

## **Reflections on Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development and Institutional Identity at Ohio University**

Jane M. Hamel-Lambert, Judith L. Millesen, Karen Slovak,  
and Lynn M. Harter

### **Abstract**

Ohio University was one of six campuses funded in 2009–2010 as part of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative. Following a self-assessment, a faculty development program to increase faculty competency in community-based participatory research (CBPR) was designed and implemented. The program included three major components designed to advance individual competencies for engaged scholarship: (1) a Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship, (2) the Community-Based Participatory Research Learning Community, and (3) the co-editing of a book, *Participatory Partnerships for Social Action and Research*. An additional goal, centralizing community-based participatory research efforts within the Appalachian Rural Health Institute, was partially achieved and is the focus of ongoing efforts. Two lessons were learned from this grant-funded endeavor: (1) there is a reciprocal relationship between institutional and faculty values and action; and (2) sustained dialogue with institutional leadership is critical for creating institutional structures and sustaining resources for community-engaged scholarship.

### **Setting the Context**

**F**ounded in 1804 as the first university in the Northwest Territory, Ohio University is nestled in the foothills of the Appalachian corridor. The Appalachian region of the southeastern corner of Ohio is a rural area challenged by persistent poverty, high unemployment, low educational attainment, and growing health disparities. Ohio University is a large public university proud of its long tradition of serving the communities in its region. For decades, Ohio University has implemented effective outreach and engagement activities through nine colleges, numerous centers and institutes, and five regional campuses. In 2006, Ohio University renewed its commitment to community-engaged scholarship as reflected in its strategic plan by explicitly recognizing campus-community partnerships in its vision statement, and allocating resources accordingly.

Ohio University's commitment to community-engaged scholarship is evidenced in the activities of a number of administrative units as well as by faculty-developed partnerships, including

- two projects in the School of Communications Studies (a documentary titled *The Art of the Possible* and a process guide that describes a collaborative model of art that promotes partnerships between artists with and without developmental disabilities);
- the Department of Psychology's Youth Experiencing Success in Schools Program (Y.E.S.S.);
- the College of Engineering's Designing to Make a Difference capstone experience;
- the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine's Integrating Professionals for Appalachian Children (IPAC);
- the College of Education's Edward Stevens Center for the Study and Development of Literacy and Language (Stevens Literacy Center); and
- numerous projects students have worked on with professional staff and faculty members through the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs.

Ohio University applied to participate in the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative with the explicit goal of establishing a community-based participatory research (CBPR) center housed within the university's Appalachian Rural Health Institute (ARHI). ARHI is committed to equitable principles of health service delivery, to engagement of interdisciplinary research teams, and to the use of community-based participatory research approaches to improve the health status and related quality of life of rural Appalachian populations. It was felt that establishing a CBPR center would strengthen Ohio University's identity as an engaged campus, better positioning the university to apply for the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification for community engagement, and providing a front door for community agencies to engage in partnerships for social action and research.

The Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative provided an opportunity for Ohio University to strengthen its institutional commitment to faculty development for engaged scholarship, underscoring its investment in engagement and expanding opportunities for community-engaged scholarship. Faculty for

the Engaged Campus was a national initiative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, University of Minnesota, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill aimed at strengthening community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing faculty development models. Faculty for the Engaged Campus invested in six diverse institutions, each of which contributed matching resources, to implement innovative, campus-wide, competency-based faculty development programs. A fundamental assumption of this investment was that engaged faculty members are a prerequisite for engaged campuses. Moreover, an institution's identity as an engaged campus is strengthened by increasing the skills and capacity of faculty for engaged scholarship through faculty development.

### Theoretical Framework

The notion of community engagement advanced by Kania and Kramer (2011) embraces elements of Boyer's (1996) visionary framework as well as the recommendations offered by the Kellogg Commission (1999) and Carnegie (2010) in that there must be proper alignment of institutional efforts and resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities. This kind of work, although potentially rewarding for all involved in the process, is not easy. The literature on engaged scholarship is replete with discussion of barriers to such partnerships, particularly those related to proper alignment of timelines, goals, expectations, and so forth (Bringle, Hatcher, Jones, & Platter, 2006; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006; Thornton & Jaeger, 2008; Wade & Demb, 2009). Perhaps because the obstacles to engaged scholarship are well-documented, faculty development efforts are often targeted at aligning ideology, structure, and action (see O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006 for an excellent overview of what is needed to prepare faculty for community-engaged scholarship). The faculty development model created at Ohio University as part of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative directly tackled some of the challenges associated with community engagement, essentially advocating for a shift in culture, one that would emerge from and promote increased alignment.

