COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEIVED COSTS

AND BENEFITS OF TWELVE CORE PRACTICES

By

MARCIE ANN SIMPSON

(Under the Direction of Lorilee R. Sandmann)

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study utilized an online survey instrument to examine the

frequency, perceived benefits and perceived costs of community-engagement practices.

The study population included the 2006 and 2008 higher education institutions receiving

the Carnegie Foundation Community Engaged classification. From the population of 196

institutions, 132 responded providing an adjusted response rate of 69.1%.

This study identified a comprehensive list of 12 community-engaged practices.

These 12 practices were the items for four broad questions related to frequency of

practice, perceived benefit to the institution, perceived benefit to the community, and

perceived cost to the institution. Overall, the relative perceived costs for community-

engagement practices were low and both community and institutional benefits were

perceived to be relatively high.

The study results identified administrators as providing the highest level of

support and faculty the lowest support. Additional analysis generated a benefit-cost ratio

for each practice and ranks for institutional benefit and community benefit with the top

three and bottom two practices holding identical ratio ranks. Capturing actual monetary

figures for costs and benefits was not feasible for this study. Relative costs and relative

benefits rates, as identified by the survey participants, were used to calculate benefit-cost

ratios based on cost-benefit analysis logic.

The four major conclusions for this study were: (a) Prevalence of practice was

high among exemplary institutions and these institutions conduct the practice at 100

percent of the time over the year time frame or not at all. (b) Practices that are integrated

with the research work of faculty are ranked lowest in frequency of practice. (c)

Decisions related to community-engagement practices are not made based on perceived

cost and benefit efficiency. (d) The perceived benefits are high and the perceived costs

are low for both the institution and the community. The discussion provides insight into

how institutional theory might influence the frequency of practice and decision making

relative to benefits and costs of community-engagement practices.

INDEX WORDS: Community engagement, community-engagement practices, benefit-
cost evaluation, decision making, institutional theory, institutionalization, innovation,
higher education, adult education

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEIVED COSTS

AND BENEFITS OF TWELVE CORE PRACTICES

By

MARCIE ANN SIMPSON

B.S., The University of Georgia, 1987

M.Ed., The University of Georgia, 1994

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEIVED COSTS

AND BENEFITS OF TWELVE CORE PRACTICES

By

MARCIE ANN SIMPSON

Approved:

Major Professor: Lorilee R. Sandmann

Committee: Thomas Valentine
                     Wendy E. A. Ruona
                     Libby V. Morris

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2011

along the way. A very, special thank you to my best friend and husband, Horace, who

encouraged me to begin this journey and made sure I arrived at the final destination with

diploma in hand. He stood by my side, sacrificed, and cheered me on every step of the

way. I could not have completed this journey without him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

More than 400 years ago during the colonial era, U.S. higher education was

created with core principles that included civic and public service. Higher education's

emphasis on fulfilling this mission has wavered as societal and organizational demands

have changed. In particular, many have argued that during the last 30 years, the private

good of individuals and organizations has taken precedence over serving the public good

(Bardo, 2009; Dubb, 2007; Hartley, 2009; Kallison & Cohen, 2010; Kezar, Chambers, &

Burkhardt, 2005; London, 2001). In response to this public perception and resultant

pressure, institutions have turned to community engagement as a set of practices to

address this multifaceted civic commitment and public service responsibility. The

community engagement movement, as an innovation within higher education, has

revitalized practices of civic and public service. Particularly in resource-restricted

environments, however, this renewed emphasis on practicing community engagement

results in decision making challenges for administrators and engagement advocates. The

challenge is implementing community engagement practices of civic and public service

within the traditions of the higher education institution.

Higher Education Civic and Public Service Mission

Serving society and preparing students to become productive citizens have been

integral aspects of U.S. higher education from early seminaries and colonial colleges until

the 1960s (Kallison & Cohen, 2010). Early colonial institutions delivered a classical education to prepare students to become religious leaders and public servants. The tradition of civic and public service continued with the establishment of land-grant colleges in the late 1800s, which provided educational opportunities for a broader population of students – specifically in the fields of agriculture and mechanical arts (Ward, 2003). For these public colleges, the responsibility of preparing students to become productive citizens and maintaining ties to the community remained an integral part of the mission. The emphasis of the civic and public-service mission abated during the post-World War II era in favor of employment production, as servicemen and women were welcomed to higher education through the G.I. Bill. Simultaneously, the general shift in mission for colleges and universities was toward research and specialized knowledge creation, with less connection to civic and public-service outcomes. Often, this mission obligation of engagement was deferred to community colleges or specialized units, such as cooperative extension or community based continuing education (Johnson, 2007; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005; Ward, 2003).

Civic and Community Engagement

Higher education's shift toward a research and workforce agenda led to criticisms of higher education as being self-indulgent; focused on serving the private, individual good; and removed from the community (Hartley, 2009; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). During the last couple of decades, institutions have been pressed to take on civic and public service missions in new ways, as demonstrated by the myriad of declarations, forums, conferences, and academic writings during the last 30 years (Boyer, 1990; Boyte & Hollander, 1998; Campus Compact, n.d.; Department of Housing and Urban

2

Development [DHUD], 2002; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Gibbons, 2006; Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Higher education's response to this pressure was the development of two parallel public-service paths – student-curricular and academic public service – amalgamating under the umbrella of community engagement (Saltmash, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009).

The student public-service path finds its origins in the 1960s, with the rise of student protests on campuses and introduction of a social-justice agenda (DHUD, 2001; London, 2001). An increase in public service and student civic engagement occurred during the 1970s and 1980s, as evidenced by the number of federal programs, national networks, and funding initiatives (Hartley, 2009; Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000; Ward, 2003). Federal, state, and local funding provided resources for program development and leadership education for students, consequently propelling campus-based service opportunities to a new level (DHUD, 2001; Hartley; Melchior, 2000; Ryan, 2005; Ward, 2003). This push for campus-based service, augmented with the pressure for higher education institutions to justify their existence and the literal deterioration of surrounding communities, compelled higher education to support and encourage community-based service and scholarship intended to create change (Ramaley, 2005; Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe, & Rosaen, 2000; Sandmann & Weerts, 2006). Community-based service opportunities grew as students and faculty volunteered their time. At this point in history, these acts of community service occurred based on the wants and desires of the student or faculty member and not necessarily on the community's needs.

Student community service advanced from a volunteer activity to a curricular-based pedagogy of service learning. The education field's increased acceptance of experiential-learning pedagogy contributed significantly to this advancement (Hartley, 2009). Service learning moves beyond volunteerism and is a structured, teacher-directed learning activity for students within the community environment, enabling the student to apply classroom knowledge practically in the community (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Hartley, 2009; Johnson, 2007; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2001). By participating in service-learning projects, students build on their understanding of civic responsibilities. Adding further depth to the service-learning concept is curricular engagement, which introduces the reciprocal and mutually beneficial nature of community and campus projects through classroom curricula (Hartley & Soo, 2009; London, 2001).

Academic public-service scholarship runs parallel yet diverges with student public service. In the last decade, community-based teaching and service-learning projects, coupled with a call for expanded research models, propelled faculty to participate in applied research, consulting, and shared explorations with the community (Boyer, 1990; Checkoway, 2001; Glassick, 2000; Holland, 1999; Ramaley, 2005). Boyer said, "At no time in our history has the need been greater for connecting the work of the academy to the social and environmental challenges beyond the campus" (1996, p. xii). Scholarship of engagement, the application of scholarly expertise to real-world problems through academic public service, is how higher education institutions are responding to the public call for increased civic and public service (Boyer; Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000; Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). These engaged research activities are

manifested in the form of participatory-action research, applied research, and/or community-based research (Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe, & Rosaen, 2000).

This evolution to a sophisticated, more complex approach toward civic and public service that extends beyond traditional instruction, research, or service and that begins to incorporate all three higher education missions is where the parallel paths of student and academic public service merge to become community engagement. The term "community engagement" encapsulates the depth and breadth of this collection of civic and public-service activities: service learning, curricular engagement, civic engagement, community partnerships, and scholarship of engagement (Sandmann, 2008). Community-engagement practices, regardless of form, have the following tenets: (a) reciprocal and mutually beneficial, (b) place-specific and community-based (local, state, regional, or national), and (c) knowledge-generating (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2002; Hartley, 2009; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008).

Due to the growing momentum and renewed commitment to civic responsibilities, community-engagement scholars have called community engagement an innovation for higher education. This innovative movement has enabled the establishment of new practices and/or the expansion of traditional practices to accommodate the tenets of engagement (Hartley, 2009; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008). One example of renewing traditional practices is the establishment of quality, reciprocal community-campus partnerships. Partnerships had previously been isolated situations of need within higher education (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002). The renewed emphasis on community-campus partnerships has transformed these connections into long-term, reciprocal relationships

between faculty, the community, and students and is a key method by which community

engagement occurs. These partnerships are generated through service-learning projects,

faculty and community research projects, and university outreach methods. University

outreach is another traditional model being expanded to encompass the tenets of

engagement. The traditional outreach model of taking the university expertise to the

people is perceived as a one-way interaction and lacks the reciprocal relationship with the

community. Colleges and universities are challenged to expand the outreach model and

incorporate a reciprocal relationship with the community (Kellogg Commission on the

Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).

Community engagement as an innovation is moving toward institutionalization within

higher education.

Institutionalization of Community Engagement

The institutionalization of community engagement involves the movement of

community-engagement practices from the organization's periphery to its core. Higher

education has and continues to adapt to accommodate community engagement within the

institution. The accommodation of community engagement is evidenced by changes in

organizational operations, such as staffing, funding, programming, and reward systems

(Hartley, 2009; Holland, 2004, 2009; Levine, 1980; Sandmann, 2008). A mixture of

strategies and models facilitates the strategic movement of community engagement

toward mission-critical status. Within this mixture of models, three common objectives

exist in varying degrees: (a) identify ideal levels of engagement relative to the specific

institution, (b) identify the elements of the institution that are essential to quality

engagement, and (c) identify the areas in need of improvement or change (Bringle &

Hatcher, 1999; Furco, 2002; Furco & Miller, 2009; Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelsen, 2005; Gorgol & Hartley, 2009; Holland, 2001; Shumer, 2000). These models address a wide range of engagement indicators relevant to students, the community, faculty, and the institution. Instrument designs are as varied as the content and include checklists, benchmarking tools, rubrics, matrices, and assessment systems (Furco & Miller, 2009).

This study gives particular attention to The Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's (2010) voluntary classification for community engagement is a nationally recognized, comprehensive assessment system. This model requires significant resources to complete and produces greater returns when compared to rubric-type assessments. By investing the time, energy, and commitment of faculty and administration to complete the application, which is a strategic self-assessment and goal-setting process, the return further embeds community engagement into the organizational structure by enabling the organization to (a) foster organizational reflection, (b) educate faculty on community engagement, (c) build team capacity, (d) increase communications, (e) provide professional development, (f) promote comparisons and benchmarking, (g) identify improvement needs, (h) share the model of community-engagement excellence, (i) establish performance measurements, and (j) develop leadership in support of community engagement (Driscoll, 2008; Ruben, Russ, Smulowitz, & Connaughton, 2007; Sandmann, Williams, & Abrams, 2009). The Carnegie Classification provides the framework, system, and process to advance the institutionalization of community engagement.

Administrators use this type of tool to assist with the decision-making process that occurs to institutionalize community-engagement practices within an organization.

Decision making

Higher education administrators rely on decision-making skills as they transact the context of the complex business of higher education. Within the context of institutionalizing community engagement, decisions are made related to the implementation of community-engagement practices, changes in policies, allocation of funds, and formation of organizational structure. While there are many decision-making models, Bolman and Deal's frame of leadership is relevant and can be used to explain the nature of higher education administrative decision making.

Bolman and Deal (1991b) identify four frames for understanding organizations and leadership: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. Leaders work from these distinctive frames to help manage the complex decision-making environment. The structural frame emphasizes goals and efficiency, and the structural leader values analysis of data and considers the "bottom line." The human-resource frame focuses on human needs and values relationships, leading through facilitation and empowerment. The political frame focuses on conflict and competition among different interest groups due to limited resources. Political leaders are advocates and negotiators who value realism and pragmatism. The symbolic frame sees a chaotic world in which meaning is socially created. Symbolic leaders recognize that cultural symbols shape human behavior and provide a shared sense of meaning, mission, and identity.

Bolman and Deal (1991a) found that 50 percent of higher education administrators studied used two frames, compared to 24 percent using one and 20 percent

using three. The two frames used by the highest percentage of administrators were the

structural frame (67 percent) and the political frame (71 percent). Higher education

administrators working from political and structural frames emphasize data analysis, can

negotiate competing issues, and value practical solutions. This decision making

preference supports the use of data collection and strategic planning for institutionalizing

community engagement within the context of higher education.

Cost and Benefit Evaluation

One data-collection tool available to higher education administrators but seldom

used is cost-benefit evaluation. There are three decision-making models for cost-benefit

evaluation: (a) selecting all alternatives where benefits exceed the costs, (b) identifying

an alternative (or alternatives) with the highest benefit-cost ratio from a group of

alternatives, and (c) evaluating programs based on the culmination of benefit-cost ratios

(Levin & McEwan, 2001). Cost-benefit evaluation is a technique that simultaneously

compares costs and benefits. Traditional cost-benefit analysis methodology demands that

costs be measured and reported in monetary units. Taking the methodology beyond the

traditional and moving toward the theory of cost-utility analysis, where costs and benefits

are reported in terms of "the relative strength of preference or satisfaction" (Levin &

McEwan, 2001, p. 189) provides the logic for this study.

The simultaneous evaluation of perceived costs and benefits for an alternative

brings the decision making to a central time and place (Levin & McEwan, 2001). The

comparison of like units enables the administrator or researcher to determine (a) whether

any particular alternative has benefits exceeding its costs and (b) which set of alternatives

with different objectives has the highest ratio of benefits to costs. This practice is not

common in higher education institutions but should be considered as a valuable way to consider alternatives (Levin & McEwan, 2001). Traditionally, when a decision must be made between alternatives A and B, various departments are involved. For instance, the budget department might decide that alternative B is the most appropriate choice because the cost is lowest. An academic department might decide that A is the best option based on its community and institutional benefits. Cost-benefit evaluation brings the decision to a central place and compares all variables for all options. For the purpose of this study, cost-benefit evaluation is the simultaneous comparison of perceived relative costs and benefits in order to determine the most appropriate choice of one practice over another.

What Is Benefit?

In the education field, an activity's benefit is more complex than a simple dollar amount to the organization. Benefits can include abstract concepts, such as increased self-esteem, knowledge, confidence, and societal improvement. Cost-benefit analysis demands an economist to place a monetary value on these benefits by calculating the individual's willingness to pay for the good or service (Levin & McEwan, 2001). The sum of an individual's willingness to pay is the total benefit. In cost-utility analysis, key stakeholders can determine the value of benefits for alternatives (Ross, 2008) – and benefits are related to satisfaction and utility, not only dollars.

What Is Cost?

The traditional, most straightforward concept of cost is the dollar amount associated with an alternative plus the sum of the less-obvious costs. The cost of the alternative is the total cost of all resources used or lost. Some of the most significant

items to consider when calculating the cost of total resources are personnel time,

facilities, and equipment/supplies. There can also be other costs, such as time, utilities,

special services, travel, and hosting expenses (Levin & McEwan, 2001).

