

Summer Intensive on Community-Engaged Scholarship: Generative Tensions and Future Directions for Professional Development

Diane M. Doberneck

Abstract

Since the mid-1990s, universities and colleges have sought to institutionalize service-learning and community engagement. Along with aligning institutional roles and rewards, professional development for faculty and academic staff has been a key strategy for institutionalization. However, as Welch and Plaxton-Moore (2017) noted, professional development around community engagement is rarely guided by theory or conceptual frameworks and often lacks impact or outcome data. As a response to this critique, this paper presents Michigan State University's Summer Intensive on Community-Engaged Scholarship, a weeklong professional development program for faculty, academic staff, and advanced graduate students offered in person annually. The author describes the program's underlying conceptual framework, chronicles iterative improvements in its implementation over 4 years, and documents its impacts on 85 participants. The most significant gains in participant understanding were in history and foundations, variations of community engagement, collaboration techniques, use of theory, conceptual frameworks and best practices to guide community-engaged research or teaching and learning, communicating with public audiences, communicating with academic audiences, and preparing materials for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The author concludes with reflections on the program's inherent generative tensions and suggests future directions for professional development related to community-engaged scholarship and practice.

Since the mid-1990s, universities and colleges have sought to institutionalize service-learning and community engagement (Butin, 2010; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Stanton, 2008; Van de Ven, 2007). Along with aligning institutional roles and rewards, professional development for faculty and academic staff has been a key strategy for making service-learning and community engagement an integral and sustained part of the university's mission and commitments (Berkey et al., 2018; Blanchard et al., 2009; Dostilio & Welch, 2019; Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018; O'Meara, 2011; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006). According to Gravette and Broscheid (2018), the four main approaches to faculty and professional development include (a) information resources (e.g., websites, blogs, online toolkits); (b) supports, incentives, and recognition programs (e.g., grants, stipends, awards); (c) short-term programs (e.g., consultations, workshops, talks, conferences); and (d) extended and immersive programs (e.g., institutes, faculty learning communities, mentoring programs, fellowship programs) (pp. 89–90). While each approach focuses on specific professional development goals, extended and immersive programs provide lasting changes in practice, thereby sustaining institutional change over time.

With institutional change in mind, some higher education institutions have developed

their own extended or immersive professional development programs for faculty, academic staff, and graduate students. Notable examples include the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Faculty Engaged Scholars Program (Blanchard et al., 2012), the University of New Hampshire's Engaged Scholars Academy (French et al., 2013), Ohio University's Faculty Fellowship in Engaged Learning and Community-Based Participatory Research Learning Community (Hamel-Lambert et al., 2012), North Carolina State University's Education and Discovery Grounded in Engaged Scholarship (EDGES) 12-month learning community (Jameson et al., 2012), McGill University's Participatory Health Research Faculty Development Workshop (Salsberg et al., 2012), the University of San Francisco's Service-Learning Seminar for Faculty (Borrero & Reed, 2016), the University of Minnesota's Community-Engaged Scholars Program (Jordan, 2016), Salisbury University's Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum (Surak & Pope, 2016), Michigan State University's Graduate Certification in Community Engagement (Doberneck et al., 2017), and the University of Georgia's Graduate Portfolio in Community Engagement (Matthews et al., 2015).

In addition to institution-specific programs, extended and immersive programs have also

been developed to reach national audiences. Notable national programs include the Publicly Active Graduate Education Fellows Program through Imagining America (Gilven et al., 2012), the Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop for graduate students and early career faculty through the Engagement Scholarship Consortium (Doberneck, Brown, & Allen, 2010), Campus Compact's Diving Deep multiday workshop for community engagement professionals (McReynolds & Shields, 2015), Campus Compact's online Community Engagement Professional Credentialing Program (Campus Compact, n.d.), and the Engagement Academy for University Leaders (hosted through the Engagement Scholarship Consortium). These national programs encourage participants to network beyond the borders of their campus and to understand national trends in service-learning and community engagement. None of the above-mentioned faculty and professional development programs were developed to simultaneously serve an on-campus audience and a national audience.

The Summer Intensive on Community-Engaged Scholarship (hereafter Summer Intensive) hosted annually by Michigan State University (MSU) is one such extended/immersive program; it was intentionally designed both to foster national networking and to strengthen an institution's capacity for service-learning and community engagement among faculty, academic staff, and graduate students. Situated at the intersection of the scholarship of engagement and the scholarship of teaching and learning, this paper outlines the Summer Intensive's underlying conceptual framework, chronicles improvements in the program's development over 4 years, and provides evaluation data from over 85 program participants. Unlike other articles that describe a professional development program for community engagement and provide evaluation data from a single year, this paper provides data from 4 years and discusses iterative program improvements over time, a process which may be of interest to those planning professional development initiatives on their own campuses. The paper concludes with generative tensions and reflective questions for planning future professional development for community-engaged scholarship. The audience for this paper is community engagement professionals—either those new to the field of professional development or those seeking an example of competency-guided, evidence-based programming.

Institutional Context

MSU is a land-grant and sea-grant institution in the north-central Midwest United States, a member of the Association of American Universities, and designated as an R1 (very high research activity) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. MSU's institutional leaders have had a long-standing and contemporary commitment to outreach and engagement. MSU was in the inaugural cohort of institutions to earn the Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification for Community Engagement and has maintained this engagement accreditation since 2005. Institutionally, MSU holds memberships in The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), the Engagement Scholarship Consortium, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Imagining America, Campus Compact, Advancing Research Impact in Society, and the Talloires Network of Engaged Universities. Key staff members of MSU's University Outreach and Engagement Office have either held or currently hold leadership positions in the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities' Commission on Economic and Community Engagement, Advancing Research Impact in Society, and the Academy of Community Engagement Scholarship.

Part of this institutional commitment to outreach and engagement is an emphasis on professional development for community-engaged scholarship so that students, faculty, academic staff, administrators, and community partners are well prepared to collaborate respectfully and ethically with one another. In 2006, MSU developed Tools of Engagement: online modules for faculty to orient undergraduates in advance of service-learning and civic engagement experiences (Springer & Casey, 2010). In 2008, MSU initiated the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement to prepare graduate and professional students for respectful, scholarly, and systemic approaches to community-engaged scholarship and practice (Doberneck et al., 2017; Matthews et al., 2015). In 2016, MSU built upon these successes to develop a weeklong intensive workshop for faculty, academic staff, and advanced graduate students. Unlike Tools of Engagement or the Graduate Certification in Community Engagement, MSU's Summer Intensive was intentionally designed for both institutional and national participants.