Although not specifically geared toward faculty development and institutional identity, the basic premise of an argument advanced by Kania and Kramer (2011) advocating an approach to large-scale social change was particularly useful in informing an understanding of what is needed to build and sustain a collective approach toward creating an engaged campus. Simply stated,

Kania and Kramer assert that many of today's seemingly intractable social problems can be tackled more effectively through cross-sector coalitions of organizations working together toward shared objectives. They further explain that because many of the players involved in social change initiatives (e.g., funders, governments, nonprofit organizations) are focused on self-promotion or *isolated impact*, the potential for *collective impact*, which is described as "the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem" (2011, p. 36), is often overlooked.

Most helpful in interpreting the value of Ohio University's community-engaged scholarship faculty development activities were Kania and Kramer's (2011) findings related to funders, which the authors saw as parallel to universities. Specifically, Kania and Kramer argue that in order to create large-scale change, funders needed to follow four practices: (1) take responsibility for assembling the elements of a solution, (2) create a movement for change, (3) include solutions from outside, and (4) use actionable knowledge to influence behavior and improve performance (p. 41). They are essentially advocating for a shift in culture, one that supplants a dysfunctional funding environment that has historically underwritten the costs of independent proposals intended to address interdependent problems with one that invests significant resources in building an infrastructure capable of supporting the facilitation, coordination, and measurement of collective efforts.

Indeed, the link between collective impact and faculty development is tenuous at best, yet the four practices embodied in collective impact initiatives advanced by funders are quite useful when thinking about the conditions under which universities might provide the support necessary to design a model of faculty development that makes explicit the disparate cultures of administration and faculty. The authors believe that faculty development programs that incorporate these four practices can help to create a positive campus climate for community-engaged scholarship that engages faculty members from across campus, meets the individual goals of participating faculty members, and advances the institution's civic mission.

Thornton and Jaeger (2008) examined the relationship between institutional culture and civic responsibility at two major research universities. In their examination, they noted that "culture is treated as the lynchpin that joins ideology and action together" (p. 163). Thornton and Jaeger drew on Swidler's (1986) framework that linked ideology or expressive belief systems with culture (defined

as “symbolic vehicles of meaning”), and with action or long-term strategies to explain how culture shapes an institution’s approach to civic responsibility. The authors found Thornton and Jaeger’s ideas useful for understanding the relationship between institutional culture and sustained faculty development for community-engaged scholarship.

### **Ohio University’s Faculty Development Action Plan**

The Ohio University community-engaged scholarship faculty development plan resulted from the institution’s participation in the Faculty for the Engaged Campus Charrette in spring 2008. The overarching goal of this charrette was for participating teams to leave with an action plan for their campus that detailed a faculty development approach to strengthening engaged scholarship. Ohio University’s participating team comprised representatives from the university’s College of Osteopathic Medicine, College of Communication, School of Leadership and Public Affairs, College of Arts and Sciences, and one of the five regional campuses. The team self-selected across three planning meetings that began with a broad stakeholder session attended by representatives from all colleges and two of the regional campuses to discuss the opportunity to apply to participate in the charrette.

---

*“The overarching goal of this charrette was for participating teams to leave with an action plan for their campus that detailed a faculty development approach to strengthening engaged scholarship.”*

---

The Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative required Ohio University to engage in a self-assessment through which the team grappled with the varying levels of resources to support community-engaged scholarship across the university’s units, and with the complexities of institutional barriers to community-engaged scholarship that challenged the university’s faculty members interested in doing community-engaged scholarship. The self-assessment process generated a profile of Ohio University characterized by considerable variability across units with regard to internal institutional structures to support community-engaged scholarship. For example, the self-assessment process revealed that the

university did not have a universally accepted definition of community engagement.