Analysis of Costs and Benefits Summary

Cost-benefit analysis evaluation is the identification, measurement, and evaluation

of the various benefits and costs flowing from a set of alternatives (Boardman,

Greenberg, Vining, & Weimer, 2006). This study adapted the logic of cost-benefit

analysis theory to allow for the investigation of perceived relative costs, perceived

relative benefits, and benefit-cost ratios of the community-engagement practices. For the

purpose of this study perceived costs and perceived benefit values replace the traditional

dollar figures used in cost-benefit analysis.

<center>**Statement of the Problem**</center>

Higher education institutions have increased their efforts to partner with their

external communities (local, regional, national, global, and/or professional) to build

capacity and jointly address critical, contemporary, local, and global problems.   To

continue meeting these needs, administrators and advocates are working toward

institutionalizing community engagement; that is, moving community-engagement

practices into the core of the enterprise. As part of this work, several scholars and The

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching have created models for

administrators to identify, quantify, and qualify community-engagement practices

(Holland, 2006; Furco, 2003; Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelsen, 2005).

The various models are intended to provide administrators with data to assist in

the identification of strengths and weaknesses of current community-engagement

<center>11</center>

practices and facilitate goal setting for increasing institution-appropriate practices. While

specific practices and indicators are identified, current models do not explicitly address

the costs and benefits associated with these practices or indicators. Administrators,

therefore, are forced to consider costs in the abstract or artificially construct assumed

costs. Granted, administrators are accustomed to relying on their intuitive decision-

making skills, which are based on their vast expert knowledge in the field (Simon, 1987).

Evidence, as provided by Bolman and Deal (1991a), suggests that administrators would

appreciate and use data relevant to activity needs, costs, and benefits as they make

strategic institutional planning, programmatic, and budget decisions. The current models

of community engagement provide institutional-specific goals and practices; however,

the data on costs and benefits relevant to such goals and practices is missing from

existing models and literature (Levin and McEwan, 2001).

Purpose of the Study

This study's purpose was to further understand the operationalization of

community engagement in high-performing, community-engaged, higher education

institutions. The research questions informing this study are as follows:

1. To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices?

2. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the
   institution?

3. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the
   community?

4. What is the perceived cost of community-engagement practices to the
   institution?

5. How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?

6. What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?

Significance of the Study

U.S. higher education has an implicit contract with society to contribute to the public good. As higher education has seemed to vacillate toward private, individual profit, stakeholders have begun demanding a return to doing public good. This study provides insight that can help further the movement toward serving the public good by providing both theoretical and practical implications for the field of higher education and community engagement.

This study was grounded in institutionalization theory and cost-benefit evaluation within the context of higher education. Typically, cost-benefit evaluation is applied to corporate and public-administration environments. An important aspect of this research project was the expansion of cost-benefit evaluation to topics in the field of higher education. This study also contributes to the literature base of adult education, specifically building on the literature related to community-engagement processes and outcomes. Community engagement is an expression of adult education addressing social justice issues and serving the needs of the public. Determining the perceived relative costs and benefits of community-engagement practices does not exist in the literature of community engagement and higher education. Also, the contribution of data on perceived benefits and costs is significant to the community-engagement movement. Another product of the study was the generation of data related to the extent to which community engagement was embedded in the organization, hence contributing to the institutionalization research base.

The practical applications of this study are relevant to adult education, administrators, scholars, and study participants. The resulting data on perceived costs and benefits of community-engagement practices adds depth and breadth to conversations as an organization strives to further embed community engagement in its short- and long-term operations and as budget restraints demand the allocation of limited resources. Further understanding of the perceived costs and benefits of community-engagement practices allows for more informed decisions regarding support and implementation of these practices. The culmination of the extent of participation in community-engagement practices compared to perceived costs and benefits provides insight into how administrators make decisions and carry out engagement missions. The study results relevant to the cost-benefit evaluation provide insight beyond the context of the higher education institution and into public-policy considerations.

Definitions of Terms

Community engagement: collaboration between higher education institutions and the surrounding community to generate mutually benefiting knowledge and resources (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009)

Cost: what is given up or necessary to put an alternative into place; costs can be monetary or non-monetary and include direct, indirect, and lost opportunity costs

Benefit: a value of an alternative's outcome (Levin & McEwan, 2001)

Community: the public or society surrounding a higher education institution; can be local, regional, national, international, or virtual

Cost-benefit evaluation: This study replaces the traditional dollar figures found in cost-benefit analysis with a perceived cost and benefit value on a scale of 1 to 4.

Cost-benefit evaluation is the weighing of costs against the outcome/benefit of one or more items in order to rank or choose the best alternative

Institutionalization: making something an established custom or accepted part of the organization

Practice: structured or unstructured activity or procedure conducted by faculty, staff, or students to facilitate the outcomes of community engagement

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study sought to investigate the perceived costs and benefits of community-engagement practices of the 2006 and 2008 higher education organizations that received the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement. The research questions explored in this study are as follows: (a) to what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices, (b) what is the perceived relative benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution, (c) what is the perceived relative benefit of community-engagement practices for the community, (d) what is the perceived relative cost of community-engagement practices to the institution, and (e) how does institutional type impact community-engagement practices.

To discuss the relevant literature, Chapter 2 has five subdivisions: (a) the civic mission of higher education, (b) institutionalization of innovations in higher education, (c) community engagement, (d) community-engagement assessment models and major developments, and (e) conclusion.

Civic Mission of Higher Education

This section provides a historical review of the U.S. higher education mission that emphasizes the historical significance of public service and civic responsibility aspects of the mission of U.S. higher education. The discussion begins with a definition of "mission" and concludes with a chronological review of the status of the U.S. higher education mission.

An institution's mission defines the qualities, values, and organizational purpose of that institution. The mission is the organizational identity. Adhering to and working within the designated mission is critical to organizational success. When an institution of higher education is created, the institution is charged with a mission. For the purpose of this study, reference to mission is the broad, global concept of mission that spans all institutions within the field of higher education. In the United States, higher education institutions are often classified with a combination of three broad missions: teaching, research, and service. Institutions are described using one or a combination of these three missions. A teaching mission involves the institution pledging to provide instruction to students and prepare them to become productive citizens. A research mission is the pledge to produce research results and contribute to the generation of new knowledge. A service mission is a commitment to providing connections between the institution, faculty expertise, and the needs of society with the intent of contributing to the public good (Ward, 2003). When authors make a call for higher education to return to their mission of service, public good, and civic responsibility, they are challenging higher education to return to work that benefits the community.

Why is there a call to return to doing public good? In the colonial days, U.S. institutions of higher education embraced a strong civic mission. This civic mission directed higher education institutions to provide an educational experience that would enable students to participate in society and make contributions to community improvements (Checkoway, 2001; London, 2001). The Colonial College, with its strong British roots, prepared students for civic and religious leadership. In addition to its civic mission, the Colonial College also embraced a strong teaching mission. This dual

mission of teaching and service was espoused into the 1800s (Aronson & Webster, 2007; Checkoway, 2001).

A significant shift in mission occurred with the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts, which created land-grant universities as "the people's college." Land-grant institutions embraced the missions of outreach (service) and teaching. The outreach mission ensured that the knowledge generated within the institution was made available to the people in the community, hence contributing to community improvement. Later, additional legislation added research to the land-grant mission. In the outreach model, the expert is a faculty member of higher education who provides answers to clientele. In this model, knowledge transfers from the institution to the community. Granted, the land-grant model is closely akin to the community-engagement model with a very significant difference in how knowledge is generated. The land-grant model involves a one-way transfer from the institution to the community. With community engagement, knowledge generates from a reciprocal exchange between institution and community. This concept of an outreach mission was not exclusive to land-grant institutions. Soon after land-grant institutions emerged, other public and private institutions took up this mission of service and outreach (London, 2001; Dubb, 2007).

By the late 1900s, the research mission had begun gaining a position in the field of higher education. Higher education institutions accepted the German approach to research, which called for a strict scientific perspective on research and knowledge creation. The German scientific perspective dictates that the researcher should view the world from a distance and conduct experiments in a controlled environment (Ramaley, 2005). Scientists typically conducted research to contribute to a larger body of

knowledge for professional gain. The research environment did not incorporate students and instruction into the research process; therefore, teaching and research occurred independently. The research model at this time did not allow for any value to be placed on service, because participating in service-type endeavors or conducting research in the real world was considered contradictory to the scientific-driven research model. Nonetheless, overall the service mission was still important in higher education, because at this time the research model was the exception and not the rule (Boyer, 1990).

Higher education significantly shifted its emphasis away from the civic and service mission around the time of World War II. At this time, governmental demand for research soared (Checkoway, 2001; Dubb, 2007). The federal government called on higher education institutions to help society by conducting research and generating new knowledge. The continued emphasis on the research model created specialized knowledge that led to the organization of academic associations and departments. This internal development moved higher education from the practice of sharing knowledge with the public to sharing knowledge within specialized academic environments, such as professional associations. Higher education was moving away from its civic mission (Checkoway, 2001).

With the ongoing federal funding for grants at research institutions and the professional academic environment, the research model became the "standard of excellence" in higher education. The perception that an institution must demonstrate research-institution characteristics in order to be considered exemplary led to institutions with teaching and service missions mimicking the research institutions. This false application of the research mission presumably stressed some organizations' capabilities

to meet the expectations of their mission (Checkoway, 2001). For example, a community or comprehensive college trying to emulate a research institution jeopardizes its success by deviating from the teaching mission. Such colleges self-impose a set of standards of conducting research and producing publications on faculty hired to teach at a facility designed for instruction.

The 1980s brought about a united move toward emphasizing individual development rather than societal benefits (Hartley & Soo, 2009). Higher education contributed more to the earning potential of the individual than to societal benefits. Higher education stakeholders began to question the value higher education seemed to place on personal gain over societal gain (Kallison & Cohen, 2010). This emphasis on individual gain is confirmed by the importance placed on students' professional, economic, and personal development. The evolution of higher education and mission continues to date with a renewed call to return to a public service and civically responsible mission (Dubb, 2007; Hartley & Soo; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005; Wellman, 2006). This renewed or "renaissance" movement toward serving the public good has been referred to as an innovation for higher education ─ something new or renewed in this case (Hartley, 2009). The community-engagement model is at the core of higher education returning to its public roots. The tenets of community engagement must be institutionalized throughout the field of higher education before a sustainable change occurs in the mission of higher education.

Institutionalization

This study reviewed the fields of institutionalization and institutional theory providing insight and understanding of the concept " institutionalization of community

engagement". Institutionalization and institutional theory research were pioneered in the

fields of economics, political science, sociology, and psychology (Miner, 2007; Scott,

2001, 2003, 2008). Institutional theory has two streams of thought: traditional

institutional theory and neoinstitutional theory (or new institutional theory). Researchers

who call their work neoinstitutional or new institutional theory have introduced the

cultural-cognitive aspects of institutions in their works. For the purpose of this

discussion, the investigations and observations concentrate on literature grounded in the

sociological perspective of institutions and organizations and highlight the

neoinstitutional and diffusion theorists. The term "institutional theory" applies because

the two fields are highly integrated. The following sections address (a) institutional

theory, (b) the diffusion of innovations theory, and (c) a higher education institutional

summary.

Institutional theory

A review of institutional theory must begin by defining the term "institution." An

institution is a commonly accepted practice with a shared meaning. A very

straightforward example is a handshake, which symbolizes more than simply two hands

gripping. In the United States, the handshake is a socially accepted way of greeting

someone or making a deal agreement (Hatch, 1997). The meaning of this act as an

accepted, commonly understood practice is institutionalized in U.S. society.

Institutional theory explains the complex interactions of organizations,

interactions of actors, and the forces working to sustain institutions. To better understand

the following discussion, consider this scenario: There is a field of higher education

consisting of many diverse organizations. Some of these organizations are schools of

higher education, funding agencies, regulating agencies, accreditation agencies, certification agencies, the schools that instruct the faculty who work in higher education, professional associations, advocacy groups, and the public. These organizations interact within the field to maintain the stability of the institution of higher education.

There are four key foundational pillars of institutional theory literature. First, the seminal work for institutional theory is John Meyer and Richard Rowan's 1977 article titled *Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony*. This article was eventually republished in the 1983 book co-authored by John Meyer and Richard Scott, with the assistance of Brian Rowan and Terrence E. Deal. This 1983 book is titled *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*. Therefore, references are often made to either the 1977 or 1983 work or to the Meyer/Scott perspective. Meyer and Rowan argued that organizations are not just products of responses to technical demands but are also products of cultural rules. Second, Meyer and Rowan (1977) emphasize that institutionalized conventions are the result of a social process by which a shared definition of social reality comes to be accepted. Third, Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell added the environmental perspective of institutional theory. Their research finding and beliefs were published in 1983 in the influential work *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields*. Fourth, Scott's work as the historian of institutional theory has made major contributions to the field. Scott's work brought together the various works of institutional theory in his writing, such as the 2008 book titled *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests*.

Institutional theory defined. Scott (2001) provided an analytical framework that is beneficial in explaining how institutions function and how the nuances of institutional

work are studied. Scott (2008) defined an institution as an act, thought, or method that has shared meanings, defines a social relationship, and guides interactions by providing actors a way to interpret the behavior of others (for example, the handshake). There are three significant assumptions in institutional theory: (a) institutions move toward stability through normative, regulative, and culturally cognitive means; (b) institutions strive for legitimacy; and (c) institutional models are likely to be loosely coupled or decoupled (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2001).

Normative, regulative, and culturally cognitive elements. Scott (2001, 2008) identified three institutional elements: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive. All three elements occur simultaneously within an organization, and different elements dominate the institution at various times. Identifying the three distinct elements facilitates the evaluation of institutions and the dynamics that occur. Another application of Scott's institutional elements is the categorization of researchers and research based on the three elements. For example, institutional theory work conducted in sociology typically concentrates on the cultural-cognitive elements.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) suggested that organizations use isomorphism to rationally deal with uncertainty. Isomorphism describes the institutional environment working or moving toward homogeneity in structure, culture, and output. DiMaggio and Powell proposed three mechanisms through which institutional isomorphic change occurs: (a) coercive, (b) normative, and (c) mimetic. Coercive pressures come from governmental- and law-type regulations. Normative pressure comes from cultural pressures, such as influence from professional training. Mimetic pressures cause the

organization to desire imitating another organization and typically occur in times of uncertainty.

The regulative institutional element identifies rules and sanctions as the means to influence behavior. Rules and laws establish the institutional order. The regulating structures are the state, trade and professional associations, business groups, firms, and agencies (Fligstein, 2001). The isomorphic change mechanism associated with this element is coercive pressure (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). These laws and explicit rules force institutional actors to comply with the institutional order; likewise, non-compliance is unacceptable (Scott, 2001).

Normative elements involve the creation of expectations and social obligations (Scott, 2001). Behavior is viewed as morally governed. Accepted social obligations and expectations may be more important than external, regulative demands. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) equated the normative elements with professionalism. Through professional training, certification, or accreditation, the norms of the institution are perpetuated. In higher education, faculty members earn degrees that reinforce certain norms. These faculty members then return to higher education organizations to carry on and reinforce the existing culture. Likewise, professionals attending the higher education organization also return to their fields and perpetuate the existing culture. The normative isomorphic mechanism is based on social obligation and binding expectations (Scott, 2001).

