciesAndProceduresForTenure.pdf>
- Moore, T. L., & Ward, T. (2008). Documenting engagement: Faculty perspectives on self-representation in promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(4), 5-27.
- North Carolina State University, Scholarship of Engagement Task Force. (2009, Fall). *Report of the Scholarship of Engagement Task Force: Executive summary*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/news/engagement.php>
- North Carolina State University. (2010a). *Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement through the Scholarship of Engagement*. Executive Summary. North Carolina State University. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/news/documents/SETReport_exec_summary_print4pg.pdf
- North Carolina State University. (2010b). *Integrating Learning, Discovery, and Engagement through the Scholarship of Engagement*. Report of the Scholarship of Engagement Task Force North Carolina State University. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsu.edu/extension/documents/SET2010.pdf>
- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York: Routledge.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7-29.
- Phillips, J. T., & Ward, C. V. L. (2009). Two-dimensional approach for assessing transformative campus/community service-learning partnerships. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, and B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 103-127). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 91-104.
- Schomberg, S. F. (2006). Hope tempered by reality: Integrating public engagement into promotion and tenure decisions. *Metropolitan Universities*, 17, 74-81.
- Schomberg, S. F., & Farmer, J. A., Jr. (1994). The evolving concept of public service and implications for rewarding faculty. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 58, 122-140.
- Smith, T. L. (2003). *Documenting the new American scholarship: Tenure and promotion dossier narratives*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED475428)
- Stanton, T. K. (2008). New times demand a new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 3, 19-42.

- University of Buffalo. (2005) UB 2010: *The Interim Report to the University at Buffalo Community*. Retrieved from <http://www.buffalo.edu/ub2020/overview/files/interimreport.pdf>
- University of Illinois Urbana Champaign. (2007). *Task Force Report For Civic Commitment in the 21st Century: Report and Recommendations to the Chancellor*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.
- University of Saskatchewan. (2006). *Linking With Communities for Discovery and Learning. The Foundational Document on Outreach and Engagement*. Retrieved from http://www.usask.ca/ip/inst_planning/docs/OEFD_FINALAPPROVED.pdf
- University of Syracuse. (2008). *The proposed new language and reorganization and renumbering of sections of the faculty manual, follows*. Retrieved from <http://elin.syr.edu/proposedfacultymanual/TenureLanguage.html>
- University of Wisconsin-Madison. (2010). *Criteria for Faculty Appointment and Promotion in UW-Extension Portfolio Format*. Retrieved from <http://www.uwex.edu/secretary/documents/Appendix-IC.pdf>
- Vogelgesang, L., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. (2005). *Does institutional support for engaged scholarship matter?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15, 5–16.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2005). The disciplines and the public good. In A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, and J. C. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 146–155). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

About the Authors

Diane M. Doberneck, is a researcher at Michigan State University's National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement and an adjunct assistant professor in the Liberty Hyde Bailey Scholars Program. Her research focuses on faculty integration of publicly engaged scholarship; effective teaching and learning practices for engaged scholarship; and international community engagement.

Chris R. Glass, is a Ph.D. student in Michigan State University's Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education department. His research focuses on civic engagement, publicly engaged scholarship, and problem-based learning.

John H. Schweitzer, is a professor in Michigan State University's Center for Community and Economic Development and an adjunct professor with the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement. He uses his knowledge of social science research processes to study the impact and effectiveness of educational and social programs and policies.