Community Engagement Definitions Guiding the Summer Intensive

The Summer Intensive was framed by three complementary definitions of community engagement—two at the institutional level and one at the individual level. In 1993, MSU’s provost charged a multidisciplinary faculty committee with assessing the field and developing an institutional-level definition of outreach scholarship. As a result of this early work, outreach was defined as “a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research [and creative activities], and service. It involves generating, transmitting, and applying knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions” (Provost’s Committee on University Outreach, 1993, p. 1). This definition helps community-engaged scholars see outreach and engagement as an integrated part of their institutional responsibilities and view their community work as a scholarly endeavor. In 2008, the Carnegie Foundation defined engagement broadly as “the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Driscoll, 2008, p. 39). This definition helps community-engaged scholars focus on the collaborative relationship between communities and universities, which should be based on mutually beneficial, reciprocal partnerships. Several decades later, an individual-level definition of community-engaged scholarship—inclusive of service-learning, civic engagement, outreach, public engagement, Extension scholarship, and broader impacts—was further refined to clarify that community engagement is an activity in which

foundational scholarship informs your understanding and guides your engagement experiences with your community partners, which, in turn, then generate new scholarship and practice for both academic and public audiences. This is all conducted in conjunction with community partners, who contribute local, Indigenous, and/or practitioner knowledge. (Doberneck et al., 2017, p. 124)

This definition reaffirms the importance of foundational scholarship—that is, theories, conceptual frameworks, or best practices that inform or guide community engagement activities

(Doberneck et al., 2017, p. 124). It also underscores community partner knowledge as integral to engagement and emphasizes that collaboration should result in scholarly products valued by both public and academic audiences (Ellison & Eatman, 2008).

In the Summer Intensive, the terms “communities” and “community partners” refer to a wide range of entities beyond the border of college and university campuses. They may be communities defined by geography, identity, affiliation/interest, circumstance, profession/practice, faith, or kin/family (Fraser, 2005; Gilchrist, 2009; Ife, 1995; Marsh, 1999; Mattesich & Monsey, 1997; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002). Often, community-engaged scholars work at the intersection of multiple community identities. For example, a health disparities researcher might partner with urban African American breast cancer survivors (i.e., a community at the intersection of geography, identity, and circumstance). A fisheries and wildlife Extension professional might collaborate with Latinx fishers on inland lakes to understand their fish consumption patterns (i.e., a community at the intersection of identity, interest, and geography). An academic staff member might partner with an affordable housing community to pair university student tutors with middle school students as part of a service-learning activity (i.e., communities at the intersection of circumstance and identity).

The Summer Intensive’s curriculum also acknowledges multiple types of community-engaged scholarship as legitimate forms of outreach and engagement, including community-engaged research, creative activities, teaching and learning, service and practice, and commercialized activities (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010). That said, it focuses mostly on community-engaged research and community-engaged teaching and learning since they are the most common types of community-engaged scholarship listed on the program’s applications.

Finally, in the Summer Intensive’s curriculum, organizers acknowledge that community-engaged collaborations may vary broadly in terms of their intensity of activity and degree of engagement (Doberneck et al., 2011; International Association for Public Participation, 2018). For some community-engaged scholars, their collaborative relationship with their community partners can be characterized as *outreach*, with a predominantly unidirectional flow of information from the university to the partners. Outreach

in these instances centers knowledge creation and production with the academic partners (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 21). For others, the collaborative relationship with their community partners can be characterized as *engagement*, with multidirectional flows of knowledge, including cocreation. Engagement in these cases is inclusive, collaborative, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 21). With this in mind, both outreach and engagement activities are included in the curriculum of community-engaged scholarship as acceptable, distinct, and valuable approaches to partnering with the public, especially if the community's wishes and context are taken into consideration in deciding between outreach or engagement approaches.

Conceptual Framework and Definitions

The Summer Intensive is guided by existing literature about faculty, staff, and graduate student professional development for community engagement. Based on that literature, MSU's overall conceptual framework for faculty and professional development comprises nine domains:

- Foundations and Variations
- Community Partnerships
- Critical Reflections and Critical Thinking
- Community-Engaged Scholarship and Practice
- Approaches and Perspectives
- Evaluation and Assessment
- Communication and Scholarly Skills
- Successful Community Engagement Careers
- Leadership for Community-Engaged Scholarship

Within these nine domains are 28 subtopics. The Summer Intensive's curriculum addresses eight of the nine domains and 19 of the 28 subtopics. The Approaches and Perspectives domain is not directly addressed in the curriculum, though capacity building, asset-based community engagement, and coalition building appear in case studies and workshops. Table 1 conveys the overall framework and the Summer Intensive's curriculum.

Adult Learning Theory

Because the participants in the Summer Intensive are administrators, faculty, staff, and

Table 1. Community Engagement Competencies Framework for Faculty, Academic Staff, Graduate Students

Competencies and Subtopics	Addressed in the Summer Intensive Curriculum
Foundations and Variations	
1. History of Community-Engaged Scholarship	X
2. Variations in Community-Engaged Scholarship	X
Community Partnerships	
3. Initiating Community Partnerships	X
4. Sustaining Community Partnerships	X
5. Techniques for Community Collaboration	X
Critical Reflection and Critical Thinking	
6. Engaging with Diverse Communities	X
7. Critical Reflection and Critical Thinking	X
8. Ethics in Community-Engaged Scholarship	X
Community-Engaged Scholarship and Practice	
9. Community-Engaged Research and Creative Activities	X
10. Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning	X
11. Community-Engaged Service and Practice	
12. Community-Engaged Commercialized Activities	

Table 1 (continued). Community Engagement Competencies Framework for Faculty, Academic Staff, Graduate Students

Competencies and Subtopics	Addressed in the Summer Intensive Curriculum
Approaches and Perspectives	
13. Asset-Based Community Engagement	
14. Capacity Building Approaches to Sustained Change	
15. Coalition Approaches to Community Change	
Evaluation and Assessment	
16. Evaluating Community Partnerships	X
17. Quality, Excellence, and Rigor in Peer Review of CES	
Communication and Scholarly Skills	
18. Grant Writing to Support Community-Engaged Scholarship	
19. Communicating With Public Audiences	X
Communicating With Policy-Makers	X
Communicating With Journalists and Media	
20. Communicating With Academic Audiences	X
Successful Community Engagement Careers	
21. Documenting and Communicating Your Engagement Accomplishments	X
22. Community Engagement Across the Career Span	
Leadership and Administration	
23. Mentoring Undergraduate or Graduate Students as Community-Engaged Scholars	X
24. Supporting Community-Engaged Faculty/Staff Through RPT/Professional Reviews	X
25. Fundraising, Donor Relations, and Institutional Advancement Related to Community Engagement	
26. Institutional Documentation of Community Engagement Activity and Impact	X
27. Strategic Communications to Support Community Engagement	
28. Leading Community-Engaged Scholarship in Your Department, School, or College	X

graduate students, adult learning theory is an appropriate philosophy for organizing the program's logistics and curriculum. Adult learning theory posits that children and adults approach learning in different ways, and because of that, teaching and learning must be organized in ways that honor adults' prior knowledge and experience and connect explicitly to the practicalities of their work or life contexts (Cross, 1981). Adults generally are more self-directed, appreciate learning choices,

prefer problem-centered learning, prefer to apply new knowledge immediately, and are motivated by internal rather than external factors (Knowles, 1980). In designing a professional development program, organizers will do well to establish a cooperative learning environment, inquire about learners' specific needs and interests, and then address those interests and needs through intentionally sequenced and scaffolded experiences (Knowles et al., 1984). Collaborative design,

opportunities for theory-to-practice applications, and reflection on practical implementation by the learner are also important.