The cultural-cognitive element is a social-constructivist point of view, where shared conceptions result and produce the social reality and a lens through which meaning is constructed (Scott, 2001). Neither rules nor normative expectations create

order; rather, order comes from taken-for-granted beliefs created from the social context. From this perspective, meaning-making and shared understanding influence institutional order. Institutional actors look to their environment for clues to societal expectations. Isomorphic change is created by mimetic pressures, which typically occur in times of uncertainty. An organization that is unsure of what to do will decide to copy a successful organization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

     Legitimacy. As institutions work toward stability, there is a simultaneous need for legitimacy. Legitimacy is exhibiting desirable, proper, or appropriate actions within a socially constructed set of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions (Scott, 2008). Legitimacy is the force that pressures organizations to become similar (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The fear of lacking credibility forces organizations to adopt practices or organizational forms similar to the organizations considered legitimate. In each institutional element, there is a basis for legitimacy: the regulative is legally sanctioned, the normative is morally governed, and the cultural-cognitive is culturally supported. In addition to this basis of legitimacy, early adopters of an innovation add legitimacy to the innovation ─ one reason why early adopters increase the opportunity for institutionalization. Early adopters establish legitimacy; therefore, late adopters are coerced to adapt out of fear of losing their legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

     Institutional loose coupling or decoupling. The third assumption in institutional theory is that institutional models are likely to be loosely coupled or decoupled. A loosely coupled organization has vague rules and less-rigid organizational structure (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Weick, 1976). Loose coupling or decoupling is a contradicting perspective that explains how higher-level organizational

rules and policies can be ignored (Meyer & Scott, 1983). Rules and expectations exist,

but departments or professions can interpret and apply those rules based on their needs

and external influences. Individual entities may ignore the rules while striving for

normative or cultural-cognitive stability (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Organizational fields. The three key elements of an organization are identified

to further explore how institutional theory observes these phenomena. The concept of

organizational fields is critical in facilitating the analyses of a complex, open system,

where the organization is embedded in the larger society or even within other

organizations. An organizational field is the sum of organizations that constitute a

recognized area of institutional life. An organizational field could consist of "key

suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations

that produce similar services or products" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148).

DiMaggio and Powell further define the necessary elements for a field: (a) an increase in

the interaction among organizations in the field, (b) the emergence of inter-organizational

structures, (c) an increase in the information load with which organizations in the field

must contend, and (d) the development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set

of organizations that are involved in a common enterprise. Within the organizational

field, the regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive forces sustain the institution

common to the field. An organizational field is not a static environment. The definition

of the field depends on the context and research being conducted. One example of an

organizational field is the "field of higher education," consisting of all schools, colleges,

universities, professions, and suppliers.   Another example of an organizational field is

the "field of community colleges."

Critiques of institutional theory. Institutional theory is difficult to test empirically, and theorists have critiqued it because it lacks consensus in key concepts, measures or methods, a set of standard variables, a standard research methodology, and a standard set of research methods (Zucker, 1987; Scott, 2008). Another critique is that new institutional theory allows no room for degrees of institutionalization. The institution is either institutionalized or not. There is little discussion of the extent or degree to which institutionalization occurred (Machado-da-Silva, Silva-da-Fonseca, & Crubellate, 2005). Neoinstitutional theory continues to overemphasize the taken-for-granted nature of institutional rules, beliefs, and myths (Oliver, 1991). Another critique is that the interactive roles of individuals or groups and structure within the organization should have more attention (Cooney, 2008). In order to compensate for the limitations of institutional theory, the researcher expands the theory of institutionalization to include diffusion of innovation theory.

Diffusion of Innovation

Diffusion of innovation research is loosely integrated with institutional theory and specifically concentrates on how an innovation becomes adopted and institutionalized. There are two schools of thought in the field of diffusion research: contemporary and classical. The contemporary stream is grounded strongly in the institutional theory work just described. Key researchers of contemporary diffusion research are DiMaggio, Powell, Zucker, and Fligstein. Previous sections thoroughly described the foundations of institutional theory; therefore, the following material examines the classical diffusion theory approach and the contributions this literature base can make toward understanding institutionalization.

Background of classical diffusion research. Diffusion research finds its roots in sociology (to include rural sociology) and communications. Diffusion innovation research investigates how and why new ideas or technologies are adopted. Classical innovation theorists define an innovation as an idea, practice, or object that is novel or new to the entity adopting the innovation (Rogers, 2003; Levine, 1980). The concept of newness is relevant to the circumstance of the innovation. Something can be an innovation today even if it was practiced years ago; hence, an innovation can be a renewed innovation (Levine, 1980).

What is diffusion? Strang and Soule define this term as "the spread of something within a social system. The key term here is 'spread,' and it should be taken viscerally (as far as one's constructionism permits) to denote flow or movement from a source to an adopter, paradigmatically via communication and influence" (1998, p. 266). The diffusion research began with two seminal works: (a) Ryan and Gross's 1943 analysis of the diffusion of hybrid corn at Iowa State University and (b) the University of Lund in Sweden's Torsten Hagerstrand 1967 work, which emphasized geography or space as a factor in the diffusion of innovation. James Coleman, Elihu Katz, and Herbert Menzel (1966) conducted further research beginning in 1954 at Columbia University. This drug study's original purpose was to investigate whether mass media was contributing to the use of a new drug. Based on initial results, these sociologists changed the question to ask about interpersonal networks. This study is said to have brought forth the importance of interpersonal networks in diffusion of innovations. Additionally, this study revealed the important and influential role of the opinion leader for diffusion theory. According to

Rogers (2003), this study was second only to Ryan and Gross in significantly contributing to the field of diffusion innovation.

Diffusion research took a 10-year break between the Ryan and Gross study and further research – 1943 to 1954 –mostly due to World War II. Just after the war, rural sociologists such as Eugene A. Wilkening at the University of Wisconsin and Herbert Lionberger at the University of Missouri reinvigorated the research. In 1954, Lee Coleman (from the University of Kentucky) and George M. Beal and Joe Bohlen (from Iowa State University) joined together to research agricultural diffusion. These researchers played a significant role in the development of innovation and diffusion theory, but to date, Everett Rogers is the most noted researcher in this field.

Diffusion of innovation: Everett Rogers. According to Rogers (2004), in 1954 he began his studies as a graduate student at Iowa State University under Professor George Beal. While conducting research for his dissertation, he saw the similar s-curve phenomenon in studies such as the drug study by Coleman, Katz, and Menzel and the corn diffusion study. The s-curve phenomenon is the graphic display of a slow adoption of an innovation followed by an accelerated adoption to a final climax over time. After continued research, Rogers felt strongly that he could generalize the diffusion model beyond rural agriculture. This conviction drove Rogers (2003) to write the first edition of his book, *Diffusion of Innovations*, in 1962. The fifth edition of this book was published in 2003. Rogers (2004) has used this diffusion model in rural sociology and public health. During his career, he moved to the field of communications and took his diffusion model research with him. He notes that there have been more than 5,000 studies in various fields directly related to the diffusion model.

Rogers' (2003) diffusion model emphasizes the individual and innovation and provides an organizational perspective. The organizational level of an innovation is relevant to this study. Following is a summary of Rogers' innovation process for organizations. There are five stages: agenda setting, matching, redefining/restructuring, clarifying, and routinizing. The agenda-setting stage involves identifying and prioritizing problems and needs and searching within the organization for innovations to meet these needs. Matching is the process of fitting an innovation with an organizational need. Redefining/restructuring occurs when an innovation that came from the external environment of the organization begins to lose external characteristics. Clarifying occurs when the innovation is put into widespread use in the organization. Routinizing is the process of incorporating an innovation into the regular activities of the organization. During this process, the innovation loses its individual identity. From Rogers' perspective, at this point (when the individual identity is lost), the innovation process is complete. According to Rogers, institutionalization occurs after routinization, and the probability of reaching institutionalization is impacted by the following factors: (a) the degree to which the innovation was reinvented for the organization, (b) the amount of participation by individuals during the innovation initiation process, and (c) the involvement of a local champion or individual promoting the innovation.

Why innovations fail: Arthur Levine. Rogers' contributions are significant, but this literature review must acknowledge the work of A. Levine. Levine's work is significant because he applies diffusion theory to the context of higher education. His book *Why Innovations Fail* (1980) was based on a case study of a higher education institution. Researchers have used Levine's diffusion model in empirical studies to

include Sandmann & Weerts (2008), Colbeck (2002), and Holland (2005). Researchers using Levine's theory often equate diffusion with institutionalization (Holland, 2009).

Levine's (1980) innovation process has four stages: (a) recognition of need, (b) planning and formulating a solution, (c) initiation and implementation of a plan, and (d) institutionalization or termination. According to Levine (1980), at the time for institutionalization or termination, the organization will be in a state of flux trying to reconcile this new innovation within existing organizational boundaries. These boundaries encompass the organizational social space that includes personality, norms, values, and goals of the organization. During this state of flux, the organization will either experience boundary expansion or contraction, leading to the enclaving, diffusing, resocializing, or terminating of the innovation.

Boundary expansion occurs when the organization accepts the innovation. There are two forms of acceptance: enclaving and diffusion. Enclaving occurs when the organization agrees to allow the innovation to exist, but only within an isolated position. Diffusion occurs when the innovation characteristics spread throughout the organization. Boundary contraction involves the constriction of organizational boundaries and causes the exclusion of innovation differences. At this point, the innovation would be considered outside organizational acceptance, or deviant. Once the innovation is considered deviant, one of two things will happen: resocialization or termination. Resocialization is the process where the innovation is forced to return to the acceptable norms, values, and goals. Termination occurs when the innovation is eliminated.

Limitations of diffusion research. These research methods have some limitations. Diffusion research based on the s-curve falls short because the s-curve does

not always hold true, and there is not a sound explanation for this inconsistency (Wolfe, 1994). Wolfe also critiques diffusion of innovation research for assuming that the innovation does not vary and that the potential adopters are more or less equivalent. Wolfe argues that adopters are typically not equivalent in most cases and that the innovation usually is not the same throughout the innovation process. McMaster and Wastell (2005) suggest that diffusion of innovation research has a pro-innovation bias. This theory assumes that if the innovation fails, there is an issue with the individual, not with the innovation. This assumption removes the ability to critique the innovation directly.

Rogers' diffusion of innovations for organizations is limited because the environment is based on a managerial hierarchy. If managers decide to adopt the innovation, the remaining process is very linear. There is no room for individuals in the model, which assumes a decision making structure that is hierarchal in nature.

Higher Education and Community Engagement Institutionalization Summary

DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) theory on fields enables the researcher to analyze the innovation of community engagement within the boundaries of education. Scott's (2008) framework of restrictive, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements inform the research and allow for discussions on how higher education is responding to the innovation of community engagement while trying to maintain institutional stability. This study will concentrate on the struggle to return to institutional stability through the institutionalization of the innovation of community engagement. The unchanging and taken-for-granted characteristics of an institution provide an explanation of the culture of

higher education. Levine's theory on boundary expansion and contraction provides a lens for viewing the institutionalization of the innovation of community engagement.

<div align="center">**Community Engagement**</div>

Higher education is a well-established institution experiencing the shifts and challenges associated with the introduction of a new innovation: community engagement. Community engagement is the contemporary conceptualization of community-engagement associated activities, philosophies, and practices; public service; and civic mission. This section will provide further exploration of community engagement by presenting the following: (a) the evolution of community engagement, (b) community engagement defined, and (c) community engagement summarized.

Evolution of Community Engagement

The foundations of service and community engagement date back to the early 1900s, with philosopher John Dewey's argument that liberal education involves more than preparing students for lives of professional accomplishment and personal gain (London, 2001). But the most recent initiative calling for higher education to serve the community and be civically responsible is a culmination of both academic and student public service.

Academic public service. In 1990, higher education received its most significant plea to adapt the current research model to embrace a wider acceptance of knowledge generation and scholarship. The seminal work of Ernest Boyer (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered,* was a wake-up call for the scholarly world of higher education. Boyer reminds the academy that higher education and society are interdependent and begins a discussion on scholarship that reaches beyond the traditional research scope.

Boyer (1990) proposes new definitions for academic life. He proposes a four-part framework where scholarship exists at all institutional levels. Boyer's four-part framework is: (a) the scholarship of discovery, or investigation-driven research and the generation of new knowledge; (b) the scholarship of integration, or the discovery of knowledge across disciplines; (c) the scholarship of application, or applying knowledge to the problem; and (d) the scholarship of teaching as an academic enterprise. Boyer's seminal work may be the impetus for the community-engagement movement, but other driving forces also laid the ground work for the acceptance of this overreaching philosophy of community engagement.

Student public service. Student public service contributes to the development of the contemporary community-engagement philosophy. Student public service is identified as service-learning or community service. Both student service-learning and community service involve providing services to the community. The difference is community service is a voluntary, independent activity often undertaken without the support of the higher education institution. Service-learning is a formal, curriculum-based activity facilitating the interaction of students with community partners under the guidance of higher education faculty. Service-learning is a for-credit course grounded in the pedagogical philosophies of experiential learning.

Service-learning finds its roots in the 1960s, with student protests for a social-justice agenda (DHUD, 2001; Hartley, 2009; London, 2001). In the 1970s, service-learning continued to grow as demonstrated by an increase in federal funding initiatives, national networks, and student civic and public service activities. One example of a federal initiative was the ACTION program. This program provided full-year, for-credit

opportunities for students to aid poverty-stricken areas (Dubbs, 2007). The National

Society of Experiential Education (NSEE), founded in 1971, is another indicator of the

social-justice agenda. This society established a network among those working in the

areas of community-based teaching and research. This group championed for a

transformation of the core work of higher education to include a social-action agenda.

In 1984, Wayne Meisel, a Harvard graduate, began a "Walk for Action" (Hartley,

2009). He walked from Maine to Washington, D.C., and visited 67 colleges promoting

student community service. The Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) was

formed from Meisel's "Walk for Action." COOL was designed to provide a network for

students, faculty, and schools interested in community-based work. More than 400

institutions were involved in COOL. In 1985, Frank Newman propelled another

community service-based initiative when he wrote the report titled *Higher Education and

the American Resurgence.* This report calling for education for citizenship generated

much interest from the presidents of Stanford University, Georgetown University, and

Brown University (Hartley, 2009). This small group of university presidents initiated the

creation of Campus Compact, a national organization of university presidents founded in

1986. The purpose of this organization was to mobilize the service-learning and

engagement movement by supporting initiatives designed to increase the civic role of

education (Campus Compact Vision, n.d.). Campus Compact's membership growth is

evidence of the increasing support for upholding the civic mission in higher education –

100 members in 1986 to more than 1,000 members in 2007 and remains at this level

(Campus Compact, n.d.; Dubb, 2007; Hartley, 2009).

In 2000, the National Survey of Student Engagement (2010) was administered to 276 colleges and universities, and this number grew to 643 in 2009. This survey obtains data on student participation in activities both inside and outside the classroom and is intended for use by potential students, parents, and administrators. Students and parents use the data to better understand the types of activities that specific institutions make available. Administrators use the data to make improvements and changes in policies and procedures. The NSSE differs from this study in both scope and content. This study provides data beyond the scope of students and includes the perspective of the institution, faculty, and community.

Academic and student public service. Academic and student public service merged in the late 1990s as community-based research occurred and campus-community partnerships formed. Community-Campus Partnership for Health (CCPH), founded in 1996, is an organization with representatives from higher education, the healthcare field, government, and communities. These representatives work to promote health through service-learning, community-based participatory research, and other partnership initiatives. CCPH is a network of more than 1,700 communities and campuses in North America and the world. "These partnerships are powerful tools for improving higher education, civic engagement, and the overall health of communities" (Community-Campus Partnership for Health, 2008, para. 1).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's (2009) creation of the voluntary community-engagement classification further propelled the community-engagement movement. Traditional Carnegie classifications rely on national data, but the newly added elective classification requires the submission of an application. Seventy-

six institutions earned the classification in 2006, 120 in 2008, and 115 in 2010 for a total of 311 institutions classified as engaged institutions. The voluntary classification for community engagement is the only one of its kind for the Carnegie Foundation. Others were initiated but no longer exist, further demonstrating the importance higher education places on community engagement (CFAT, 2009).