The self-assessment also showed that although institutional incentives for community-engaged scholarship existed (e.g., internal grants, funds to attend conferences), degrees of faculty support varied. Similarly, the value assigned to the construct varied across colleges and departments, even though “engagement” is referenced in the university’s mission. Moreover, the degree of recognition extended to community-engaged scholarship during review, promotion, and tenure processes varied across the university’s departments, schools, colleges, and extended campuses. In addition, community-based learning was often incorporated into the institution’s educational activities, but community-based research occurred less frequently.

Exiting the charrette, Ohio University’s goal was to strengthen the infrastructure that supported engaged scholarship at Ohio University by establishing a community-based participatory research center with the Appalachian Rural Health Institute. Creation of the proposed center promised to provide a central location and a robust community for faculty who were engaged in community-based participatory research as well as to establish a corridor between the university and the community that would support ongoing partnerships for social action and research. To accomplish this goal, the team recognized the need to secure a commitment from Ohio University’s leadership, secure the involvement of the regional campuses, and build capacity among the faculty to conduct community-based participatory research.

The plan that was developed during the weekend charrette was informed by feedback received from colleagues, through an exercise labeled Critical Friends. This exercise prompted reflection on the distinction between community-based participatory research and community-engaged scholarship, a theme that continued to weave throughout conversations and implementation efforts. These colleagues also highlighted the importance of keeping faculty development and institutional reform of policies, procedures, and promotion and tenure guidelines central to the efforts to ensure sustainable institutional change.

### **Implementation of the Faculty Development Action Plan**

Ohio University’s funded proposal kept central the desire to create a community-based participatory research center within

the Appalachian Rural Health Institute through building capacity for interprofessional engaged scholarship anchored by community-based participatory research philosophies and methods, and through connecting existing service-learning pedagogies with engaged research efforts. Structurally, these goals would be accomplished through a faculty development plan organized around three programs: (1) Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship, (2) the CBPR Learning Community for university and community partners, and (3) editing a book featuring a collection of case studies illustrating the complexities of participatory partnerships, as experienced by nationally recognized experts and their community partners. Collectively, these faculty development activities were designed to introduce early career faculty members to the principles of community-engaged scholarship for research and the dimensions of partnership development; to advance faculty members whose scholarship involves equitable partnerships with the community in the areas of dissemination and grant writing; and to lead all faculty toward recognizing the role of policy and advocacy when translating knowledge into action, within both the academy (e.g., for promotion and tenure) and the community.

### **Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship**

The creation of the Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship was an investment in a cross-campus structure that would coordinate opportunities and fund faculty development to advance engaged scholarship. In addition to supporting the individual scholarship of two fellows, resources of the fellowship also enabled the mentoring of other faculty members, community partners, and staff through the Community-Based Participatory Research Learning Community programs organized by the fellows. The fellows did extensive outreach serving as resources and mentors to faculty from the regional campuses, the Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, Communication, Arts and Sciences, and Health and Human Services as well as a number of community agencies to advance competencies for community-engaged scholarship.

#### **Organizational structure.**

Ohio University named its first Faculty Fellow in Engaged Scholarship in fall 2008 and housed the fellow in the Office of Campus-Community Engagement. The funding from the grant enabled the expansion of the fellowship program by allowing the naming of a regional campus Faculty Fellow in Engaged Scholarship.

Financial support from the provost's office both enabled the establishment and augmented the expansion of the Faculty Fellowship program. In 2010, the Office of Campus-Community Engagement was closed during a restructuring of Ohio University. In retrospect, the establishment of the fellowship, and its expansion, may have foreshadowed the office's closure as Ohio University sought to improve efficiencies and to redistribute the resources associated with engaged scholarship. Moreover, the proposed vision of developing a center for Community-Based Participatory Research within the Appalachian Rural Health Institute may have meshed beautifully with the larger, yet unannounced, institutional agenda to push the responsibilities originally invested in the office deeper into the university's core organization structure to strengthen engagement.