Over the 4 years, the Summer Intensive’s curriculum evolved from being taught primarily through lectures to include a wider array of teaching approaches that embody an adult learning theory-guided approach, with more emphasis on field trips, dialogue, case studies, small-group activities, reflection, and consultations. Table 2 illustrates the shift toward more adult learning theory-guided sessions over time.

Summer Intensive Program Description: Year 1

In 2016, the Summer Intensive was held from Monday morning at 8 a.m. through Friday afternoon at 1:30 p.m. The 14 workshops varied

in length from 45 to 90 minutes, with one session lasting an entire afternoon. The format included lectures, workshops, and lunchtime talks primarily by University Outreach and Engagement staff, with the topics following the conceptual framework closely. Lunch breaks were scheduled for 1 hour, with a few featuring lunchtime speakers. On the first night, a networking reception was held to foster informal interactions among the participants and presenters. Participants received workshop materials in a binder that also included daily reflection pages for notetaking. Participants were encouraged to take note of ideas they could incorporate into their scholarship and practice upon returning to their respective campuses.

At the close of Year 1, Summer Intensive organizers held a group reflective session in

Table 2. Summer Intensive’s Community Engagement Competencies and Associated Teaching Approaches

Competencies and Subtopics	2016	2017	2018	2019
Foundations and Variations				
History of Community-Engaged Scholarship	Lecture	Lecture	Lecture	Lecture
Variations in Community-Engaged Scholarship	Lecture	Lecture	Lecture	Lecture
Community Partnerships				
Initiating Community Partnerships	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop Field Trip	Case Study Field Trip
Sustaining Community Partnerships	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop Field Trip	Case Study Field Trip
Techniques for Community Collaboration	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop Lightning Talk	Workshop Lightning Talk
Critical Reflection and Critical Thinking				
Engaging with Diverse Communities	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop	Case Studies
Ethics in Community-Engaged Scholarship				
Community-Engaged Scholarship and Practice				
Community-Engaged Research and Creative Activities	Workshop	Workshop Breakout	Special Track Field Trip	Workshop Case Study Field Trip
Community-Engaged Teaching and Learning	Workshop	Workshop Breakout	Special Track Consultations	Workshop Case Study Consultations
Evaluation and Assessment				
Evaluating Community Partnerships	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop Consultations	Workshop Consultations

Table 2 (continued). Summer Intensive’s Community Engagement Competencies and Associated Teaching Approaches

Competencies and Subtopics	2016	2017	2018	2019
Communication and Scholarly Skills				
Communicating With Public Audiences	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop
Communicating With Academic Audiences	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop Consultations	Workshop Consultations
Successful Community Engagement Careers				
Documenting and Communicating Your Engagement Accomplishments for RPT	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop	Workshop
Community Engagement Across the Career Span	Lunch Talk	Faculty Panel	Faculty Panel	Faculty Panel
Leadership for Community-Engaged Scholarship				
Mentoring Graduate Students as Community-Engaged Scholars and Practitioners		Grad Student Panel	Grad Student Panel	Grad Student Panel
Institutional Leadership				Consultations

which they asked participants to share ideas about what worked well and what could be improved. Organizers took copious notes during this reflective session and during the following organizers’ debriefing meeting. Participants also received a six-page evaluation with qualitative and quantitative questions focused on program logistics, content, and learning impact: What topics should we consider expanding or adding? What topics should we consider dropping? What was the best part of the program? What aspects of the program should be improved? What other comments would you like to share with program organizers? Written responses to the evaluation’s program logistics and content questions were used to identify changes in the program from year to year.

Improvements Over Time

Adjustments From Year 1 to Year 2

Based on participants’ evaluations and instructors’ feedback, program organizers made several logistical and curricular adjustments for Year 2. Instead of starting at 9 a.m. on Monday, the organizers started the workshop with a lunch on Day 1 and ended it with a lunch on Day 5. This shift in timing allowed participants traveling from places within driving distance to have adequate

time to travel to and from the event. In Year 2, the lunch break was extended to 1.5 hours to allow participants to catch up on email, exercise, write reflective notes, and network with one another, a strategic choice that better reflected the needs of adult learners, including self-care. No lunchtime speakers meant that lunch was truly a break from the learning. The networking reception was moved from Day 1 to Day 3 so that those traveling could rest the first night. Year 1 evaluations also suggested that a midweek reception might work better because participants would by that time be more familiar with one another and more comfortable networking with presenters they had already met.

Year 1 participants also commented that there had not been enough time to take the ideas presented during the Summer Intensive and envision how to use them in their work on their own campuses. In Year 2, organizers added a session on Day 1 and a second session on Day 5 for participants to spend time individually and in small groups developing their action plans. Finally, a panel of graduate students from the MSU Graduate Certification in Community Engagement were invited to share their experiences as emerging engaged scholars and to describe what effective mentoring looks like from their perspectives.

Adjustments From Year 2 to Year 3

Co-organized and cohosted by MSU's Center for Service-Learning and Community Engagement (now Center for Community-Engaged Learning), Year 3 was the first in which some institutions sent teams of faculty, academic staff, and graduate students to attend. On the second day of the workshop, we divided participants into two groups based on interests indicated on their applications: (a) community-engaged teaching and learning or (b) community-engaged research and evaluation. Each group was assigned a track for the day on Tuesday and participated in sessions and workshops about (a) theories and conceptual frameworks, (b) initiating and sustaining partnerships, and (c) methods, tools, and practices. Participants also took a field trip to community partner sites and heard presentations from community partners about their perspectives. This two-track approach allowed participants to focus in depth on materials related to their specific type of community engagement. The Lansing-based Refugee Development Center hosted the community-engaged learning field trip, while the InterTribal Research Council hosted the community-engaged research field trip at a local nature center. The theory session, field trip, and community partner perspective were added in direct response to suggestions in participants' evaluations and workshop instructors' debriefing comments.

On Day 5, organizers extended the time allotted for the Action Plan Part II session and offered optional concurrent 30-minute consultations with University Outreach and Engagement staff. Consultations addressed issues such as institutional leadership and change, the National Science Foundation's broader impacts, community-based participatory research, graduate professional development for community engagement, publishing community-engaged scholarship, and evaluation of community engagement activities.

Adjustments From Year 3 to Year 4

Campus Compact for Michigan co-organized and cohosted the Summer Intensive in Year 4 and augmented Summer Intensive programming with its own pre and post workshop sessions for participants. While Year 3 participants appreciated the two-track structure of the previous year, they felt that they had missed out on valuable information and insights that the other track was privy to. For Year 4, we reconfigured the schedule so that all participants took part in a theory session

and two case studies related to community-engaged teaching and community-engaged research. We did, however, break participants into two groups for the field trips. Once field trip participants returned to campus, we held a reflection session so participants could share ideas across the two community-partner-led field trip sites.