Community Engagement Defined

The definition of community engagement developed by the Carnegie framework is the national standard. Community engagement "describes 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" (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009). The four tenets of community engagement are as follows: (a) reciprocal, (b) community-oriented, (c) civic, and (d) scholarly. Activities of community engagement meeting these four tenets manifest through instruction, research, and scholarship.

Community engagement in the instructional arena provides students with the opportunity to learn civic and social responsibility through experiential learning opportunities connected to the community, which benefits from the service provided (London, 2001; Saltmarsh, 2005). Student engagement activities are described as community-based learning, service-learning, public and community service, and civic learning (Saltmarsh, 2005). Saltmarsh also states that civic learning is "rooted in respect for community-based knowledge, grounded in experiential and reflective modes of teaching and learning, aimed at active participation in American democracy..." (p. 53).

Community engagement further manifests in the research environment through activities that include applied research, participatory research, and community-based research. Importantly, these research models are executed *with* the community, not *on* the community (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999). Practicing engaged research mandates a partnership between campus and community members and requires both parties to mutually benefit (Ramaley, 2005). The community contributes by actively identifying existing community needs and issues and provides the research environment. The faculty member contributes technical or process expertise to the mutually reciprocal problem-solving and knowledge-creating experience. Sharing research findings with the community is an integral part of a true engaged-research project (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999).

The principles of engaged scholarship are the additive tenets of community engagement and the standards for quality research (Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, & Buglione, 2009; Sandmann, 2008). Engaged scholarship is a unique element of community engagement where scholarly artifacts are generated. When community-based, engaged research is conducted and the campus and community work together to create scholarly work, engaged scholarship results. Another arena of engaged scholarship is the research conducted on the practices of community engagement. Weerts (2005) applied Havelock's theory of knowledge flow to case studies of community-university partnerships at three different land-grant universities. His research addressed knowledge-flow barriers, capacity building for university-community engagement, and motivators that promote engagement activities.

Community Engagement Summary

Community engagement rejuvenates the spirit of public service and civic mission in higher education. Community engagement is the umbrella term that captures the collective practices of service-learning, curricular engagement, civic engagement, community partnerships, and scholarship of engagement while embracing the values and norms of mutually reciprocal partnerships. Community engagement is evolving as an innovation in higher education and is being institutionalized in some organizations (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Hartley, 2009; Holland, 1999, 2009). The integration of public service and civic responsibility across the three missions of instruction, research, and service contributes to the current community-engagement movement.

Assessment of Institutionalization of Community Engagement

As evidenced by hundreds of institutions, community engagement is an innovation that has become institutionalized (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009; Sandmann, Williams, & Abrams, 2009). For these institutions, community engagement is an integral part of doing business, where engagement as an innovation has gained institutional acceptance (Holland, 2009). Institutionalization of community engagement is assessed in the literature, and the following literature review will include: (a) community-engagement assessment models, (b) evidence of institutionalization, and (c) research on engagement informing institutionalization.

Community-Engagement Assessment Models

Several models measure the institutionalization of community engagement, ranging from matrix-type tools to more elaborate systems of assessment (Furco & Miller,

2009). Engagement assessment models have three common goals: (a) estimating the desired level of engagement relevant to the organizational context, (b) identifying the elements necessary for optimal engagement, and (c) identifying areas of weaknesses and opportunity for organizational change. The models assist higher education institutions in strategically planning for the intentional institutionalization of community engagement.

One of the first models was the empirically created, widely used matrix called *Levels of Commitment to Community Engagement, Characterized by Key Organizational Factors Evidencing Relevance to Institutional Mission* (Holland, 1997). Seven organizational factors exist in this model: (a) mission; (b) promotion, tenure, and hiring; (c) organizational structure and funding; (d) student involvement; (e) faculty involvement; (f) community involvement; and (g) campus publications. Four levels of commitment are applied to each factor. The levels range from low relevance to full integration of engagement. Going beyond Holland, several other models were created to measure community engagement: *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment* (Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelson, 2005), *Indicators of Community Engagement* (Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2001), and *Benchmarks on Engagement* (CIC Committee on Engagement, 2005).

Furco (1998) developed a detailed rubric for measuring the institutionalization of service-learning as a specific strategy of community engagement. The *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institution of Service-Learning in Higher Education* contains five dimensions: (a) philosophy and mission of service-learning, (b) faculty support for and involvement in service-learning, (c) student support for and involvement in service-learning, (d) community participation and partnerships, and (e) institutional support. The

five dimensions are further divided into several components. The three stages of development applied to each component are critical mass building, quality building, and sustained institutionalization. Other models designed around a specific aspect of community engagement are as follows: *Shumer's Self-Assessment Survey for Service-Learning* (Shumer, 2000), Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis's *Comprehensive Assessment of the Scholarship of Engagement* (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999), and Furco's *Evaluation System for Experiential Education* (Furco, 1997).

Evidence of the Institutionalization of Community Engagement

The assessment models and tools are a means of understanding, measuring, and facilitating the institutionalization of community engagement at the individual school level. In addition to these specific examples of institutionalization, the field of higher education is adopting community-engagement practices. Evidence of the institutionalization of community engagement is demonstrated by the production of prominent organizations, reports, conferences, networks, and changes in accreditation standards.

The Carnegie Foundation contributes to the engagement movement with The Carnegie Elective Community Engagement Classification model. This model is an assessment tool developed by Carnegie and national leaders of community engagement (Driscoll, 2008). To date, more than 300 higher education institutions have received the Carnegie engaged classification. The application structure is designed to: (a) respect the diversity of institutions and their unique approaches to engagement, (b) engage the institution in a reflective process of self-assessment, and (c) acknowledge and honor institutional achievements while encouraging continuous development (Driscoll, 2008).

The Carnegie model is a declaration of the institutionalization of community engagement in an organization and a process for institutions to further institutionalize community engagement.

The *Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities,* which existed between January 1996 and March 2000, created six reports on public higher education issues. Community engagement was identified as a topic for one of the six reports. This designation demonstrates the significance of the community-engagement movement. This report was titled *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution* (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1999). Reported results indicated, "In the end, the clear evidence is that, with the resources and superbly qualified professors and staff on our campuses, we can organize our institutions to serve both local and national needs in a more coherent and effective way. We can and must do better" (p. 3).

The topics covered in Wingspread Conferences demonstrate further evidence of engagement. Wingspread Conferences are conducted to address innovative solutions for community and environmental issues. The Johnson Foundation sponsors these events at its Wingspread facility. Community engagement has been the topic of 19 Wingspread conferences held between 2000 and 2007. Conference topics during the last several years include civic engagement relating to faculty work, students engaged in community-based research, the institutionalization of engagement, and online engagement resource networks. Sandmann and Weerts (2006) state, "In 1999, the Wingspread Declaration on Civic Engagement united a group of college and university presidents to express civic engagement as a core mission within their institutions" (p. 4).

Another example of higher education's commitment to community engagement is the 2007 National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' (NASULGC) commitment to defining engagement. The NASULC, now called the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), states that an engaged institution has the following characteristics: (a) students involved in community service; (b) community-based education; and (c) research that is conducted *with* clients, not just *for* clients. "These characteristics describe a culture of engagement … an ivory bridge, rather than an ivory tower. A bridge firmly rooted in both the academic world and the communities it serves. A public institution of higher education is incomplete without engagement" (NASULGC, 2007, pp. 1-2).

Various networks have been created to support and sustain the community-engagement movement. The Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (HENCE) is one such network created from the joint work of the 2006 Wingspread Conference (Higher Education Network for Community Engagement, n.d). The HENCE network was created to "deepen, consolidate, and advance the literature, research, practice, policy, and advocacy for community engagement as a core element of higher education's role in society" (HENCE, para. 1). The Talloires Network is a support system for community engagement at the international level (The Talloires Network, 2008). This network includes an international group of university leaders and others who are concerned with civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education.

In 2005, Tufts University's fourth Talloires Conference ─ held in Talloires, France ─ designated "Strengthening the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education" as its conference theme (The Talloires Network, 2008). Twenty-nine

university presidents, rectors, and vice chancellors from 23 countries attended this international conference. *The Talloires Declaration: On the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education* (2005) was a product of this international meeting. This declaration states that higher education institutions do not exist in isolation from the communities in which they are located and that "universities should use the processes of education and research to respond to, serve, and strengthen its communities for local and global citizenship" (para. 5). The international Talloires Network was a result of this conference.

Evidence exists of the institutional acceptance of community engagement in the realm of accreditation and assessment. Regional higher education accreditation organizations are making provisions for capturing engagement activities in their standards. For example, the North Central Association Higher Learning Commission recently added "Criterion Five – Engagement and Service," which reads: "As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways that both value" (North Central Association Higher Learning Commission, 2003, 3.1-6). Other accreditation agencies have made provisions for organizations to incorporate their engagement activities in their accreditation process (Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 2009; Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, 2003; Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 2008; Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 2008).

Research in Institutionalization of Engagement

Sandmann and Weerts (2008) investigated the role that boundary expansion plays in the capability of an organization to institutionalize engagement practices. The subjects

of this study were two types of research institutions: three land-grant and three urban research universities. Specifically, the researchers found that large land-grant universities incorporate engagement into their existing norms and values, whereas urban universities create new norms and values. Younger, more flexible urban universities are more likely to "infuse" (using a Sandmann and Weerts term) engagement across organizational boundaries. Sandmann has also conducted studies on the topic of scholarship of engagement, as seen in her 10-year retrospective of the conceptualization of scholarship of engagement (Sandmann, 2008).

Holland's research is often service-learning-oriented but also branches out to the general concept of engagement. Specifically, her research addresses the issues of institutionalizing community engagement (Holland, 1997, 2006, 2009), and identifying the extent to which organizations are committed to engagement. One manifestation of her research is the empirically based matrix titled *Levels of Commitment to Service, Characterized by Key Organizational Factors Evidencing Relevance to Institutional Mission* (Holland, 2006).

Steve Dubb's 2007 report, *Linking Colleges to Communities,* proposed "... to begin to address this [external policy] deficiency and open a conversation regarding how to more effectively stir the university sector to meet the needs of American communities today" (p. 3). This study presented an in-depth look at the history and future of community engagement and is specifically from the government's and regulatory entity's perspective.

The 2005 book *Engaging Campus and Community* presented the results of eight case studies from state and land-grant universities (Peters, Jordan, Adamek, & Alter).

These case studies examined scholars who were actively engaged in public work. The overall objective of these studies was to contribute to the discussions on the civic dimensions of academic engagement theory and practice. The findings address the implications that funding, organizational structure, and administrative support have on engagement.

Bringle and Hatcher (1999) conducted research on the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. Data were collected based on the Comprehensive Action Plan for Service-learning (CAPSL) assessment matrix from 185 faculty and staff in the service-learning field. The study was intended to demonstrate the ability of the CAPSL instrument to measure institutionalization of service-learning and to use this data as a basis for investigating institutionalization.

Institutionalizing community engagement in the field of higher education requires a change in culture. Dubb acknowledged the cultural change in the statement, "There are some favorable trends and indicators of cultural change. These include revision of university mission statements, changes in the definition of scholarship among faculty, and the expansion of community action participatory research in the professions, especially health care" (2007, p. 66).

Institutionalization of Community Engagement Summary

U. S. higher education is an institution with a set of established norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors that have been institutionalized over the last 100 years. Institutionalization occurs within and between the institutional fields. There are several potential institutional fields for higher education: technical schools, colleges, universities, funding sources, governing bodies, faculty, students, communities, and professional

organizations. When investigating higher education from the institutional perspective, the researcher must acknowledge that entities within higher education are also institutionalized institutions. Universities, departments, faculties, or even professions all have institutionalized properties and operate as institutions. Institutionalization is a dynamic, constantly negotiated state. The nature of an institution dictates that forces push for stability as change occurs.

Community engagement as an innovation within the institution of higher education calls for changes in the norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors of the institution. This innovation impacts both the institutional level and organizational levels of higher education. Currently, the institutionalization of community engagement faces the following issues: (a) becoming part of the norms, rules, and values of higher education – institutionalized or diffused; (b) existing on the periphery of or in isolated areas of higher education – enclaved; and (c) returning to the accepted norms and standards – resocialized (Levine, 1980; Rogers, 2004).

The literature presents a range of studies on the institutionalization of community engagement within higher education and individual schools, colleges, and universities. The missing component from the analysis and explication of institutionalization is the ability to discuss costs and benefits. Administrators who work toward institutionalizing community engagement make decisions for support and funding based on perceived costs and benefits. Often, the judgment of costs and benefits is based on an intuitive, subjective understanding.

Chapter Summary

The current movement of community engagement and the interest and support for community-engagement practices is a demonstration of the institutionalization of this community-engagement innovation. The civic and service role of higher education is renegotiated as society's needs change. History has exhibited fluctuations in the extent to which higher education has embraced and practiced public service and its civic mission. In the last several decades, higher education has moved from a one-sided service-providing model to a more comprehensive, reciprocal model of community engagement. During this time, community engagement has gained momentum as a movement or innovation for higher education. The work of individuals such as Boyer and groups such as Campus Compact, Community-Campus Partnership for Health, and The Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement and the growing pedagogy of service-learning are a few highlights of the work behind the community-engagement movement.

The literature and work in the field provides examples of successful institutionalization, tools for institutionalization, and research in this area. The identified gap in the literature is the area related to practices, perceived costs, and perceived benefits of community engagement. This study provides data enabling administrators and advocates to include perceived costs and benefits as a component of the decision making process while working toward further institutionalizing community engagement.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study's purpose was to further understand the operationalization of community engagement in high-performing, community-engaged, higher education institutions. This chapter describes the methodology designed to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices?

2. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution?

3. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the community?

4. What is the perceived cost of community-engagement practices to the institution?

5. How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?

6. What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?

Community-engagement philosophies strengthen the relationship between scholarship, practices, and serving the community while integrating the institutional missions of teaching, research, and outreach. For this reason, community-engagement practices are moving toward institutionalization within higher education institutions – moving from unique cases to core, common practices. With the movement, administrators are faced with the need to make decisions regarding support and funding

for these practices in a resource-constrained environment. The literature is robust with theories, philosophies, techniques, and tools on how to institutionalize and sustain community engagement, yet little attention is given to the financial aspects of community engagement. Cost and benefits are considered difficult to measure in the complex environment of community engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999; CCI Committee on Engagement, 2005; Furco, 1998; Furco & Williams, 2009; Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelson, 2005; Holland, 1997; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2001). This study bridges the gap in the conversations and literature of adult education, community engagement, and higher education, addressing the need for data on perceived relative costs and benefits of community-engagement practices. This chapter is organized into eight sections: (a) logical framework, (b) study population, (c) instrumentation, (d) data collection, (e) data preparation, (f) description of respondents, (g) data analysis, and (h) limitations.