The closure of the Office of Campus-Community Engagement prompted much conversation about finding a home for the Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship program. Guided by the provost's desire to consolidate and leverage efficiencies, the Appalachian Rural Health Institute emerged as the best structure to house this program. In September 2010, with the grant ending, the Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship program was again eclipsed by continued organizational restructuring. With ARHI's institutional development work suspended while awaiting the emergence a new integrated health sciences center, plans for sustaining the Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship program were on hold. Consequently, the program did not fund a fellow during the 2010–11 academic year, but the institute's directors are anticipating naming a fellow for the 2011–12 academic year, pending approval of its executive leadership committee.

## **The Learning Community**

Learning community participants were recruited through e-mail announcements and word of mouth. The learning community was led by the two fellows from the Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Scholarship program, one from the regional campus and the other from the Athens campus. The specific objectives for the learning community included (1) maintaining broad constituency participation, including community members, tenured and junior faculty members, and university staff; (2) supporting new university–community partnerships for engaged scholarship; (3) facilitating development of requested training curriculums for faculty and community partners; and (4) offering peer review of co-authored articles for publication and external funding applications.

## Logistics.

The learning community met 26 times over an 18-month period between January 2009 and September 2010. These meetings typically lasted for 90 minutes and made use of a videoconference system. Videoconferencing allowed for unified programming between the main and regional campuses. It also provided an opportunity to invite presentations from national speakers to contextualize local interests within the national community-engaged scholarship context.

## Curriculum.

The bi-monthly sessions focused on community-engaged scholarship competencies (Blanchard et al., 2009), peer-sharing of participant work, and structured presentations on topics like partnership development, evaluation, funding opportunities, getting published, research methodology, and institutional review. Table 1 depicts how community-engaged scholarship competencies were matched to learning community activities.

**Table 1. Community Learning Activities and Community-Engaged Competencies**

Competencies	Activities	Competency Level
Understanding community-engaged scholarship; literature of engagement; principles of community-based participatory research; understanding determinants of social issues	Readings from Minkler & Wallerstein (2003) and Israel et al. (2005) and the journal <i>Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action</i>	Novice
Sustainable equitable partnerships; ability to work with diverse constituents; understanding worlds of nonprofits and academy; finding and developing partnerships; defining roles and benefits	Evaluating Participatory Dimensions of Partnerships; Sharing Power and Governance Structure,	Intermediate
Research methods—qualitative and quantitative; institutional review board (IRB); building community capacity; fidelity challenges in translating research	IRB presentation; Focus Groups and Moderator Guides; Survey Development; Building Community Capacity for Research;	Intermediate-advanced
Funding research and programmatic innovations; grant writing; identifying research/foundation support; budgeting and proposal development	Logic Models; Exploration of Learn and Serve Grant and National Institutes of Health Community Infrastructure Grant; Understanding Funders	Intermediate-advanced
Art of writing; panel presentation of editors publishing Community Engaged Scholarship; translating/disseminating knowledge; pursuing joint authorship; using Promotion & Tenure toolkit to re-envision portfolios; policy implications	Writing with your Community Partners; Editorial Point of View; Peer review of articles	Intermediate-advanced

The learning community curriculum blended reading the literature, topical presentations by national experts, and case presentations by participants seeking peer consultations. Didactic presentations were augmented by shared readings of *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health* (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2003), *Methods in Community Based Participatory Research for Health* (Israel, Eng, Schultz, & Parker, 2005), and various articles from the journal *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*. These three resources were purchased for the participants. The learning community read additional materials; selected readings are listed in Appendix 1.

---

*“The learning community curriculum blended reading the literature, topical presentations by national experts, and case presentations by participants seeking peer consultations.”*

---

These three resources were purchased for the participants. The learning community read additional materials; selected readings are listed in Appendix 1.

### **Participation.**

The learning community sessions were primarily held during the academic months between January 2010 and September 2011. At the beginning of each quarter, participants refined a proposal agenda tailoring the sessions and readings to meet the needs of the participants. The learning community averaged 11 members across eight disciplines (psychology, social work, communication, public affairs, public health, nursing, counseling, and early childhood education). A total of 57 individuals attended; of those, 16 persons represented community agencies (e.g., school, health department, Red Cross, community mental health, social services, developmental disabilities, state department of health, medicine), 11 were students, 17 were faculty members, and 13 were university staff members.