This new configuration allowed for two faculty-led case study presentations on the research day and two more on the teaching and learning day. Case study presenters were encouraged to explain the history of their partnership, describe the foundational scholarship that influenced their project, and comment on how diversity, equity, and inclusion factored into their work. The community-engaged teaching and learning case study presentations included a jointly appointed English and African American studies professor who spoke about the importance of mentoring African American women in classes and a professor from the Residential College for Arts and Humanities who spoke about a partnership with a local K-12 school's Hispanic club. The community-engaged research case study presentations included an anthropology professor who featured a photovoice project conducted in partnership with women in Flint and a psychology professor who spoke about his health disparities research with the Arab American community and communities of people living with HIV. Presenters were encouraged to copresent with their community partners. Due to logistical constraints, only one copresented with a community partner (the principal from the K-12 school), and another copresented with a graduate student involved in the photovoice project.

Because one of the four faculty-led case studies focused on photovoice as a participatory action research technique, we reenvisioned the midweek reception to include a photo gallery of the outcomes of the photovoice project. Many participants mentioned in their evaluations that this was an important element of the Summer Intensive because it directly addressed the emotional aspects of community engagement in ways the workshop sessions had not. This year, because we had a high number of participants with Extension appointments, we also organized a special lunch for them to meet informally with MSU's person responsible for supporting Extension professionals to prepare their annual review and promotion materials. Figure 1 presents the most recent Summer Intensive schedule from 2019.

Figure 1. 2019 Summer Intensive Schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	Breakfast, Q&A 8:45 Day Overview	Breakfast, Q&A 8:45 Day Overview	Breakfast, Q&A 8:45 Day Overview	Breakfast, Q&A 8:45 Day Overview
	9:00–9:45 Session 4: Theory for CE Teaching & Learning	9:00–9:45 Session 9: Theory for CE Research	9:00–10:45 Session 14: Evaluating Community Partnerships	9:00–10:45 Session 18: Small-Group Work OR Consultations with Outreach & Engagement Office Staff
	9:45–10:00 Break	9:45–10:00 Break		
	10:00–10:45 Session 5: CE Teaching & Learning Case Study #1	10:00–10:45 Session 10: CE Research Case Study #1	10:45–11:00 Break	10:45–11:00 Break
	10:45–11:00 Break	10:45–11:00 Break		
	11:00–11:45 Session 6: CE Teaching & Learning Case Study #2	11:00–11:45 Session 11: CE Research Case Study #2		
Lunch Welcome	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Boxed Lunch Evaluation Turn-In
1:30–3:00 Session 1: Your Action Plan (in Assigned Small Groups)	1:30–2:00 Transport Session 7: Refugee Development Center–CE Teaching & Learning Field Trip	1:30–3:00 Session 12: Techniques for Collaboration Overview Lightning Talks	1:30–2:30 Session 16: Panel Graduate Students on Community Engagement	
3:00–3:15 Break	Tribal Research Council–CE Research Field Trip	3:00–3:15 Break	2:30–2:45 Break	
3:15–4:00 Session 2: History & Foundations		4:00–4:30 Travel time	2:45–5:00 Session 17: Communicating with Public Audiences	
4:00–4:15 Break				
4:15–5:30 Session 3: Variations in CES	4:30–5:30 Session 8: Cross-Field Trip Reflections	3:15–5:00 Session 13: Communicating with Academic Audiences		
Dinner on Your Own	Dinner on Your Own	5:00–6:30 Reception	Dinner on Your Own	

Future Adjustments

As the curriculum for the Summer Intensive continues to evolve, new ways of incorporating community partner and participant voices are points of emphasis for continued improvement. All community-engaged scholarship relies on authentic partnership with community organizations and communities themselves. Professional development for community engagement should not be imagined and implemented without community partner perspectives in setting priorities for the curriculum and in coteaching important sessions. Participants also bring a wealth of experience and ideas to the Summer Intensive. Intentionally incorporating their examples into the sessions and adding space for them to share and discuss their experiences is another way for Summer Intensive organizers to foster peer-to-peer learning and position faculty as colearners (Eatman, 2018). Finally, while past Summer Intensive workshops have featured graduate student panels about mentoring, a future addition might include an undergraduate panel to highlight the community engagement experience from their perspectives.

Participant Demographics

Over the 4 years, the Summer Intensive attracted 89 participants. Of these participants, 79% self-identified as women and 21% as men. Overall, 75% identified as White, 16% identified as Black or African American, and 9% as Asian or Asian American. In 2018, those percentages were even higher, with 15% identifying as Black or African American and 15% identifying as Asian or Asian American. Hispanic, Latino, and Spanish-origin participants comprised 15% of the participants over the 4 years. Seven percent of the participants were international, having traveled from other countries to participate in the Summer Intensive. In terms of age, 20% of participants were in their 20s, 36% were in their 30s, 29% were in their 40s, and 16% were in their 50s. In terms of institutional role, 36% of the participants were graduate students or postdoctoral students and 39% were tenure-track faculty, with 24% of the tenure-track faculty at the assistant (pretenure) faculty level. Administrators and other academic staff comprised 25% of participants. In 2019, one academic staff member participated with her community partner. Over the 4 years, 54% were interested in community-engaged teaching and learning, inclusive of service-learning and civic engagement, while 46% were focused on

community-engaged research. For all 4 workshop years, it was an almost even split between MSU (51%) and non-MSU (49%) participants.

Evaluation Data

Each year, participants anonymously completed paper evaluations focused on the program's logistics, content, and learning impact. Logistics and content data were detailed in the previous sections, and learning impact data are reported in this section. To assess learning, this evaluation used retrospective-pre and post self-ratings of competencies addressed in the Summer Intensive. For the retrospective-pre questions, participants were asked: "Knowing what you now know, how would you rate your knowledge prior to the Summer Intensive?" Using a retrospective-pre question instead of administering pre-assessment questions on the program application yields more accurate results for educational programming (Nimon et al., 2011). The evaluation response rate averaged 89% across all 4 years, with a high of 100% in 2017 and a low of 83% in 2018. The program evaluation for the Summer Intensive was submitted to MSU's institutional review board (IRB), which determined that the evaluation did not require formal review or IRB approval.