Logical Framework

The logical framework for this methodology is grounded in the conceptualization of the researcher-identified log of inputs, outputs, and outcomes of community engagement (Table 3.1). Community-engagement inputs are actions and structures that lead to the manifestations of community engagement. Administrative leadership is an input supporting community engagement. Other inputs include funding, organizational mission, promotion and rewards, and organizational infrastructure. A unique aspect of support for community engagement and one reason why measuring costs can be difficult is because there is seldom a "community-engagement budget" within an institution. Costs and support are often decentralized and captured in various departmental and

50

programmatic budgets. The costs of community engagement include faculty time,

salaries, institutional building resources, supplies, student time, community partners'

time, lost opportunity costs, and so on.

Table 3.1

Conceptualization of the Operationalization of Community Engagement

	Variable Name	Variable Description
Input	Institutional Characteristics	Structure, leadership, funding, and policy
Output	Practices of Community Engagement	Structured and unstructured activity or practice undertaken by administrators or faculty to facilitate outcomes
Outcome	Benefits of Community Engagement	Achievements and improvements produced for community, students, and faculty.

Outputs are practices and the manifestations of community engagement and are

structured or unstructured activities or procedures undertaken by administrators, faculty,

staff, or students to facilitate the outcomes of community engagement. Practices generate

returns for the community, students, faculty, and the institution. Outcomes are the

returns or benefits of the achievements and improvements produced by community,

students, and faculty and can be economic, professional, social, or personal. This study

investigated various aspects, as identified in the research questions, of perceived relative

costs (inputs) and perceived relative benefits (outcomes) of community-engagement

practices (outputs). For the purpose of this study the unit measures of costs and benefits

are non-monetary values of perceived benefit and cost.

Study Population

This research project is a population study of the Carnegie community-engaged

classification recipients as of July 2010. The studied population are the 196 recipients of

the 2006 and 2008 Carnegie community-engaged classification. A list of successful

applicants is posted online on the CFAT website. A representative from each of the 196

institutions was asked to respond to the survey instrument (see Appendix A). This

exemplary population provides a reliable understanding of community-engagement

practices, benefits, and costs. These institutions have demonstrated the capability to

embrace, participate in, and document community engagement. The expertise and

knowledge of this population provides unique insight into the institutionalization,

decision making, and operationalization of community engagement.

Instrumentation

A four-part, researcher-designed instrument (Appendix A) was developed to

collect data for the purpose of measuring the (a) variety of practices, (b) perceived

relative benefits to the institution, (c) perceived relative benefits to the community, (d)

perceived relative costs to the institution, (e) impact of type of institution on practices,

and (f) perceived institutional support. The instrument was an online, self-completion

survey administered to representatives from the 2006 and 2008 Carnegie-classified,

community-engaged institutions. This instrument development process entailed: (a)

concept clarification, (b) item pool development, (c) item pool refinement, (d) instrument

format, (e) construction of a response scale, addition of background information, and

refinement of the instrument (see Table 3.2).

Concept Clarification

The instrument development process began with a review of the literature and

hours of discussion among the researcher, major professor, and methodologist. The

process followed these developmental phases: (a) defining community engagement to

provide the grounding principles, (b) critically reviewing the nationally accepted

Carnegie Foundation application for insight, (c) identifying the functions of community

engagement, (d) applying the implementation logic for community engagement, and (e)

identifying the constructs of practices, benefits, and costs for this study.

Table 3.2

Instrument Development Process

Process Steps	Activity
Concept Clarification	Identifying practices as the item for evaluation
Item Pool Development	Analysis of the Carnegie application Literature review
Item Pool Refinement	Review for redundancy by researcher, major professor, and methodologist Review of the 19 practices by an expert panel Identification and review of 12 practices by major professor
Construction of Response Scale	Identification of two response scales
Instrument Format	Identification of four focus questions Frequency of practice Assessing benefits to the institution Assessing benefits to the community Assessing costs to the institution
Addition of Background Information	Identification of institutional and individual demographics
Refinement of Instrument	Review of instrument by adult education graduate students Review by major professor and methodologist Review by higher education administrators Pilot study conducted

To begin the instrument-development process, the researcher, major professor, and methodologist decided the appropriate starting point was a sound definition of community engagement. For the purpose of this study, community engagement is "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity," as defined by the nationally acclaimed Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT, 2009).

This definition establishes the guiding principles of scholarship and reciprocity, yet there remained a need to further identify the expressions, functions, or operationalization of community engagement. The literature and various instruments were analyzed to investigate the operationalization of community engagement. The CFAT classification application for engagement was determined to be the instrument with the greatest potential for garnering insight into the operationalization of community engagement. Three factors informed the decision to use the CFAT classification as the instrument for further analysis. First was the national credibility of the Carnegie Foundation and the classification process. Second, the instrument was designed by a panel of nationally acclaimed experts in the field of higher education. Third, this nationally acclaimed instrument was designed to be a catalyst for change and to further institutionalize community engagement.

The multi-page, multi-section CFAT application was first deconstructed into categories based on the application sections: foundational indicators and categories of community engagement. When this analysis did not prove insightful, the application was

then deconstructed based on researcher-defined categories of institution, community, and faculty. This procedure still did not completely yield a data organization that would provide an understanding of engagement practices. The last attempt was deconstructing individual questions without regard to categorization. Upon meticulous analysis of the CFAT classification application, the researcher found that community engagement is a function of the following elements: organizational structure, administrative support, faculty scholarship, student participation, instruction, and community-university relationships. The question still remained as to how these functions of community engagement might inform how institutions carry out community-engagement practices. Based on further review of the CFAT classification application, the researcher found that each item could be identified as either (a) *support* for engagement, (b) a *practice* of engagement, or (c) a *result* of engagement practices. These identifications mirrored the researcher's logic model of community engagement. The researcher believes an institutional indicator that community engagement is institutionalized is when practices are abundant.

The importance of focusing on practices became apparent as the researcher reviewed the Carnegie application, reflected on the field of community engagement, deliberated the quantitative research possibilities, and considered the stage of the logic model where institutionalization is manifested. The researcher contemplated the question of measuring the inputs of indirect and direct costs as well as measuring the outcomes or benefits. Both the dollar figures and the intrinsic values for costs and benefits were considered too broad in scope to be feasible for this study. The researcher then considered gathering only monetary data for inputs and outputs, which also was beyond

the scope of this study. The decision was made to draw on the expertise of the population and gather data on perceived relative costs and benefits. The study population could provide this data.

Item Pool Development

Detailed item pool development began with the challenge to develop a comprehensive yet concise list of community-engagement practices. This list was established by (a) deconstructing the CFAT application for community engagement, (b) conducting a literature review, (c) reviewing for redundancy, and (d) assembling an expert panel to review the items.

Analysis of the CFAT application. The CFAT classification application was again the starting point, but this time the objective was item pool development. The CFAT classification application is divided into two sections: foundational indicators and categories of community engagement. The topics of institutional identity, culture, and commitment relevant to community engagement are found in the foundational indicator section. Probing questions related to curricular engagement, outreach, and partnerships are found in the "Categories of Engagement" section.

The CFAT application was designed to allow open-ended responses and to capture the entire spectrum of community engagement. This open-ended, all-inclusive format was not conducive to producing a survey-style instrument or a concise list of practices; therefore, the researcher converted each question into individual, survey-appropriate statements. Any individual question that contained multiple parts was rewritten as several independent statements. The original application contained 29

numbered questions. Once the items were rewritten in a survey-appropriate format, 58

potential survey items were identified.

Literature review. The objective of the item pool generation was establishing a

comprehensive list of community-engagement practices. The CFAT application is

intentionally broad in scope to allow applicants a wide range in expressing community

engagement as appropriate for the particular institution's mission and context. Therefore,

the researcher reviewed the literature for additional practices, expecting to find items that

were more specific in nature. The additional step guaranteed the development of a

comprehensive list. An additional 20 practices were identified and added to the item

pool, and while they varied only slightly, they were included to ensure thoroughness.

The 78 items were assigned to one of three researcher-identified logic model categories:

input, output, or outcome. There were 50 outputs, or more specifically, "practices" of

community engagement. These 50 practices were rewritten as grammatically correct and

similar statements.

Item Pool Refinement

Review for redundancy. First, the researcher and faculty methodologist

reviewed the 50-practice item list. Duplicates and inappropriate items were removed, and

no gaps were identified. Upon removal of the duplicates, the item list was reduced from

50 to 19 practices. Second, the researcher met with Dr. Lorilee R. Sandmann, major

professor and expert in community engagement, to review the list of practices. The

original 50 items, noted removed items, and remaining 19 practices were analyzed for

accuracy. Dr. Sandmann approved the 19 practices (see Appendix B). To achieve the

57

desired level of rigor and refinement of the item pool, an expert panel was assembled to critique the item list.

Review of the 19 practices by an expert panel. An expert panel reviewed the list of 19 community-engagement practices. This panel of five experts from the field of higher education with expertise in community engagement assembled for a group discussion and individual comments. The panel was assembled for a breakfast meeting during the 10th Annual National Outreach Scholarship Conference held in Athens, Georgia. The members of the panel represented community-engagement work in various states and in the areas of economic development, public health, curricular engagement, and extension. Panelists provided input regarding individual item clarity, additional items needed, and items that could be removed.

The hour-and-a-half discussion provided specific details related to item clarity, including but not limited to how community is defined, the need to combine community-based education and extension programming, and how economic development is captured. Overall, the suggestions were to combine several items due to redundancy and add descriptive examples. The panel recommended adding examples to help clarify the meaning of the identified practice for the benefit of respondents representing a wide variety of institutional types. In addition to collecting the discussion session comments, the researcher requested that each member provide a written critique of the 19 community-engagement practices.

Identification and review of the 12 practices. The researcher and major professor reviewed both verbal and written comments and established a list of 12 practices from the original 19 as reviewed by the expert panel (see Appendix C). This

comprehensive list of 12 tangible, measurable, and unique community-engagement

practices was used in instrument development (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3

List of the 12 Community Engagement Practices

Practice Description
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)
2. Offered extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school-facilitated student volunteerism)
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research)
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research)
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library

Construction of Response Scale

The next step in the instrument-development process was determining a response

scale for section one, frequency of practice, and for sections two through four, perceived

costs and benefits. The frequency-of-practice scale initially was based on

number of quarters or semesters. During the graduate student review, this scale was

deemed inappropriate and difficult to understand. The challenge was finding a scale that

could be understood by institutions with quarter and semester systems. The final

response options were based on frequency, and the choices were six-month periods

during a two-year timeframe. The response options were January through June 2008,

July through December 2008, January through June 2009, and July through December

2009. The survey respondents were instructed to select all choices that applied for each

of the 12 community-engagement practices.

Sections two, three, and four would have the same response scales with one

change: benefit to cost. The two sections related to benefits were sections two and three.

A four-point Likert scale ranging from little or no benefit to high benefit was used.

Section four measured perceived costs; therefore, a four-point Likert scale ranging from

little or no cost to high cost was used.

Instrument Format Development

Identification of four focus questions. Four unique focus questions (with

varying response scales) were applied to the 12 practices of community engagement:

frequency of practices, benefit to the institution, benefit to the community, and

institutional costs. The respondents were instructed to use their expertise and perceptions

to respond to each question (see Appendix A).

Frequency of practices. In the first section, the survey respondent identified the

frequency with which the practices were conducted in the institution. This study

establishes the frequency of practices or the patterns in which different practices were

conducted. To achieve this goal, the researcher used the focus question, "In which of the

four time frames did your institution participate in the following community-engagement

practices? (Select all that apply.)" The response options for this question were as follows:

January through June 2008, July through December 2008, January through June 2009,

and July through December 2009.

Assessing benefits to the institution. In the second section, the respondents were

asked to determine the perceived, relative institutional benefit of each practice. To

capture the institutional benefits, the study used the focus question, "For each of the

practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of relative

benefits to your institution, faculty, and students." The response scale included four

options: little or no benefit, some benefit, moderate benefit, and high benefit.

Assessing benefits to the community. In the third section, respondents were

asked to determine the perceived, relative benefit of each practice to the community. To

capture this information, the study used the focus question, "For each of the practices

below, mark the appropriate response that best represents your perception of relative

benefits to your community(ies) and individuals of your community(ies)." The response

scale included four options: little or no benefit, some benefit, moderate benefit, and high

benefit.

Assessing costs to the institution. In the fourth section, respondents were asked

to identify their perceived, relative institutional cost of each community-engagement

practice. To capture this data, the study used the focus question, "For each of the

practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of relative costs

to your institution." The response scale included four options: little or no cost, some cost,

moderate cost, and high cost.

Assessing institutional support. In the institutional support section, respondents were asked to identify their perception of support for community engagement from administration, faculty, staff, and students. A five-point response scale of poor to excellent was provided.

Addition of Background Information

For the purpose of collecting institutional and individual information from study participants, the researcher added seven items to the survey instrument. The seven individual questions were job title, number of years in current role, number of years at the institution, terminal degree, gender, race/ethnicity, and birth year. These variables were chosen to describe the survey participants and to serve as predictor variables in the analysis for differences in responses based on frequency of practices reported.

Refinement of Survey Instrument

The instrument underwent a rigorous refinement process to include a review by adult education graduate students and the implementation of a pilot study. The entire refinement process consisted of the researcher, major professor, methodologist, and higher education administrators reviewing the prototype survey and implementing a pilot study.

Review of prototype by adult education graduate students. A critique group of five adult education graduate students familiar with survey design and implementation was assembled. The critique session was led by expert methodologist Dr. Thomas Valentine. This group met for two hours to analyze the survey from the perspective of future respondents. The group reviewed hard copies of the online survey and survey cover letter for clarity and ease of use. Upon completion of the meeting and survey

updates, the survey was sent electronically to each participant of this critique group. Each member was able to critique the online experience as well as the content. Comments, suggestions, and concerns were collected and processed.

Review of instrument by researcher, major professor, and methodologist. The researcher processed both written and discussion comments from the critique session and online review and made slight changes to the working prototype instrument. The research methodologist and major professor then reviewed this prototype. The decision was made that the prototype was sound from the perspective of ease of use, yet one unanswered question emerged: the ability of an administrator to respond to the instrument.

Review of prototype instrument by higher education administrators. Of great concern was the ability for a potential respondent to answer the survey quickly, accurately, and with confidence. The next step of the item pool refinement was asking for a critique of the instrument from the perspective of an administrator. The prototype instrument was distributed to four higher education administrators who were familiar with community engagement. These administrators were asked to provide input regarding their ability and confidence in answering the questions asked. The administrators were e-mailed the link to the prototype instrument and asked to comment on any other concerns that arose as they took the online survey. Upon completion of the survey, a short interview was conducted with each administrator. There were no new insights from this group, so the prototype instrument was ready to test with a pilot sample.

Validity of the survey instrument was established by: (a) using the nationally acclaimed Carnegie Foundation framework as the foundation, (b) intense scrutiny in developing survey items, (c) an expert review of the items, and (d) critique-group input. The final step in the development process and establishing validity was administering a pilot study to verify the survey's capability to answer the research questions and verify the answerability of the survey for respondents.

Implementation of a pilot study. The pilot study was found to be technically adequate (Appendix D) with an adjusted response rate of 42.2 percent. The research committee made the decision to implement the pilot using 25 percent of the study population, which produced 49 participants. Two contacts with the pilot participants occurred: the initial contact and one follow-up reminder. The pilot participants were asked to complete the survey and provide any suggestions for improvement. The pilot cover letter informed the participants that if the suggested changes were not significant, their responses would be used in the final study (Appendix E). The input provided by the pilot study participants identified the need for minor technical changes to the survey instrument. Therefore the nineteen complete responses from the pilot study were included in the study results.