### **An Edited Book Project**

Three of the four authors of this article were the co-editors of *Participatory Partnerships for Social Action and Research* (Harter, Hamel-Lambert, & Milleden, 2011). Although not a common mode for faculty development, contributing to a book provided both the authors and the editorial team an opportunity to develop new skills and build stronger relationships.

## **Author recruitment.**

The editorial team recruited contributing authors through the network formed at the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative's Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Charrette in 2008. Several nationally recognized community-based participatory research individuals were also invited to co-author chapters with their community partners. In the end, 21 people (together with their academic and community partners) wrote chapters for the book.

## **The book's focus.**

The book's focus shifted over time. Originally it was to be a collection of community-based participatory research case studies. As the process unfolded, however, it was clear that the chapters would also include examples of collaborative work between community and university members. Thus, the book's final title was *Participatory Partnerships for Social Action and Research* (Harter et al., 2011).

Most of the book's chapters were co-authored by campus and community partners. For many participants, this was their first opportunity to co-author reflections about the process of collaborative community-engaged scholarship partnerships. By writing together, participants were able to reflect on their partnerships' histories, successes, and missteps.

## **Observations**

This section describes the findings and outcomes associated with the strategies advanced for faculty development. Although the findings reflect the recommendations offered by Kania and Kramer (2011), it was difficult to categorize efforts as one or another of the recommended practices—take responsibility for assembling the elements of a solution; create a movement for change; include solutions from outside; and use actionable knowledge to influence behavior and improve performance (p. 41)—as the lines between categories seemed to blur when what was learned was reflected upon. The authors feel a certain confidence, however, in asserting that in response to an institutional assessment showing considerable variability with regard to university support for engaged scholarship, faculty development efforts were explicitly aimed at assembling elements of a solution designed to shift institutional culture in ways that effectively aligned ideology and action.

## **Observations Regarding the Learning Community Activities**

Observations regarding the impact of the learning community activities are based on a survey of the participants, a site visit by the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative leaders, the examination of faculty research project dissemination, the submission of grant applications, and program leaders' own observations.

### **Sustaining participation in the learning community.**

Over time, participation from community participants waned, and faculty members and students became more selective about sessions they attended, participating in those most likely to add value to their work. As a result, the average number of participants was reduced from 15 (spring 2009) to 11 (fall 2010). Those actively involved in partnerships and community-engaged scholarship participated most consistently. The authors found that although the program achieved campus-wide participation, it was a challenge to move beyond single participants from individual departments toward cultivating a philosophy within departments, between departments within a college, across the Athens campus, or between the Athens and regional campuses.

### **Positive outcomes.**

The online survey of participants was conducted in 2009, with the university's IRB approval, to assess the impact of participating in the learning community on knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to community-based participatory research. The survey was e-mailed to 15 participants who were actively attending the programs during the quarter the survey was distributed, the majority of whom attended regularly across the year. Twelve responses were returned (seven from university participants and five from community participants). Those 12 survey-responding participants felt that their participation had "increased their overall knowledge of community-based participatory research philosophy," "improved their knowledge for scholarly dissemination," helped them "gain competencies," and "positively impacted their value of qualitative research." In addition, it prompted more than six of the responding participants to "approach a community member to discuss a project," "approach a faculty person to do a project," "submit a community-based participatory research focused grant," or "invite others to join the community-based participatory research learning community."

The authors observed that one benefit of the learning community was that it provided a forum for both community members and university researchers to talk about the difficulties each experienced in their partnerships. Although there was considerable variability within the learning community's membership in terms of community-engaged scholarship skills and experiences, that diversity offered opportunities for mentorship, and for discussion about what it means to be an engaged scholar. The learning community sessions embraced recommendations offered by Qualters (2009), who asserts that "bringing faculty together to talk in a structured, reflective environment creates a community of learners who are willing to support each other" (p. 12).

### **Participant productivity.**

During the 18-month project period, learning community participants authored 11 chapters in the book project, *Participatory Partnerships for Social Action and Research* (six involving community partners as co-authors), published 11 articles, and presented 12 papers and two posters (seven involving community partners) at annual conferences. Ten grants were submitted, three of which were funded, yielding over \$4 million.