Summer Intensive participants were asked to rate their level of competence for each of the conceptual framework subtopics. In 2016 and 2017, the ratings were on a scale from 1 to 4. In 2018 and 2019, the ratings were on a scale of 1 to 5. Means, standard deviations, and changes in means were calculated and are summarized in Table 3. These data show that across all 4 years of the Summer Intensive, participants demonstrated the most learning gains in two domains: (a) Foundations and Variations and (b) Communication and Scholarly Skills. The seven subtopics in the Summer Intensive's curriculum that indicated more than a 1.5 change in mean from retrospective-pretest to posttest included (a) history of community-engaged scholarship; (b) variations in community-engaged scholarship; (c) employ collaboration techniques to achieve different engagement purposes; (d) use of theories, conceptual frameworks, and best practices to guide community-engaged scholarship; (e) communicate with public audiences; (f) communicating with academic audiences; and (g) document and communicate engagement accomplishments for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The two subtopics that showed the lowest mean change between retrospective-pre

Table 3. Summer Intensive Participant Self-Reported Retrospective Pretest and Posttest Ratings of Changes in Community Engagement Competency by Year

Competencies and Sub-topics	2016			2017			2018			2019		
	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean
Foundations and Variations												
History of community-engaged scholarship	1.86	3.07	+1.12	1.91	3.23	+1.32	2.07	3.86	+1.79	1.06	3.86	+2.26
Variations in community-engaged scholarship	2.00	3.21	+1.21	1.73	3.09	+1.36	2.28	4.00	+1.72	2.20	3.94	+1.74
Community Partnerships												
Initiate and sustain community partnerships	2.29	3.21	+0.93	2.82	3.18	+0.36						
Incorporate community partner knowledge and decision-making into my community work							2.84	4.29	+1.44	2.84	4.30	+1.46
Appreciate community partner perspectives on collaborating with university partners												
Develop ethical and respectful community-engaged partnerships							3.05	4.43	+1.38	3.44	4.50	+1.06
Employ various collaboration techniques to achieve different engagement purposes	2.57	3.43	+0.86	2.45	3.27	+0.82	3.16	4.28	+1.22	3.24	4.34	+1.10

Note. 2016 and 2017 data were on scale of 1–4. 2018 and 2019 data were on scale of 1–5.

Table 3 (continued). Summer Intensive Participant Self-Reported Retrospective Pretest and Posttest Ratings of Changes in Community Engagement Competency by Year

Competencies and Sub-topics	2016			2017			2018			2019		
	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean
Critical Reflection and Critical Thinking												
Engage with diverse communities	2.57	3.21	+0.64	3.00	3.23	+0.23						
Acknowledge my own power and privilege and how they affect my community engagement							3.82	4.57	+0.75	3.56	4.30	+0.74
Identify and engage partners who may be traditionally underrepresented in my kind of work							2.77	3.75	+0.98	2.52	3.80	+1.28
Navigate the complexity of cross-cultural elements of community-university partnerships							3.11	4.07	+0.96	2.92	3.82	+0.90
Community-Engaged Scholarship and Practice												
Community-engaged research and creative activities	2.07	3.21	+1.14	2.10	3.18	+1.08						
Community-engaged teaching and learning	2.00	2.79	+0.79	2.45	3.41	+0.95						
Use theories, conceptual frameworks, or models to guide my community-engaged scholarship							2.28	3.79	+1.52	1.96	3.98	+2.02

Note. 2016 and 2017 data were on scale of 1-4. 2018 and 2019 data were on scale of 1-5.

Table 3 (continued). Summer Intensive Participant Self-Reported Retrospective Pretest and Posttest Ratings of Changes in Community Engagement Competency by Year

Competencies and Sub-topics	2016			2017			2018			2019		
	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Change in Mean
Evaluation and Assessment												
Evaluate community partnerships	1.93	3.00	+1.07	1.64	2.90	+1.26	1.89	3.52	+1.63	1.84	3.46	+1.62
Communication and Scholarly Skills												
Communicate with public audiences	2.64	3.29	+0.64	2.64	2.82	+0.18	2.02	3.79	+1.77	2.00	3.66	+1.66
Communicate with academic audiences	2.50	3.14	+0.64	2.73	3.00	+0.27	1.96	4.20	+2.25	2.30	4.15	+1.85
Successful Community Engagement Careers												
Document and communicate your engagement accomplishments for reappointment, promotion, and tenure	1.64	3.00	+1.36	1.73	3.00	+1.27	1.68	3.90	+2.22	2.05	3.85	+1.80
Leadership for Community-Engaged Scholarship												
Mentor graduate students as community-engaged scholars and practitioners							2.41	3.46	+1.06	1.79	3.02	+1.23

Note. 2016 and 2017 data were on scale of 1-4. 2018 and 2019 data were on scale of 1-5.

and posttests were (a) acknowledge my own power and privilege and how they affect my community engagement and (b) navigate the complexity of cross-cultural elements of community-university partnerships. It should be noted that for both of these subtopics, participants rated themselves high in the retrospective-pretests, thereby leaving less room for potential improvement.

There are limitations associated with the program description and evaluation data. The Summer Intensive program description was written by one of the program leaders and therefore may have included biases. Efforts were made to minimize the effects of any such biases by including critiques of the program and evaluation data from participants' perspectives. In addition, the data reported by participants were collected at the end of the program, as is common in evaluations of professional development programming. However, this program evaluation would have benefited from participant impact data collected 3 to 6 months following the program to document lasting impact. Future program evaluations will include such data collection and analysis.

Generative Tensions

As the Summer Intensive organizer for the 4 years, I have encountered intellectual conflicts reframed as generative tensions. Generative tensions arise when "there is difficulty in creating something new together; those differences create tensions" (Nations, 2017, p. 2). However, when viewed in a positive light, those tensions can become "catalysts for creating a wide range of meanings and diverse options for action" (Nations, 2017, p. 5). In other words, when viewed generatively, conflict may lead to innovation, creativity, and new possibilities. The generative tensions encountered during Summer Intensive planning and implementation may be instructive for others who organize professional development around community engagement on their own campuses.

Using the Community Engagement Competency Framework Creates Generative Tensions With Being Learner-Centered and Learner-Driven.

In the scholarship about professional development for community engagement, national competencies have been identified and refined over time (Atiles, 2019; Berkey et al., 2018; Blanchard et al., 2009; Blanchard et al., 2012; DeLugan et al., 2014; Doberneck et al., 2017; Dostilio, 2017; Dostilio & Welch, 2019; Jameson et al., 2012; Jordan, 2016; Suvedi & Kaplowitz, 2016). I have

drawn heavily on these community engagement competencies to inform the Summer Intensive's curriculum. Following best practices in adult learning, I ask participants about their learning interests and ask nominators about nominees' needs each year. I then modify the curriculum to align with each year's particular learning interests. However, participants and nominators do not tend to mention interest in some of the community engagement competencies (e.g., peer review, asset-based community engagement, capacity building). Alternatively, participants and nominators may indicate topics that are not included in the community engagement competencies (e.g., grant writing, managing conflict among partners, political advocacy).

Generative tension: How do I follow the community engagement competencies delineated in the literature while being responsive to participants' changing learning interests and needs each year—within the confines of a 4-day program?

Amplifying the Voices of Black, Indigenous, LGBTQIA+, Latinx, and Female Faculty as Well as Persons with Disabilities and Other People of Color as Speakers Creates Generative Tensions With Having Speaker Requests Be an Added Burden to Them Professionally.