Data Collection

Every effort was made to direct this survey to the individual at the highest level of administration with an intimate knowledge of community-engagement practices. Contact information was obtained from an established list of 2006 recipients (Sandmann personal communication) and a researcher-constructed list of 2008 recipients. The researcher analyzed the 2008 recipients' institutional websites for engagement contacts. The entire

population of 196 participants received an initial e-mail announcing the survey and asking them to verify that they were the appropriate contact person. The initial e-mail recipient was given the opportunity to provide contact information for an alternative respondent for the survey.

Research data was collected using an online survey. The Institutional Review Board, Human Subjects Office at the University of Georgia approved the survey and collection process. The design and collection process was developed using Dillman's (2007) Tailored Design Method. This method uses social-exchange theory to reduce survey errors by creating trust and perceptions of rewards while reducing the perception of cost for the respondents. Trust was established through the researcher's advisee relationship with nationally recognized community-engagement scholar, Dr. Lorilee Sandmann. The rewards for participation are both intrinsic and extrinsic. The intrinsic reward was the personal satisfaction for the professional contribution the individuals made to a field in which they work. The external, tangible reward was the receipt of an executive summary of the research results. Each respondent was e-mailed an executive summary of the research results.

The targeted population conducts day-to-day business within an environment of digital communication; therefore, using e-mail communication and an Internet-based survey was determined appropriate for this study. The electronic communication facilitated respondent participation in the survey and reduced barriers such as time-consuming paperwork, processing, and handling. Upon participant request, a PDF version of the survey was provided to respondents.

The selection of the survey software involved an analytical process of evaluating several survey tools based on a predetermined set of features that the researcher deemed necessary for this project. This approach was based on a similar analysis conducted by Kimberly Anderson (2008). Table 3.4 outlines the features determined as essential for development of this online survey. Several online options were available, such as Zoomerang®, Surveymonkey®, SurveyGizmo®, SurveyPro®, and Limesurvey®. Surveymonkey® was selected for online instrument development based on this program meeting the research requirements, being familiar to the researcher, and the reliability of the program based on reputation. Additionally, the survey software could integrate an implied consent form as an IRB-approved University of Georgia study.

Table 3.4

Criteria for Internet-Based Survey

Criteria	Desired Feature
Data format	Compatible with export to Excel
E-mail communications	Produce personalized e-mail, individualized to recipient
Question format	Multiple-choice, open-ended, and skip logic
Questions setup	Ability to design the online form that facilitates ease of use
Participant access	Ability to stop survey and continue later
Print	Ability to produce a print version on the fly
Ease of use	Respondents finding the survey easy to use
Screen reader	Ability for a screen reader to read survey to participant

Data was collected through a confidential, self-administered, Web-based survey. The survey instrument followed the online and visual design principles of Dillman

(2007). Online survey development provided an opportunity for customization, such as skip logic, response tracking, and visual presentation. Skip logic enabled the researcher to provide an implied consent form and the option for the respondent to agree or disagree. With a simple selection of yes (agree) or no (disagree), the respondent was respectively moved to the next question or to the end of the survey. Once the survey was completed and data was submitted to the researcher, results were kept confidential.

A multiple contact strategy described by Dillman (2007) was used for this study (Table 3.5). The e-mail notifications to participants included the following: (a) a request for participation including the survey link (see Appendix F), (b) all participants receiving a follow-up thank you one week later and a request for participation if not completed at that time (see Appendix G), (c) non-respondents receiving a participation request two weeks later (see Appendix H), (d) a final request for participation sent nine weeks later (see Appendix I), and (e) upon completion of the study, all respondents will receive a final thank you with an executive summary of the results. Returned, undeliverable e-mail messages were investigated using additional contact information.

The first three contacts were made through SurveyMonkey®. In an attempt to encourage participation from the remaining non-responders, the last follow-up contact was sent from Dr. Lorilee Sandmann's work e-mail account. There were two major advantages of sending directly from Dr. Sandmann's e-mail address: first, the name recognition of her e-mail address and second, e-mail messages with corporate addresses such as SurveyMonkey® run a high risk of being filtered as spam or junk mail and never make it to the recipient's e-mail inbox. Sending the last reminder from the personal work address increased the probability that the message was delivered to the intended inbox.

Table 3.5

Multiple Contact Time Schedule

Date	Email Contact Content
November 10, 2010	Cover e-mail with survey link
November 17, 2010	Follow-up 1: Reminder and thank you sent to all participants
December 1, 2010	Follow-up 2: Reminder to only those who have not responded
January 13, 2011	Follow-up 3: Final reminder to those who have not responded
End of Study	Executive summary emailed to all those who responded.

The research data collection process generated 113 returned surveys, with 100 of these being useable. Table 3.6 provides a description of the study response rates. The pilot and the research data were combined to produce the population results and 119 useable responses. The combined population raw response was 67.3 percent, and after adjusting for five dead e-mails, the response rate was 69.1 percent. The useable response rate for this study was 62.3 percent. This rate was adjusted for the 13 unusable responses and five dead e-mail contacts. The 13 unusable responses included three declines to the consent and 10 with incomplete data.

Table 3.6

Description of Study Response Rates

	# Mailed	Number of Responses	Number of Useable Responses	Raw Response Rate	Adjusted Response Rate	Useable Response Rate
Pilot Sample	49	19	19	38.7%	42.2%	42.2%
Research Survey	175	113	100	64.5%	65.3%	52.3%
Combined	196	132	119	67.3%	69.1%	62.3%

Data Preparation

Data was collected via SurveyMonkey®, exported into Excel®, and imported into

PASW® Statistics software. At the conclusion of the data-collection period, the

researcher downloaded a total of 132 records from the pilot and research studies into a

Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet. The combined, raw data was cleaned to facilitate analysis.

For instance, the SurveyMonkey® download inserted two header rows on the spreadsheet.

The first row displayed the focus question for each section of the survey, and the second

showed the SurveyMonkey® question number. The researcher removed these two

headers and replaced them with one header containing researcher-identified question

numbers as needed for the eventual PASW® analysis.

The next step in data cleaning was standardizing entries for open-ended questions.

The entries requiring review, cleaning, and possible standardization included the

additional comments requested in sections one through four, job title, number of years in

current role, number of years at the institution, terminal degree, gender, race/ethnicity,

and year born. All open-text variables, with the exception of the comments text, were

standardized. The comments were reviewed and determined to provide no insight to the

study results. Job title was sorted into the categories of administrative with engagement,

administrative, director, director with engagement, professor, and other. Number of years

in current role was checked for numeric values and changed accordingly. The same

procedure was carried out for number of years at the institution. The terminal degree

responses were assigned to the categories of doctorate, master's, or bachelor's. The text

responses for gender were assigned to male and female. Race/ethnicity was categorized

into African-American, Asian, Caucasian, Latino, and other. The age of the respondent was calculated by subtracting the year born from the survey's current year (2010).

Three characteristics from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's (2009) institutional classifications were identified as relevant to this study and added to the research data Excel® document. The relevant Carnegie categories were institutional level, funding control, and degrees granted. Institutional level was standardized to include four-year and two-year institutions. Funding control was standardized to include public and private not-for-profit institutions. Also, type of degree-granting institution was standardized to include a doctorate-granting university, a master's college or university, a bachelor's college, an associate's college, a special-focus institution, or a tribal college.

The data set was then imported into PASW® for further preparation. The first step was to determine that each variable was appropriately labeled as nominal, ordinal, or categorical. Any responses with less than 75 percent of the survey completed or answering "no" to the consent were removed from the data. A total of 13 records were removed; three declined the consent, and 10 were incomplete. Using PASW®, the missing data statistics were generated for all items. This data was reviewed, and only one item approached the 10 percent missing level; therefore, all data was determined useable. This data-cleaning process resulted in 119 useable surveys.

Next, the frequency, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each item. The results were reviewed to ensure that the range of responses was appropriate for each item group: practices, institutional benefit, community benefit, costs, and support.

One set of analysis required the creation of four indices: institutional benefit, community benefit, cost, and support (Table 3.7). These four key measures were necessary to conduct the analysis required to further understand how different types of institutions operate. The index scores were created by summing together the items and then calculating the mean item mean. The mean item mean was calculated by adding the means of each item together and then dividing by the number of items. The mean item mean was used here because this calculation translates directly to the original four point response scale. The institutional benefit, community benefit, and cost indices demonstrate the overall values of the combined community-engagement practices. The support index reports the combined institutional support for the five support variables. The coefficient alpha for each index were examined to determine the reliability of the index measures (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The index measures demonstrate reliability with a range of alpha coefficients from .82 to .89, all over the minimum goal of .80.

Table 3.7

Key Measures: Mean Item Means and Validity

Index	Number of Items	M	SD	Mean Item Mean	Alpha
Institutional Benefit	12	43.9	4.25	3.66	.82
Community Benefit	12	42.7	5.55	3.56	.89
Institutional Cost	12	25.7	6.16	2.14	.88
Institutional Support	4	15.4	3.11	3.84	.84

Unfortunately the nature of the data did not allow for the development of an additive score for practices. At first, the researcher and methodologist proposed creating the additive score but determined at best this score would only identify the variety of practices which did not seem meaningful as an indicator of the intensity or significance of conducting the practices at an institution. An example of why a summative variety score would not be beneficial is one institution may be offering dozens of non-credit courses and would have a value of 1 and another institution only offering one non-credit course would also have a value of 1.

Description of Respondents

Of the 197 population contacts, 132 responded to the study and 119 were deemed useable. Table 3.8 provides a summary of the individual characteristics of the study's useable responses. The respondents ranged from 26 to 76 years of age, with a mean age of 51. The respondents are experienced and familiar with their institutions, as demonstrated by an average number of 14.75 years at their current institution and an average of 6.29 years in their current position. The majority (60.2 percent) of the respondents were female. More than 90 percent of the respondents identified themselves as Caucasian (93.6 percent). The remaining 6.4 percent were African-American (2.7 percent), Latino (1.8 percent), Asian (0.9 percent), and other (0.9 percent).

Table 3.8

Description of Data Set (n = 117)

Variable	Value	
Age (in years)	M = 51	SD = 11.2
Years at Current Institution	M = 14.8	SD = 10.4
Years in Current Role	M = 6.3	SD = 5.2
Gender		
Male	n = 45	39.8%
Female	n = 68	60.2%
Race		
Caucasian	n = 103	93.6%
African American	n = 3	2.7%
Latino	n = 2	1.8%
Asian	n = 1	0.9%
Other	n = 1	0.9%
Job Title		
Administrator	n = 18	16.2%
Administrator with engagement	n = 12	10.8%
Director	n = 25	22.5%
Director with engagement	n = 52	46.8%
Professor	n = 3	2.7%
Other	n = 1	0.9%
Terminal Degree		
Doctorate	n = 62	55.9%
Master's	n = 43	38.7%
Bachelor's	n = 6	5.4%

Note. n varies slightly due to missing data.

    The researcher designed the survey to allow the respondent to enter his or her title. At the conclusion of the study, the researcher standardized the titles to include the broad categories of administrator, administrator with engagement responsibilities, director, director with engagement responsibilities, professor, and other. Examples of

administrative titles include: President, Vice President, Provost, Dean, and Associate

Dean. Examples of director titles include: Director, Co-Director, or Assistant Director of

centers, institutes, or special initiatives within the organization. An overwhelming

majority of respondents, 96.3 percent, identified themselves as an administrator or

director, and 57.6 percent of this group specifically identified community engagement,

outreach, or service learning in their title. The remaining 3.6 percent were not in an

administrative or leadership position.

Not surprisingly, all respondents hold an advanced degree of doctorate (55.9

percent), master's (38.7 percent), or bachelor's (5.4 percent). The respondents were

asked to enter their degree in a text box. The researcher recoded the identified degrees

into the three categories of doctorate, master's, and bachelor's. The doctorate category

included degrees such as juris doctorate and doctor of philosophy.

Table 3.9 displays the institutional characteristics of the study respondents. The

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's classification data for 2009 was

used to identify the institutional characteristics. A point of interest is the majority (94

percent) of the institutions are four-year schools, compared to 6 percent two-year schools.

Funding control was more often public (61.5 percent) than private, not-for-profit (38.5

percent), and there were no for-profit institutions.

Institutions granting doctorate degrees hold the highest percentage, with 43.6

percent, compared to master's degrees at 40 percent and bachelor's degrees at 17 percent.

When the master's and bachelor's institutions are combined, this group makes up the

largest percentage (48.7 percent) of the institutions.

Table 3.9

Institutional Characteristics of Study Respondents (n=117)

	Frequency	
Variable	N	%
Institutional Level		
Four-Year Institution	110	94.0
Two-Year Institution	7	6.0
Funding Control		
Public Institution	72	61.5
Private, Not-for-Profit	45	38.5
Type of Degree Granted by Institution		
Doctorate University	51	43.6
Master's College or University	40	34.2
Baccalaureate College	17	14.5
Associate College	8	6.8
Special-Focus Institution	1	0.9

Note. n varies slightly due to missing data.

Data Analysis

The data collected for this study was analyzed using version 18 of the Predictive

Analytics SoftWare® (PASW) program. The study's first question asks for the frequency

of community-engagement practices. To answer this question, the researcher calculated

the frequency and mean percent of institutions conducting each of the 12 practices for

each of the time frames.   These calculations provided the frequency and percent of

institutions conducting each practice in one, two, three, four, and zero time frames. The

next calculations were the frequencies and percentages of practices being offered during

the single time period of 2008 through 2009. The practices were ranked from high to low

based on the recurrence of the practice during the two year period.

To answer question two, "What is the perceived relative benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution?", the researcher calculated the mean, mean rank, and standard deviation of the 12 practices. Practices were ranked based on mean, from highest to lowest benefit to the institution. These same calculations will be applied to research questions three ("What is the perceived, relative benefit of community-engagement practices for the community?") and four ("What is the perceived, relative cost of community-engagement practices to the institution?").

To answer research question five, "How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?", the researcher applied the average of participation by type of degree-granting institution (doctorate, master's, bachelor's, and associate's) to each of the twelve items.

To answer research question six, "What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?" the means, mean rank, and standard deviations were calculated for the four variables. These support variables were then ranked from high to low.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the similarity among institutions. As recipients of the Carnegie Classification of Engagement for 2006 and 2008, the participants are a select group demonstrating excellence in community-engagement practices.

In assessing the external validity of this study's findings the population of interest should be noted and the limitations of this pre-selected, elite group should be recognized. Any attempt to generalize this study's findings to the higher education population would be inappropriate.

The intent of this study was not to produce practice data to be generalized to the population from which one can draw statistical inferences of the total population. Instead, this study was intended to serve as an investigation of elite community institutions. This study was designed to provide empirical data to explain perceptions of state-of-the-art institutions and set benchmarks for community-engagement practice.

As a study of state-of-the-art institutions these findings provide documentation regarding the frequency, perceived benefits, perceived costs, and support of community engagement. Other institutions that wish to begin community-engagement initiatives will understand what successful programs are doing and the data generated from this study provides benchmarks for success.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study's purpose was to further understand the operationalization of community engagement in high-performing, community-engaged, higher education institutions. This chapter presents the findings in relation to the six research questions:

1. To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices?

2. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution?

3. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the community?