### **Challenges identified.**

In addition to the positive features of the learning community reported by the 12 survey respondents, a number of challenges were also noted in response to an open-ended question that asked how the sessions could be improved, whether participant expectations regarding benefits were met, whether the respondent planned to continue to attend sessions, and what content was desired. The respondents reported concerns regarding the limited time to develop and nurture community partnerships, particularly on the regional campuses where higher teaching loads tend to compete for faculty time that could otherwise be devoted to community-partnered research. Minkler and Wallerstein (2003) emphasize that in the academic setting, faculty members do not always have the luxury of devoting time to building relationships with community members.

The authors also observed that a challenge for expanding community-engaged scholarship at Ohio University is the limited number of examples of promotion and tenure guidelines that reward engaged scholarship. Overall at Ohio University, value apparently is assigned to quantity of scholarly publications rather

than the process of translating research into useful applications for community partners. Minkler and Wallerstein (2003) question whether interest in community-based participatory research methodologies may be lacking in promotion and tenure guidelines due to the nature of promotion and tenure policies. Even on a campus with high teaching loads (like the regional campuses at Ohio University), faculty members are expected to publish in peer-reviewed academic journals to secure promotion and tenure.

### **Observations Regarding the Book Project**

The authors believe that writing can be conceptualized as a faculty development tool for everyone involved in the publication process, including the book's editors. The purpose of the book project was to help authors grow in their ability to represent engaged scholarship in written form. The editors challenged authors to write in ways that recognized and capitalized on both the theoretical expertise of academic partners, and the local knowledge of community partners. The editors saw the creation of *Participatory Partnerships for Social Action and Research* (2011) as an opportunity for authors to rethink writing formats—to reach beyond theory development to writing about actionable interventions and/or policy development. For many contributing academic partners, this was their first opportunity to write with community partners.

### **Sustaining Ohio University's Community-Engaged Scholarship Faculty Development Action Plan**

Although the Office of Campus Community Engagement was closed as part of the university's restructuring in response to budget cuts, opportunities continue to emerge to support engaged scholarship that are championed by the authors. The Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs continues to maintain its long tradition of project-based work in service to the region and has dedicated resources to supporting faculty's documentation of efforts in practitioner and academic journals. Moreover, the current leadership of the Appalachian Rural Health Institute has prioritized community-engaged scholarship in its strategic plan. This strategic priority emphasizes both engagement and interprofessional partnerships across colleges and with the community, and it is aligned with the emergent Health Sciences Center. The Health Sciences Center fosters cooperative education and research among health

science professionals by encouraging university-community partnerships, interprofessional initiatives that make salient the power of collective impact promoted by Kania and Kramer (2011). Through the collective efforts of Ohio University's community-engaged faculty members, and with the support of university leadership present at the site visit by the leaders of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative, the authors continue to champion the vision of a nationally recognized rural health institute known for community-based participatory research. Not surprisingly, the timeline to reach this goal exceeds the 18-month project period, yet the Faculty for the Engaged Campus funding was critical in elevating this agenda such that it could be, and is, carried on today.

## Conclusion

Their work over the last 6 years in general, and their experience with the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative in particular, has led the authors to believe that faculty members attracted to doing community-engaged scholarship likely hold specific attitudes toward community and scholarship as well as valuing the core operating principles that reflect those attitudes (e.g., collaboration, reciprocity, sharing knowledge and decision-making, equitable community inclusion; Blanchard et al., 2009). Furthermore, the authors posit that institutions that invest in building their identity as community-engaged campuses embrace these same operating principles.

On a community-engaged campus, it is explicit that engagement with the community is critical to institutional mission and the advancement of knowledge and practice. The authors believe that creating environments that both support faculty development for community-engaged scholarship, and build institutional identity as a community-engaged campus, requires an alignment between faculty professional identity and institutional identity.

---

*“[C]reating environments that both support faculty development for community-engaged scholarship, and build institutional identity as a community-engaged campus, requires an alignment between faculty professional identity and institutional identity.”*

---

The authors' experience with the community-engaged scholarship faculty development programs they implemented at Ohio University as part of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative led them to propose two lessons learned regarding the importance of acknowledging the interplay between faculty development and institutional identity.