In designing the Summer Intensive, I have intentionally expanded the examples and invited speakers to feature the accomplishments of female, Black, Indigenous, LGBTQIA+, and Latinx scholars as well as persons with disabilities and other people of color. This reflects a commitment to elevating often unheard voices in the community engagement field, showcasing excellence in community-engaged scholarship, and ensuring the speakers and their scholarship reflect the identities and interests of the Summer Intensive's participants. I am, however, increasingly conscious that while faculty with these backgrounds are more likely to be community-engaged scholars, practitioners, and activists than their White, male colleagues are (Post et al., 2016), they are also much more likely than those same colleagues to contribute to unacknowledged and underappreciated service work (Flaherty, 2017; Guarino & Borden, 2017; June, 2015; Mitchell & Chavous, 2021; O'Meara, 2018). I do not want, even for well-intentioned reasons, to reinforce or perpetuate institutional disparities or add to the professional service burden of these colleagues.

Generative tension: How do I amplify, recognize, and celebrate the accomplishments of

these community-engaged scholars without my request being burdensome to them personally and professionally?

Honoring Multiple Motivations and Lenses for Community-Engaged Scholars Creates Generative Tensions With Recognizing the Critiques of Social Justice Scholars.

Community-engaged scholars collaborate with community partners for a variety of reasons and use a variety of lenses to frame their outreach and engagement. For some, including those at faith-based institutions, land-grant universities, or regional comprehensive universities with anchor institution commitments, the institutional mission shapes motivations for faculty members' community work (Gaventa & Bivens, 2014; Overton et al., 2017; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Stanton, 2008; Van de Ven, 2007; Watson et al., 2011). For some community-engaged scholars, their research is more rigorous and relevant, has a broader reach, and is more fundable when it is conducted in collaboration with partners outside of the university (Balazs & Morello-Frosch, 2013; Ochocka & Janzen, 2014; Strand et al., 2003). Others can think of no better way to teach the subject matter of their discipline or prepare their students to be successful future professionals than with and through the wisdom and contributions of community partners as coteachers and colearners (Bringle et al., 2009; Butin, 2010; Crabtree, 2008; Jacoby, 2015; Jameson et al., 2012; Kuh, 2008). Many community-engaged colleagues act from places of deep personal commitment to specific peoples, places, or issues, including social justice lenses and motivations for change (O'Meara, 2008; Post et al., 2016).

For a multi-institutional, interdisciplinary professional development program, it is important that these multiple motivations and lenses be recognized, presented, and discussed so that participants may become more aware of their own underlying motivations for community engagement and more respectful of the perspectives of others whose views differ from their own. However, at times, participants who center critical and social justice perspectives criticize the Summer Intensive for not placing issues of power, privilege, inequalities, and disparities front and center in all aspects of the program's curriculum. They point out that those of us who organize professional development about community engagement are (and continue to be) part of the problem when we do not have a singular focus on social justice.

Generative tension: How do we acknowledge and celebrate the many motivations and lenses for community-engaged scholarship while elevating the conversation about social justice issues in ways that allow multiple perspectives to thrive?

Involving Community Partners in the Curriculum Creates Generative Tensions With Expecting Community Partners to Do Some of Our Work For Us.

While DeLugan and colleagues (2014) incorporated community partner perspectives into the community engagement competencies for professional development, there continue to be additional calls for community partner voices in shaping how faculty, academic staff, and community partners learn to do community work ethically and respectfully (Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009; Tinkler et al., 2014). At the same time, community partners have their own knowledge, strategic priorities, organizational practices, and constituents to serve. In times of constrained personnel and financial resources, many of our community partners find themselves underresourced to meet their own missions and goals.

Generative tension: How do we ensure our professional development involves community partners and includes their perspectives without asking our community partners to step away from their own important work to teach us?

Welcoming Faculty, Academic Staff, Extension Professionals, and Graduate Students Creates Generative Tensions When Focusing on the Professional Development Needs of a Single Group or Professional Role.

As part of a commitment to inclusivity related to job role, the Summer Intensive invites community-engaged scholars from a range of institutional roles to learn more about community engagement. Over the 4 years, the Summer Intensive has attracted a mix of participants, including graduate and postdoctoral students, Extension professionals, service-learning professionals, tenure-track faculty, and administrators. This professional diversity poses a challenge in organizing programming that is a good fit for all participants. For example, for the successful careers competency, graduate and postdoctoral students are interested in how to position themselves well for the job market. Pretenure tenure-track faculty are interested in strategies for successful reappointment,

promotion, and tenure review. Administrators and academic staff, including Extension staff, have different success criteria and strategies for advancing their careers.

Generative tension: How do we inclusively invite participants who hold different institutional roles to our professional development offerings without ignoring specific skills needed for success in those different career pathways?

Providing an Interdisciplinary Overview of Community-Engaged Scholarship Creates Generative Tensions With Diving Deep Into Disciplinary Variations of Community Engagement.

The Summer Intensive is intentionally an interdisciplinary space where exchanges of perspectives and practices are invited and encouraged across disciplines. This interdisciplinarity provides richness and invites opportunities for collaboration with new partners. At the same time, we know that faculty, academic staff, and graduate students live their professional lives within their disciplinary homes and that those homes have their own specific community engagement epistemologies, foundational scholarship, and accepted practices (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Buzinski et al., 2013; Doberneck & Schweitzer, 2017; Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Kecskes, 2006; Warren et al., 2016). For scholars to succeed professionally, they need to understand the norms for community engagement in their own fields and be able to talk about their community-engaged scholarship in a way that makes sense to their disciplinary peers.

Generative tension: How do we provide an interdisciplinary overview of community-engaged scholarship while providing the specificity needed for community-engaged scholars to understand and communicate how community engagement is enacted in their fields and disciplines specifically?

Future Directions for Professional Development

Organizers of professional development for service-learning and community engagement would do well to reflect on these and other tensions that might arise on their own campuses as they develop the logistics and curricula for their own programs. As colleges and universities seek to institutionalize community-engaged scholarship, professional development programs for faculty, academic staff, Extension professionals, and graduate students will continue to play an important role in those institutionalization processes. Welch and Plaxton-Moore (2017) reminded us that these

important professional development activities should be theory-driven or informed by conceptual frameworks. In other words, professional development for community-engaged scholarship should not be based on brainstormed lists of planning committee members' favorite activities, readings, or practices. Instead, professional development programming should be evidence-based and generate evidence of effectiveness through systematic evaluation and scholarship.

To follow best practices for professional development, institutional leaders, including those responsible for professional development around community-engaged scholarship, would do well to consider the following key questions as they design programs with their own institutional and community partner contexts in mind.

1. Who is/are your audience(s) (e.g., administrators, tenure-track faculty, academic staff, service-learning professionals, Extension professionals, graduate students, community partners, or some combination)?
2. What are the learning interests of your specific group of participants? How can you avoid making assumptions about participants' learning needs and interests by gathering information directly from them to use in refining professional development offerings?
3. Which community engagement competencies from the literature will you focus on (e.g., all of them, a particular grouping in depth)? How will you modify the community engagement competencies to meet your participants' specific learning interests and needs? What additional topics might you need to cover to meet participants' learning needs and interests?
4. Who are the community partners to involve in the professional development planning and implementation? How and where will they be involved (e.g., planning meetings, case studies, field trips, faculty–community partner presentations offered jointly)? How can they be involved in ways that are meaningful, mutually beneficial, and not burdensome?
5. Who should faculty members (or other participants, such as academic staff, Extension professionals, graduate or undergraduate students) invite into the planning and implementation process? How and where will they be involved (e.g., planning, case studies, lunch discussions, panels, collaborative presentations) in ways that are meaningful?