4. What is the perceived cost of community-engagement practices to the institution?

5. How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?

6. What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?

Findings Related to Research Question No. 1

To answer the first research question, "To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices," the researcher calculated the frequency, frequency percent, and frequency ranks for each individual half-year time period across the two-year time frame for each practice (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). Table 4.1 presents the frequency, frequency percent, and frequency rank of the community-engagement practices conducted by institutions during four time periods: January to June 2008, July to

December 2008, January to June 2009, and July to December 2009. An interesting trend

that was unveiled in Table 4.1's data is that institutions typically conduct the practice

during all four time frames or not at all. This trend holds true for every practice.

Table 4.1

Frequency of Participation in Community-Engagement Practices for Four Half-Year
Time Periods

	Frequency	
Practice	N	%
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	114	97.4
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	1	0.9
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	117	100
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	106	90.6
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	1	0.9
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	4	3.4
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	6	5.1
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	95	81.2
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	6	5.1
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	3	2.6
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	11	9.4
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	110	94
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	1	0.9
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	4	3.4

	Frequency	
Practice	N	%
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	96	81.4
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	20	16.9
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	100	85.5
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	4	3.4
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	11	9.4
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	99	83.9
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	1	0.8
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	6	5.1
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	12	10.2
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	105	89.0
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	11	9.3
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	83	70.3
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	3	2.5
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	6	5.1
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	4	3.4
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	22	18.6
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	98	83.1
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	3	2.5
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	6	5.1
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	2	1.7
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	9	7.6
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library		
Number of institutes offered for 4 of 4 half-year periods	97	82.2
Number of institutes offered for 3 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 2 of 4 half-year periods	1	0.8
Number of institutes offered for 1 of 4 half-year periods	0	0
Number of institutes offered for 0 of 4 half-year periods	20	16.9

To establish a more parsimonious understanding of how frequently the institutions conducted the practices, the researcher calculated a frequency of practice for the two-year periods (Table 4.2). The frequency of practice for each item was relatively high ─ not surprising given the fact that this population study contained high-functioning, community-engaged institutions. Not one practice falls below 80 percent, and several practices approach 100 percent institutional participation. The top third of the practices are directly related to students. These top four practices are: (a) offering extra-curricular activities, (b) offering for-credit courses, (c) providing students with community-based internships, and (d) integrating community engagement into student leadership development. The bottom four practices, or bottom third, were as follows: (a) involving students in conducting community-based research, (b) allowing community use of the public library, (c) providing faculty consultations to the community, and (d) offering non-credit workshops to the community.

Findings Related to Research Question No. 2

The second research question asked, "What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution?" Presented in Table 4.3 are the means, mean ranks, and standard deviations of items measuring benefit to the institution for community-engagement practices. Given the respondents' expertise and experience with community engagement, naturally there was a quite high and restricted variation in the item means for institutional benefits. The means ranged from 3.13 to 3.91 on a four-point scale of 1 (little or no benefit), 2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit). The mean of item means was 3.66.

Table 4.2

Frequency of Institutions Offering Community-Engagement Practices Over the Two-Year Time Frame of 2008 to 2009 (n=117)

Practice	Institutions Conducting Identified Practice Any Time During 2008 – 2009		
	N	Percent	Rank
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	117	100	1
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	115	98.3	2
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	113	96.6	3
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	111	94.9	4
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities	109	92.4	5
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	107	90.7	6
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	106	90.6	7.5
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs	106	90.6	7.5
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	106	89.8	9
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library	98	83.1	10.5
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	98	83.1	10.5
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	96	81.4	12

The top three ranked practices for institutional benefit were both student-centered to include for-credit courses and students participating in internships. The bottom three

practices were providing faculty consultation services, offering non-credit courses, and

permitting community use of the library. The ranked means identified a tie between

integrating student leadership development opportunities and involving students in

community-based research for the fourth and fifth rankings.

Table 4.3

Perceived Institutional Benefit of Community-Engagement Practices

Practice	Institutional Benefit	
	Rank	Mean (SD)
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	1	3.91 (.28)
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	2	3.84 (.49)
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3	3.83 (.55)
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	4.5	3.75 (.47)
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	4.5	3.75 (.60)
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	6	3.74 (.53)
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	7	3.72 (.60)
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities	8	3.65 (.58)
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs	9	3.54 (.68)
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	10	3.43 (.79)
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	11	3.35 (.78)
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	12	3.13 (.91)

Note. The four-point response scale for each item was as follows: 1 (little or no benefit), 2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit).

Findings Related to Research Question No. 3

The third research question asked, "What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the community?" The means, mean ranks, and standard deviations of items measuring benefit to the community were calculated (Table 4.4). The community benefit mean variation was extremely tight, with a range of 3.36 to 3.72. The same four-point scale applies to this question: 1 (little or no benefit), 2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit). The mean of item means was 3.56. The presence of two ties in the ranking demonstrates the restricted variation. The tied rankings were fifth and sixth and also ninth and tenth.

The top two ranked practices for community benefit were providing students community-based internships and community-campus partnerships. The bottom three ranked practices were non-credit workshops, library use, and student leadership development.

Findings Related to Research Question No. 4

The fourth research question asked, "What is the perceived relative cost of community-engagement practices to the institution?" The means, mean ranks, and standard deviations of the items measuring the cost to the institution were calculated for each practice (Table 4.5). The institutional cost means ranged from 1.58 to 2.54, with a mean of item means of 2.14 on a four-point scale of 1(little or no cost), 2 (some cost), 3 (moderate cost), and 4 (high cost). All practices were identified as having little to less-than-moderate costs. Respondents reported perceived relative differences in cost for community-engagement practices, although the range is small. No ties in ranks existed.

The number one ranked practice was offering non-credit workshops. The lowest cost

practice was "permitting community members to use the campus library."

Table 4.4

Perceived Community Benefit of Community-Engagement Practices

Practice	Community Benefit	
	Rank	Mean (SD)
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	1	3.72 (.60)
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	2	3.68 (.63)
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	3	3.64 (.57)
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	4	3.63 (.69)
2. Offering extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	5.5	3.57 (.62)
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs	5.5	3.57 (.68)
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities	7	3.55 (.66)
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	8	3.49 (.71)
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	9.5	3.48 (.74)
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	9.5	3.48 (.78)
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	11	3.39 (.80)
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	12	3.36 (.73)

Note. The four-point response scale for each item was as follows: 1 (little or no benefit),
2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit).

Table 4.5

Perceived Cost of Community-Engagement Practices to the Institution

Practice	Institutional Cost	
	Rank	Mean (SD)
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	1	2.54 (.83)
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	2	2.43 (.82)
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	3	2.38 (.81)
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	4	2.30 (.78)
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	5	2.25 (.78)
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	6	2.21 (.90)
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	7	2.14 (.84)
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs	8	2.12 (.75)
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	9	2.10 (.80)
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	10	2.08 (.78)
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities	11	1.60 (.66)
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	12	1.58 (.66)

Note. The four-point response scale for each item was as follows: 1 (little or no cost), 2 (some cost), 3 (moderate cost), and 4 (high cost).

Findings Related to Research Question No. 5

The fifth question was, "How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?" The researcher first derived the percent of participation or

recurrence of the practice for each practice across all institutions (Table 4.1). Next, the

percent of institutions conducting each practice was calculated based on institutional

type. Table 4.6 presents the percentage of all institutions conducting the practice and the

percentage of participation by institutional type.

Table 4.6

Frequency Percentage of Participation in Community-Engagement Practices by Institutional Type

Practice	Frequency of Participation				
	All Institutions	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's	Associate's
	n=118	n=50	n=16	n=40	n=8
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	100	100	100	100	100
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	98	96	100	100	100
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	97	99	98	94	88
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	95	96	88	94	100
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities	92	91	84	92	88
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	91	95	93	81	69
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	91	94	88	77	50
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs	91	90	84	94	88
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	90	95	92	73	50
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library.	83	83	83	88	75
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	83	91	84	69	50
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	81	91	72	50	63

The top-ranked practice, offering extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students, reported 100 percent participation by all institutions without regard to institutional type. The second-ranked practice, offering for-credit engagement courses to students, was conducted by 98 percent of the institutions. Ninety-six percent of the doctorate-granting institutions conducted this practice, compared to 100 percent of the institutions granting master's, bachelor's, and associate's degrees. The practice of "offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members" falls to the bottom of the frequency ranking, with 81 percent of the institutions conducting this practice. Ninety-one percent of the doctorate-granting institutions and 72, 50, and 63 percent of master's, bachelor's, and associate's degree granting institutions conducted this practice, respectively.

Findings Related to Research Question No. 6

To answer the question, "What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?", the researcher calculated the means, mean ranks, and standard deviations of the items measuring support for community engagement (Table 4.7). The item means ranged from 3.61 to 4.03 on a five-point Likert Scale of 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent). The mean item mean was 3.84. Overall, the support variables demonstrate the perception that support for community engagement was good to very good for all variables. The administrative support for community engagement ranked highest, and faculty support ranked lowest.

Table 4.7

Institutional Support for Community Engagement

| | Institutional Support | |
Item	Rank	Mean (SD)
Administrative support for community engagement at my institution	1	4.03 (1.0)
Student support for community engagement at my institution	2	3.94 (0.8)
Staff support for community engagement at my institution	3	3.79 (0.1)
Faculty support for community engagement at my institution	4	3.61 (0.9)

Note: The five-point response scale for each item was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent).

Additional Analysis

The researcher conducted additional analysis to answer three emerging questions: (a) What is the interplay between benefits and costs?, (b) What is the relationship of institutional type to the community engagement?, and (c) What influence does institutional type have on the practice item "offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)?"

What is the interplay between benefits and costs?

Upon answering the research questions, the researcher identified the need to understand the interplay between cost and benefit. Identifying the best alternative to address this question was complex. The process of identifying the most appropriate alternative was complicated by the benefit measures having very high scores and all measures showing restrictive ranges. Three attempts were made to provide insight into the cost-benefit relationship by the creation of: (a) a table representation of benefit means and costs, (b) a scatter plot, and (c) a ratio index.

The first attempt involved creating a table of benefit means, cost means, and frequency of practices. This table can be found in Appendix J. The researcher's review of this table provided little insight into a better understanding of the interplay between costs and benefits.

The second attempt involved graphically displaying the data. The objective was to create a scatter plot to visually display the benefit and cost relationships of one practice relative to another. Again, due to the limited range in means, the scatter plot had tight clustering. This graphical representation was found to be of no value in providing insight into the cost-benefit relationship of the practices.

The third attempt was creating a mathematical index or a series of ratio indices (Tables 4.8 and 4.9). The benefit-cost ratio was calculated by dividing the benefit mean by the cost mean for institutional benefits (Table 4.8) and community benefits (Table 4.9). If the benefit-cost ratio is greater than one, the benefit of the practice is greater than the cost. Ranking the benefit-cost ratios identifies the practices with the greatest benefit for the cost. The top three ranked practices for both institutional and community benefit are as follows: (1) seeking input from the community in planning, (2) permitting community members to use the campus library, and (3) maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships. The bottom two ranked practices for both institutional and community benefit are conducting community-based research in and with the community and offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to the community.

Table 4.8

Institutional Benefit-Cost Ratios

Practice	Institutional Benefit Mean[a]	Cost Mean[b]	Institutional Benefit/Cost Ratio	Rank of Ratio
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities	3.65	1.60	2.28	1
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	3.13	1.58	1.98	2
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3.83	2.10	1.82	3
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	3.75	2.08	1.80	4
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	3.84	2.14	1.79	5
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs	3.54	2.12	1.67	6
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	3.75	2.25	1.67	7
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	3.91	2.38	1.64	8
2. Offering extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	3.74	2.30	1.63	9
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	3.43	2.21	1.55	10
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	3.72	2.43	1.53	11
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	3.35	2.54	1.32	12

Note. [a]Institutional Benefit Mean from Table 4.3. [b]Cost Mean from Table 4.5.

Table 4.9

Community Benefit-Cost Ratios

Practice	Community Benefit Mean[a]	Cost Mean[b]	Community Benefit/Cost Ratio	Rank of Ratio
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities	3.55	1.60	2.22	1
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	3.39	1.58	2.15	2
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3.68	2.10	1.75	3
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships	3.72	2.14	1.74	4
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs	3.57	2.12	1.68	5
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities	3.36	2.08	1.62	6
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g., faculty expertise to solve problems)	3.49	2.21	1.58	7
2. Offering extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students (e.g., non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism)	3.57	2.30	1.55	8
4. Involving students in conducting community-based research (to include action and applied research)	3.48	2.25	1.55	9
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g., for-credit service-learning)	3.64	2.38	1.53	10
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action and applied research)	3.63	2.43	1.49	11
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)	3.48	2.54	1.37	12

Note. [a]Community benefit mean from Table 4.3. [b]Cost mean from Table 4.5.

Practice No. 10 has the lowest institutional and community benefit-cost ratios. This practice is also found at the bottom of the frequency ranking and has the lowest institutional benefit mean and falls in the bottom third community benefit means.

The two practices conducted most often, No. 2 and No. 1, are found in the bottom half of both the institutional and community benefit-cost ratio rankings. Practice No. 2 has the highest frequency and falls in the middle of the institutional and community benefit mean rankings. The institutional and community benefit-cost ratios for this practice are 1.63 and 1.55 for 9th and 8th place rankings in the respective benefit-cost ratio ranks.

Practice No. 1 is the second most conducted practice. This same practice, without consideration of cost, is ranked first and third in institutional and community benefit respectively. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.61 and the practice is ranked eighth in the benefit-cost ranking.

What is the relationship of institutional type to the perceptions of benefits, costs, and support of community engagement?

The first step toward the analysis for institutional type and community engagement was creating four index measures: institutional benefit, community benefit, institutional cost, and institutional support. The means of means, standard deviations, and mean item means were calculated for each of the four index items (Table 3.7).

The next step was calculating the mean item mean of the index items by institutional type. Table 4.10 presents the results of these calculations. Institutional benefit and community benefit demonstrate very little difference in means by institutional type. Doctorate-granting institutions have the highest means for both institutional benefit

(3.70) and community benefit (3.61). Associate's-granting institutions identified the

greatest institutional support (4.13) and the lowest institutional cost (1.63).

Table 4.10

Key Measure Indices by Institutional Type

| Institutional Type | Key Measure Index | | | |
	Institution Benefit M (SD)	Community Benefit M (SD)	Institutional Cost M (SD)	Institutional Support M (SD)
Doctorate	3.70 (.35)	3.61 (.44)	2.12 (.47)	3.91 (.73)
Master's	3.67 (.33)	3.57 (.40)	2.21 (.54)	3.78 (.83)
Bachelor's	3.63 (.38)	3.57 (.35)	2.22 (.36)	3.68 (.77)
Associate's	3.63 (.45)	3.36 (.86)	1.63 (.49)	4.13 (.89)

Note: The institutional and community benefit response scale was 1 (little or no benefit), 2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit). The cost response scale for each item was as follows: 1 (little or no cost), 2 (some cost), 3 (moderate cost), and 4 (high cost). The support response scale was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (excellent).

What influence does institutional type have on the practice item "offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus)"?

Based on the researcher's professional experience and knowledge, practice No. 10

─ offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off

campus) ─ demonstrated some unpredicted results in the various rankings. The

researcher found the placement of the practice "offering non-credit workshops, trainings,

and courses to community members (on or off campus)" unexpected. This practice was

ranked in the bottom three for both institutional and community benefits and was ranked

first in institutional cost. The researcher would have expected opposite rankings, because

non-credit courses are often revenue-generating, community-based programs. Because of this anomaly, further in-depth analysis of this particular practice was conducted.