## **Lesson One**

The authors believe that there is a *reciprocal relationship between institutional and faculty values and action*. Guskey (2002) identified "organization support and change" as the missing fifth element of effective faculty development (the first four elements being participant reactions to the faculty development experience, participant learning, application of new knowledge and skills, and the subsequent impact of faculty development on productivity). Guskey highlights the importance of reviewing resources, policies, and procedures that facilitate the application of knowledge gained, a message the authors find similar to that advanced by Kania and Kramer (2011), who advocated for new funding practices to achieve collective impact. Bringle et al. (2006) highlighted the importance of convergence between individual and institutional agendas when discussing the relationship between faculty roles, rewards, and recognition and faculty development. At Ohio University there was an inherent tension between what faculty could be interested in doing, and what faculty were assigned to do. This constrained the degree to which the community-engaged faculty development programs could influence knowledge application and community-engaged scholarly productivity. In short, the authors posit that an institution's investment in creating environments that support community-engaged scholarship ought to be evaluated, not only by the ability of the investment to increase faculty scholarship, but also by the ability of the investment to strengthen institutional identity.

Moreover, when aligning institutional supports to foster community-engaged scholarship, one source of critical input is the faculty members themselves. An engaged campus cannot exist without an engaged faculty.

## **Lesson Two**

The authors believe that sustained dialogue with institutional leadership is critical to creating institutional structures and sustaining resources for community-engaged scholarship. During the 18-month period from January 2009 to September 2010 of the

Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative implementation grant at Ohio University, the authors engaged the university's leadership (e.g., provost, vice president for academic affairs, deans, associate deans) in conversations, which consolidated an understanding of the institution's interests and constraints, and led to a shared vision. At times, the grant's site visitors participated in conversations about how to conceptualize community-engaged scholarship on the campus, especially in promotion and tenure guidelines. The conversations caused deliberation on the risks and rewards of supporting community-engaged scholarship. Should the university's leadership give substantial resources in the absence of proof that community-engaged scholarly productivity would result from such an investment? Should resources be used to create environments that facilitate desired community-engaged scholarly activity (and institutional high cost), or should they reward productivity of high-achieving faculty (and individual high cost)? In the end, creating working environments that foster the expansion and reallocation of duties to recognize and reward community-engaged scholarship will require risk, innovation, and investment by the institution.

## Acknowledgments

This article was supported, in part, by the Faculty for the Engaged Campus (FEC), a national initiative of Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) in partnership with the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which aimed to strengthen community-engaged career paths in the academy by developing innovative competency-based models of faculty development, facilitating peer review and dissemination of products of community-engaged scholarship, and supporting community-engaged faculty through the promotion and tenure process. Faculty for the Engaged Campus was funded by a comprehensive program grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) in the U.S. Department of Education.

## References

- Blanchard, L., Hanssmann, C., Strauss, R. P., Belliard, J. C., Krichbaum, K., Waters, E., & Seifer, S. D. (2009). Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities, Universities, 20*(2), 47–65.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*, 11–20.
- Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., Jones, S., & Platter, W. (2006). Sustaining civic engagement: Faculty development, roles and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities, 17*, 62–74.

- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership*, 59, 45–51.
- Harter, L. M., Hamel-Lambert, J., & Millesen, J. L. (2011). *Participatory partnerships for social action and research*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Methods in community based participatory research for health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 9(1), 36–41.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kellogg Commission. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged university*. Washington, D.C.: Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Retrieved June 9, 2008 from: [http://www.cpn.org/topics/youth/highered/pdfs/Land\\_Grant\\_Engaged\\_Institution.pdf](http://www.cpn.org/topics/youth/highered/pdfs/Land_Grant_Engaged_Institution.pdf)
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2003). *Community-Based participatory research for health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Jaeger, A. J. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation. *Educational Policy*, 20, 245–266.
- Qualters, D. M. (2009). Creating a pathway for teacher change. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 20, 5–12.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273–286.
- Thornton, C., & Jaeger, A. (2008). The role of culture in institutional and individual approaches to civic responsibility at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79, 160–182.
- Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5–16.