6. How will you amplify the scholarship and voices of Black, Indigenous, LGBTQIA+, Latinx, and female faculty as well as people with disabilities and people of color throughout the learning experience in meaningful, authentic ways that are not performative or burdensome?
7. How will you incorporate adult learning principles into your program planning, design, implementation, and evaluation? How might you achieve the learning objectives through engaged learning (e.g., moving away from lectures to active learning, prioritizing practical application and reflection)?
8. Who are the institutional partners on your campus (e.g., faculty development office, center for teaching and learning, research office, diversity office, library, writing center, service-learning center, graduate school) for this professional development offering? Are there off-campus partners you might collaborate with as well?
9. How will you evaluate both the learning processes and outcomes of your professional development offering—during the offering, at its close, and a short time later? How will you ensure your evaluation moves beyond satisfaction data to evaluate impact in competency areas and implementation of new community engagement practices?
10. How will you use those evaluation findings to improve your institution's future professional development programming? Where will you share your experiences about planning and implementing professional development programs and the related evaluation data to help grow the field of professional development for community-engaged scholarship?

Conclusion

As higher education institutions recommit themselves to scholarship that addresses the many pressing social, economic, health, environmental, and political issues that have been raised since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, community engagement is poised to play an important role. Supporting faculty, academic staff, service-learning professionals, Extension personnel, and graduate students as they adopt new mindsets for respectful and ethical partnerships, learn how to move engagement from theory into practice, and build the field of community engagement through evidence-based practices becomes essential.

Institutional leaders responsible for professional development would do well to consider and adapt community engagement competencies to their specific audience and institutional context, apply adult learning practices to the logistics and curriculum, and implement iterative program planning and evaluation into their own professional development offerings. These well-conceived and implemented professional development programs, particularly the extended/immersive kind, support institutional capacity building for sustained community engagement. Ongoing evaluation and reflection will reveal what is working, what is not working, and where the generative tensions lie in their own professional development practices.

References

- Atilas, J.H. (2019). Cooperative extension competencies for the community engagement professional. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 23(1), 107–127. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1431>
- Balazs, C.L., & Morello-Frosch, R. (2013). The three Rs: How community-based participatory research strengthens the rigor, relevance, and reach of science. *Environmental Justice*, 6(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2012.0017>
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P.R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of discipline* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
- Berkey, B., Meixner, C., Green, P. M., Eddins, E.A. (Eds.). (2018). *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice*. Stylus Publishing.
- Blanchard, L.W., Hanssman, C., Strauss, R.P., Belliard, J., Krichbaum, C., Waters, E., & Seifer, S.D. (2009). Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 47–65. <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/muj/article/view/20390>
- Blanchard, L.W., Strauss, R.P., & Welch, L. (2012). Engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Campus integration and faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 97–127.
- Borrero, N., & Reed, J. (2016). A case for community partnership and professional development: A nine-week service-learning seminar for faculty. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 7(1), 27–51. <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/prt/article/view/1235>

- Bringle, R.G., Clayton, P.H., & Price, M.F. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A journal of service learning and civic engagement*, 1(1), 1–20. <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/prt/article/view/415>
- Butin, D.W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buzinski, S.G., Dean, P., Donofrio, T.A., Fox, A., Berger, A.T., Heighton, L.P., Selvi, A.F., & Stocker, L.H. (2013). Faculty and administrative partnerships: Disciplinary differences in perceptions of civic engagement and service-learning at a large, research-extensive university. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning and Civic Engagement*, 4(1), 45–57. <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/prt/article/view/483>
- Campus Compact. (n.d.) *Community engagement professional credentialing program*. <https://compact.org/current-programs/community-engagement-professional-credential>
- Crabtree, R.D. (2008). Theoretical foundations for international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(1), 18–36. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.102>
- Cross, K.P. (1981). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- DeLugan, R.M., Roussos, S., & Skram, G. (2014). Linking academic and community guidelines for community-engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(1), 155–168.
- Doberneck, D.M., Bargerstock, B.A., McNall, M., Van Egeren, L., & Zientek, R. (2017). Community engagement competencies for graduate and professional students: Michigan State University's approach to professional development. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 24(1), 122–142. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0024.111>
- Doberneck, D.M., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2010). Professional development for emerging engaged scholars. In H.E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S.D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions* (Vol. 1, pp. 391–409). Michigan State University Press.
- Doberneck, D.M., Glass, C.R., & Schweitzer, J.H. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 14(4), 5–35. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/794>
- Doberneck, D.M., Glass, C.R., & Schweitzer, J.H. (2011). Beyond activity, place, and partner: How publicly engaged scholarship varies by intensity of activity and degree of engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 4(2), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.54656/RPOV2967>
- Doberneck, D.M., & Schweitzer, J.H. (2017). Disciplinary variations in publicly engaged scholarship: An analysis using the Biglan classification of academic disciplines. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 21(1), 78–103. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1318>
- Dostilio, L.D. (Ed.). (2017). *The community engagement professional in higher education: A competency model for an emerging field*. Stylus Publishing.
- Dostilio, L.D., & Welch, M. (2019). *The community engagement professional's guidebook: A companion to The Community Engagement Profession in Higher Education*. Stylus Publishing.
- Driscoll, A. (2008, January/February). Carnegie's community engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change*, 40(1), 38–41. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.40.1.38-41>
- Eatman, T. (2018). Faculty as co-learners: Collaborative engagement and the power of story in faculty development. In B. Berkey, C. Meixner, P. M. Green, & E.A. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 59–81). Stylus Publishing.
- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T.K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university. A resource guide on promotion and tenure in the arts and humanities*. Imagining America. <https://surface.syr.edu/ia/16>
- Flaherty, C. (2017, April 12). *Relying on women, not rewarding them*. Inside HigherEd. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/12/study-finds-female-professors-outperform-men-service-their-possible-professional>
- Fraser, F. (2005). Four different approaches to community participation. *Community Development Journal*, 40(3), 286–300. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsi037>
- French, C., Williams, J.E., Tang, J., Abrams, E., Townson, L., Sabin, M., Sandmann, L.R., & Wake, C. (2013). The University of New Hampshire Engaged Scholars Academy: Instilling in faculty principles of effective partnership. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, 3, 19–42.