## About the Authors

**Jane M. Hamel-Lambert** is an associate professor of Family Medicine in the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine at Ohio University and president of Integrating Professionals for Appalachian Children (IPAC). Her research interests focus on rural health, participatory methods, pediatric health outcomes, and interprofessional partnerships. Hamel-Lambert earned her bachelor's degree from the University of Maine, Orono, her Ph.D. from Ohio University and her MBA from Case Western Reserve University.

**Judith L. Millesen** is an associate professor and director of the MPA Programs at the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs at Ohio University. Her research focuses on nonprofit administration and capacity building in the sector with a special interest in board governance. Millesen earned her bachelor's degree from Richard Stockton College, her master's degree from the University of Hartford, and her Ph.D. from the University of Albany.

**Karen Slovak** is an associate professor of social work at Ohio University - Zanesville. Her research interests are suicide, cyber-bullying, school social work, and rural issues. Slovak earned her bachelor's degree from Bowling Green State University, and her master's degree and Ph.D. from Case Western Reserve University.

**Lynn M. Harter** is the Steven and Barbara Schoonover professor of health communication at Ohio University. Her research interests focus on the construction of possibility and resiliency amidst inescapable vulnerability, illness, suffering, and trauma. Harter earned her bachelor's degree and her master's degree from Missouri State University, and her Ph.D. from the University of Nebraska.

## Appendix I. Learning Community Selected Readings

- Bordeaux, B. C., Wiley, C., Tandon, S. D., Horowitz, C. R., Brown, P. B., & Bass, E. B. (2007). Guidelines for writing manuscripts about community-based participatory research for peer-reviewed journals. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 1(3), 281–288.
- Brugge, D., & Kole, A. (2003). A case study of community-based participatory research ethics: The healthy public housing initiative. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 9, 485–501.
- Frazier, S. L., Formose, D., Birman, D., & Atkins, M. S. (2008). Closing the research to practice gap: Redefining feasibility. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 15(2), 125–129.
- Gee, G. E. (2010). Opportunity and purpose: Outreach's changing mission. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 14(3), 5–12.
- Grignon, J., Wong, K. A., & Seifer, S. D. (2008). Ensuring community-level research protections. In *Proceedings for the 2007 Educational Conference Call Series on Institutional Review Boards and Ethical Issues in Research*. Seattle, WA: Community Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Green, L. (n.d.). *Guidelines for participatory research project in health*. Retrieved from <http://lgreen.net/guidelines.html#Guidelines> for Participatory Research in Health.
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., MacFarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovation in service organizations: Systemic review and recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 8(4), 581–629.
- Israel, B. A., Krieger, J., Vlahov, D., Ciske, S., Foley, M., Fortin, P., Gusman, J. R., Lichtenstein, R., McGranaghan, R., Palermo, A., & Tang, R. (2006). Challenges and facilitating factors in sustaining community-based participatory research partnerships: Lessons learned from the Detroit, New York City, and Seattle urban research centers. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83(6), 1022–1040.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173–202.
- Minkler, M., Vasquez, V. B., Warner, J. R., Stussey, H., & Facente, S. (2006). Sowing the seeds for sustainable change: A community-based participatory research partnership for health promotion in Indiana, USA and its aftermath. *Health Promotion International*, 21(4), 293–300.

- O'Fallon, L. R., Tyson, R. L., & Dearry, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Successful models of community-based participatory research: Final Report*. Research Triangle Park, NC: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.
- Seifer, S. D., & Sgambelluri, A. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Partnership Perspectives, 4(1)*. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
- Stoecker, R. (2008). Challenging institutional barriers to community-based research. *Action Research, 6*, 49–67.
- Tandon, S. D., Phillips, K., Bordeaux, B., Bone, L., Brown, P. B., Cagney, K., Gary, T., Kim, M., Levine, D. M., Price, E., Sydnor, K. D., Stone, K., & Bass, E. B. (2007). A vision for progress in community health partnerships. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 1*, 11–29.
- Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Gartlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., Rhodes, S., Samuel-Hodge, C., Maty, S., Lux, L., Webb, L., Sutton, S. F., Swinson, T., Jackman, A., & Whitener, L. (2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence* (Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 99; AHRQ Publication 04-E022-2). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.