- Gaventa, J., & Bivens, F. (2014). Knowledge democracy, cognitive justice, and the role of universities. In B.L. Hall & R. Tandon (Eds.), *Knowledge, engagement, and higher education: Contributing to social change* (pp. 69–73). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilchrist, A. (2009). *The well-connected community: A networking approach to community development* (2nd ed.). The Policy Press.
- Gilven, A., Roberts, G.M., & Martin, C. (2012). *Collaborative futures: Critical reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education*. Graduate School Press, Syracuse University.
- Gravette, E.O., & Broscheid, A. (2018). Models and genres of faculty development. In B. Berkey, C. Meixner, P.M. Green, & E.A. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning and community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 85–106). Stylus.
- Guarino, C.M., & Borden, V.M.H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education*, 58(6), 672–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>
- Hamel-Lambert, J.M., Millesen, J.L., Slovak, K., & Harter, L.M. (2012). Reflections on community-engaged scholarship faculty development and institutional identity at Ohio University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 129–148.
- Ife, J.W. (1995). *Community development: Creating community alternatives*. Longman.
- International Association for Public Participation. (2018). IAP2 spectrum of public participation. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf
- Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*. Jossey-Bass.
- Jameson, J.K., Clayton, P.H., Jaeger, A.J., & Bringle, R.G. (2012). Investigating faculty learning in the context of community-engaged scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(2), 71–95. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0018.204>
- Jordan, C.M. (2016). The Community-Engaged Scholars Program: Designing a professional development program to enhance individual capacity, community benefit, and institutional support. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 8(3), 6–15. <https://discovery.indstate.edu/jcehe/index.php/joce/article/view/251>
- June, A.W. (2015, November 8). The invisible labor of minority faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Invisible-Labor-of/234098>
- Kecskes, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from public, individual to collective focus for the common good*. Anker Publishing.
- Kiely, R., & Sexsmith, K. (2018). Innovative considerations in faculty development and service-learning and community engagement: New perspectives for the future. In B. Berkey, C. Meixner, P.M. Green, & E. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 283–314). Stylus Publishing.
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge Adult Education.
- Knowles, M.S., & Associates. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Marsh, G. (1999). The community of circumstance—a tale of three cities: Community participation. In D.A. Chekki (Ed.), *Research in community sociology* (Vol. 9, pp. 65–86). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1997). *Community building: What makes it work*. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Matthews, P.H., Karls, A.C., Doberneck, D.M., & Springer, N.C. (2015). Portfolio and certification programs in community engagement as professional development for graduate students: Lessons learned from two land-grant universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 19(1), 157–183.
- McReynolds, M., & Shields, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Diving deep in community engagement: A model for professional development*. Iowa Campus Compact.
- Mitchell, T.D., & Chavous, T. (2021). Centering social justice in the scholarship of community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsloa.3239521.0027.101>
- Nations, M. (2017, July). *Creating patterns of generative engagement*. Human Systems Dynamics Institute. https://www.hsdinstitute.org/resources/Creating_Patterns_of_Generative_Engagement.html

- Nimon, K., Zigarmi, D., & Allen, J. (2011). Measures of program effectiveness based on retrospective pretest data: Are all created equal? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32(1), 8–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010378354>
- Ochocka, J., & Janzen, R. (2014). Breathing life into theory: Illustrations of community-based research: Hallmarks, functions, and phases. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 7(1), 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v7i1.3486>
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7–28. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/518>
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *“To serve a larger purpose”: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177–198). Temple University Press.
- O'Meara, K. (2018, June 27). *How to make faculty service demands more equitable*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/06/27/how-make-faculty-service-demands-more-equitable-opinion>
- O'Meara, K., & Jaeger, A.J. (2006). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: Barriers, facilitators, models, and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11(4), 3–27. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/537>
- Overton, B., Pasque, P.A., & Burhardt, J.C. (Eds.). (2017). *Engaged research and practice: Higher education and the pursuit of the public good*. Stylus Publishing.
- Post, M.A., Ward, E., Longo, N.V., & Saltmarsh, J. (Eds.) (2016). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Stylus Publishing.
- Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society*. Michigan State University Press. https://outreach.msu.edu/documents/ProvostCommitteeReport_2009ed.pdf
- Salsberg, J., Seller, R., Shea, L., & Macaulay, A.C. (2012). A needs assessment informs development of a participatory research faculty development workshop. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 183–194. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/920>
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *“To serve a larger purpose”: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Temple University Press.
- Springer, N.C., & Casey, K.M. (2010). From “preflection” to reflection: Building quality practices in academic service learning. In H.E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S.D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship. Contemporary landscapes, future directions* (Vol. 1., pp. 29–49). Michigan State University Press.
- Stanton, T.K. (2008). New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 3(1), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197907086716>
- Stoecker, R. (2016). *Liberating service learning and the rest of higher education civic engagement*. Temple University Press.
- Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E.A. (Eds.). (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Temple University Press.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Why do community-based research? In K. Strand, S. Marullo, N. Cutforth, R. Stoecker, & P. Donohue (Eds.), *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices* (pp. 16–42). Jossey-Bass.
- Surak, S., & Pope, A. (2016). Engaging the educators: Facilitating civic engagement through faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(3), 140–163. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1296>
- Suvedi, M., & Kaplowitz, M. (2016, February). *What every extension worker should know: Core competency handbook*. Michigan State University Press.
- Tinkler, A., Tinkler, B., Hausman, E., & Strouse, G.T. (2014). Key elements of effective service-learning partnerships from the perspective of community partners. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 5(2), 137–152. <https://libjournal.uncg.edu/index.php/prt/article/view/944>
- Van de Ven, A.H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford University Press.
- Warren, M.R., Park, J.O., & Tieken, M.C. (2016). The formation of community-engaged scholars: A collaborative approach to doctoral training in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(2), 233–260. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.86.2.233>

Watson, D., Hollister, R.M., Stroud, S.E., & Babcock, E. (2011). *The engaged university: International perspectives on civic engagement*. Routledge.

Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2017). Faculty development for advancing community engagement in higher education: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 21(2), 131–165. <https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1333>

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W.M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard University Press.

About the Author

Diane M. Doberneck is director for faculty and professional development, Office for Public Engagement and Scholarship in the University Outreach and Engagement Office, and adjunct associate professor in the Department of Community Sustainability at Michigan State University. She may be reached at connordm@msu.edu.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge program planning and support from MSU's Office of University Outreach and Engagement, cosponsorship from MSU's Center for Service-Learning (now Center for Community-Engaged Learning) in 2018, and cosponsorship from Campus Compact for Michigan in 2019. I am grateful for Jessica Barnes-Najor and Nicole C. Springer as thought partners for the Summer Intensive and for Lindsey Payne, Barbara Usher, and Nicole C. Springer for feedback on this early drafts of this manuscript. I owe a debt of gratitude to the Refugee Development Center and InterTribal Research Council for serving as community partner hosts, colearners, and coteachers during the field trips. I would also like to thank all Summer Intensive participants, presenters, and panelists for their thoughtful suggestions, candid evaluations, and valuable feedback, which have led to significant improvements over time. Finally, I appreciate the encouragement from workshop participants at the 2019 Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference who encouraged me to turn my presentation into this paper.