The item level means and standard deviation of institutional benefit, community benefit, and institutional cost were calculated for this practice by institutional type (Table 4.11). The doctorate-granting institutions perceive the highest level of institutional benefit, with a mean of 3.45. The Master's-granting institutions reported the highest community benefit (3.59) and the highest institutional cost (2.76). The Associate's-granting institutions identified the lowest institutional benefit (3.13), lowest community benefit (3.36), and lowest cost (1.63). This analysis did not provide any significant explanation of the benefit and cost rankings.

Table 4.11

Benefit and Cost Means by Type of Institution for the Practice "Offered Non-credit Workshops, Training, and Courses to Community Members (On or Off Campus)"

	Institution Benefit M (SD)	Community Benefit M (SD)	Institutional Cost M (SD)
Doctorate	3.45 (.65)	3.55 (.69)	2.40 (.74)
Master's	3.38 (.72)	3.59 (.65)	2.76 (.82)
Bachelor's	3.20 (1.0)	3.29 (.91)	2.64 (1.0)
Associate's	3.13 (1.4)	3.00 (1.4)	2.00 (.93)

Notes: The four-point response scale for benefits was as follows: 1 (little or no benefit), 2 (some benefit), 3 (moderate benefit), and 4 (high benefit). The four-point response scale for institutional cost item was 1 (little or no cost), 2 (some cost), 3 (moderate cost), and 4 (high cost).

Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings of the research study. In summary, the major finding of the research were that institutions demonstrate very little difference in their perceptions of benefit between the institution and the community and in general place high value on all community-engagement practices. Overall, the relative perceived costs for community-engagement practices were low and both institutional and community benefits were perceived to be relatively high. Institutions either conducted specific community-engagement practices or not over the time periods of this study, and institutional type had little impact on the behavior of the institution and the conduct of offerings of community-engagement practices.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study, all 12 community engagement practices were confirmed to have a high percentage of exemplary, community-engaged, higher education institutions conducting each practice. In addition to conducting practices at a high level, the exemplary institutions reported that practices produced high relative benefits and low relative costs. Even so, there was variation among the prevalence of practices and the reported perceived benefits and perceived costs. This chapter reports the significant conclusions and implications of these findings. With the purpose of facilitating this discussion, the chapter is divided into five sections: summary of the study, conclusions and discussions, implications for theory, implications for practice, and chapter summary. The first section, summary of the study, briefly reviews the design and major findings of the study. The second section, conclusions and discussions, presents four conclusions and discusses them in the context of relevant literature. The third section, implications for theory, speaks to the contributions this study has made to the fields of community engagement and higher education. The fourth section, implications for practice, outlines the impact the study's findings have for practitioners. The fifth section, chapter summary, provides a closing reflection.

Summary of Study

This study's purpose was to further understand the operationalization of community engagement in high-performing, community-engaged, higher education institutions. This section presents the findings in relation to the six research questions:

1. To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices?

2. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution?

3. What is the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the community?

4. What is the perceived cost of community-engagement practices to the institution?

5. How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?

6. What is the perceived institutional support for community engagement?

This quantitative study gathered data from exemplary community-engaged institutions. Of the 196 institutions, 119 responded to the web-based survey instrument. Five topics of interest were investigated and generated the results that informed the findings of this study: practices, institutional benefit, community benefit, institutional perceived cost, and institutional perceived support.

The first research question asked, "To what extent are institutions conducting community-engagement practices?" All the responding institutions were high practitioners of community engagement, demonstrated by the frequency range of 81.4 percent to 100 percent of the institutions conducting various practices. Offering extra-curricular activities to students was the top-ranked practice, and offering non-credit workshops was the lowest ranked in frequency.

A detailed investigation of the practice frequency for the four time frames demonstrated that conducting the practice in all four time periods holds the highest percentage of responses and that conducting the practice in zero of the four time periods holds the second-highest percentage of responses. In summary, the institution typically conducted the practice in all four time frames or did not conduct the practice at all.

The second and third research questions addressed the perceived benefit of community-engagement practices for the institution and the community, respectively. The results identify a high level of perceived benefit for both the institution and the community for all practices of community engagement. The top-three ranked practices are the same for both institutional and community benefits, with only the order of ranked practices differing. The practice of offering for-credit engagement courses to students (service-learning) was ranked first in institutional benefit and third in community benefit. The practice of providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships was ranked second for institutional benefit and first for community benefit. The practice of maintaining a reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnership was ranked third for institutional benefit and second for community benefit.

The fourth research question asked, "What is the perceived cost of community-engagement practices for the institution?" The perceived costs of community-engagement practices are relatively low, with the highest mean perceived cost of 2.54 on a 4.0 scale. The practice of offering non-credit workshops, trainings, and courses to community members had the highest perceived cost. The practice with the lowest cost was permitting community members to use the campus library.

The fifth research question asked, "How does institutional type impact community-engagement practices?" The type of school appears to have little influence on

the frequency of practice among this special sample. When the ranked results are divided

into thirds, the items found in the top, middle, and bottom thirds are the same ─ with only

the order of the items within the divisions differing for each institutional type (Table 4.6).

Using this review of the findings, the researcher found that four-year schools conducted

the practices related to scholarly practice, research, and faculty consulting more often

than the two-year schools, and the two-year schools integrated community engagement

into student leadership development opportunities more often than four-year schools.

The sixth research question asked, "What is the perceived institutional support for

community engagement?" Support for community engagement was high, with mean

scores documenting good to very good support by administration, faculty, staff, and

students. Of these, administrative support ranked highest, student support ranked second,

and staff support ranked third. Faculty members were the fourth or bottom-ranked

supporter for community engagement.

Researchers in the field of community engagement have identified the role of

institutional leadership as pivotal to the success of institutionalizing community

engagement (Holland, 2009; Sandmann & Plater, 2009). The findings from these

exemplary, high-performing institutions contributes to the literature by providing further

evidence of the importance that administrative support exerts on the implementation of

community-engagement practices.

Additional analysis produced benefit-cost ratios for both the perceived

institutional benefit and the perceived community benefit. The ratio provides a numeric

value for comparing one practice with another with respect to the relationship of

perceived benefit value to the perceived cost value of the practice. A review of the

ranked ratios revealed that the top-three and the bottom-two benefit-cost ratios for both

the institution and the community were identical (Tables 4.8 and 4.9). Based on the benefit-cost relationship identified by the benefit-cost ratio, institutions should place a priority on (a) seeking input from the community, (b) allowing library use, and (c) maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships to produce the maximum community and institutional benefit for the investment of resources. From a cost-benefit perspective, a lower priority should be given to the resource-intensive items of conducting community-based research and offering non-credit workshops.

Conclusions

This section will discuss four conclusions that are based on the themes of (a) prevalence of practice, (b) faculty research support, (c) decision making, and (d) benefits and costs.

Conclusion One - Prevalence of Practice: Exemplary institutions conduct community-engagement practices with high prevalence.

The institutions studied were considered community-engaged institutions, and were recognized by the Carnegie Foundation as having institutionalized community engagement (Driscoll, 2008). All 12 community-engagement practices were identified as being conducted at a high frequency, evidenced by the fact that not one of the practices had a frequency below 80 percent. The high frequency of institutions conducting the community-engagement practices supports the assumption that these organizations had institutionalized community engagement (Hartley, 2009).

One possible reason for the institutional similarities in conducting practices is that all these institutions made a deliberate decision to become community-engaged, therefore these institutions are pre-determined to be similar. But, because there was some variation in the practices conducted, mimetic isomorphic pressures could have pushed these

organizations toward behaving in similar manners (Gorgol & Hartley, 2009). Isomorphic pressure occurs because, as institutional theory dictates, organizations strive to reach stability even while introducing new innovations into the environment (Scott, 2008; Meyers & Rowan, 1977). When organizations are uncertain of how to act, they mimic the practices of successful organizations ─ hoping to create the same success. In this situation, the organization had introduced community engagement and was attempting to reach stability as quickly as possible. Decision makers respond to mimetic isomorphic pressures and look to other successful organizations for guidance (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This study generated a list of 12 practices that will allow organizations to respond to mimetic isomorphic pressures quickly and with confidence. In addition to providing guidance in conducting practices, this list provides higher education decision makers a tool for benchmarking community engagement practices within their organization and over time (Gorgol & Hartley, 2009).

The top-four ranked practices are practices supported by the instruction role of faculty and emphasize student involvement to include service-learning, extra-curricular engagement, internships, and student leadership opportunities. This priority given to student-oriented practices evidences the influence that the student social justice or service-learning movement has on the current environment of community engagement (DHUD, 2001; Hartley, 2009; London, 2001). Students began the call for a greater social-justice agenda for student work in higher education in the 1960s, and these practices continue today. Another explanation based in the theories of the neoliberal university and academic capitalism that consider all actions as economically driven, is that students are considered an institutional commodity to be used in trade for external

102

support and resources (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000, 2004). Therefore, the economic impact drives student-oriented practices to the top of the rankings.

Conclusion Two – Faculty Research Support: Faculty research related variables received low ranks.

The six practices that are based on the research aspects of faculty work were clustered together and were found in the 6th through 12th rankings in frequency of practice. Couple the low rate of frequency for research oriented practices with faculty's low support for community engagement, as reported by administrators, and these findings related to faculty become significant.

This phenomenon could be a demonstration of enclaving as described by Levine (1980). The institution has allowed community-engagement practices to exist as long as the characteristics remain within the traditions of higher education. The study does not specifically address whether enclaving or diffusion occurs, but the data related to the practice rankings and the number of administrators with engagement and director titles suggests that the innovation of community engagement has experienced acceptance ─ but only with certain segments of the institution. The student-oriented or instruction practices were more prevalent because these practices did not demand a shift in the current norms for academic scholarship. Faculty involvement in the community through their research work, either through consulting or research in the community, demands a paradigm shift in the traditions of faculty work and scholarship (Boyer, 1990; O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 211). Based on the low support by faculty and the low practice the assumption could be made that faculty work in area of research is on the periphery of the community-engagement movement when observing the institutions at the broad level seen by administrators.

Conclusion Three - Decision Making: Administrators do not make decisions to conduct community-engagement practices based on the efficiency of benefits and costs.

The findings for institutional and community benefits suggested that institutions concentrate on student-oriented practices; yet, when the benefit and cost are considered simultaneously as a ratio, the ranking changes and the decisions become significantly different. For example, consider the practice of allowing use of the campus public library. This practice appears to have little benefit to the community, with a rank of 11 out of 12 for community benefit. However, the library's use is ranked second in the benefit-cost ratio. The extremely low cost relative to the benefit suggests opening the campus library to the public was a simple, quick, and inexpensive community-engaged practice and therefore should be one of the first decisions made when seeking to create a community-engaged institution.

Cohen and March (1986) suggest that education administrators make decisions based on the relationship of the issue to their administrative goals and that decisions are positive for practices supporting those goals. Cohen and March also recognize that decisions of low importance can be missed or ignored when there is an environmental overload and a high demand for decision making. The low frequency rank for opening the campus library to the public could be a manifestation of a low importance decision getting overlooked in an overloaded decision-making environment. This seemingly straightforward decision was overlooked due to more important decisions demanding immediate responses from administrators.

When making decisions on how to establish priorities for conducting community-engagement practices, decisions can be quite unique depending on the data being

considered. The benefit-cost ratio data and the frequency of practice data produce

different rankings for the practices, therefore yielding different best practices for decision

making. As an example, consider the top-three ranked benefit-cost ratios for both

institutional and community benefit and the corresponding frequency of practice ranks

(Table 5.1). Assume there was a need to set priorities for the implementation of

community-engagement practices. The decision to implement practices based on benefit-

cost ratios would identify the three practices listed in Table 5.1 as the priority practices.

If the decision to implement practices was based on the frequency of exemplary

institutions conducting the practice then these three practices would move from the top

three choices to the bottom half of preferred choices.

Table 5.1

The Top-Three Ranked Benefit-Cost Ratio Practices and Their Frequency of Practice
Ranks

Item	Institutional Benefit-Cost Ratio Rank	Community Benefit-Cost Ratio Rank	Frequency of Practice Rank
11. Seeking input from community in planning engagement activities	1	1	5
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library	2	2	10.5
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3	3	6

The study's findings provides evidence that decisions related to frequency of

practice are not based on the consideration of producing the most benefit for the least

investment of resources. The implementation of practices is more likely influenced by

factors such as (a) isomorphic pressures as described by DiMaggio and Powell (1983),

105

(b) decision making process based on experience as described by Cohen and March (1986), or (c) the pressure for public prestige and rankings (Meekins & O'Meara, 2011). The normative isomorphic pressures would cause an organization to adopt similar practices of other institutions, based on the pressures from the professional field of community engagement and the need to conform to accepted standards established by the field of community engagement. Also, the positive experiences of other institutions would influence administrators to make decisions similar to these institutions.

The literature review revealed that the majority of education administrators make decisions from structured or political frames. The researcher assumed this study would support and provide evidence suggesting the sole use of the structured frame (Bolman & Deal, 1991b); however, the findings did not fully support this assumption. If administrators were making decisions from the structural frame, the decision would have been based on efficiency and the bottom line. The benefit-cost ratio ranking provides a list of best practices based on efficiency and producing the greatest benefit for the least cost. This benefit-cost ranking would be the priority ranking if decisions were made based on the bottom line. The ranked frequency of practices produced a different order or priority for community-engagement practices. Therefore, decision making most likely occurs more heavily from the political frame, where decisions are made based on the leader being an advocate or negotiator and less heavily from the structural or bottom line frame.

The current ranking systems for higher education are based on student inputs and peer-reviewed survey results and are the standards for institutional prestige (Meekins & O'Meara, 2011). Administrators are forced to make student-oriented activities a priority. The institutional need to maintain its prestige in the public rankings would explain why

student-oriented community engagement practices rise to the top of the frequency ranks of this study even though these practices may not be the most cost-efficient when trying to conduct community-engaged activities.

Conclusion Four – Benefits and Costs: Community-engagement practices produce equally high levels of benefit for both the institution and the community, with low levels of cost.

This study's credibility in regards to benefits and costs could be challenged, arguing that the respondents ─ as champions for community engagement at their institutions ─ have learned to advocate with a bias toward community engagement. Though, the study was not designed to avoid respondent influence of social desirability of response, from the perspective of downplaying costs and over-emphasizing benefits, the study results do not present a respondent bias. Furthermore, the internal variation of benefit ratings established the credibility of the benefit results. This variation in ratings among the items was demonstrated by the range of 3.13 to 3.91 for institutional benefit and 3.36 to 3.72 for community benefit. Further evidence that the respondents made choices in their ratings was the broader pattern of institutional benefits being rated slightly higher than community benefits. The differentiation of ratings may be only slight, but the variation demonstrates the validity of the results. This variation offers evidence that the respondents provided credible data and did not simply choose a predetermined response for all items.

The study results for cost demonstrate a perception of generally low costs, with practice-cost means ranging from 1.58 to 2.54 out of a possible 4.0. The cost of community engagement was interpreted as little to some cost, with none of the items being designated as moderate or high cost. The same type of variation and ranges as seen

107

in the benefit results was also found in the cost data, hence providing validity of the cost results. The variation in the ranges of responses demonstrates the credibility of the cost data.

Implications for Theory

This study was informed by the literature of institutional theory and community engagement, assessed the practices of community engagement, and contributed to the scholarly field of community engagement and higher education. The theoretical contributions of this study are in the arenas of community engagement, decision making, benefit and cost, and innovation and institutional theory.

Community Engagement and Higher Education - Practices

This study contributes a concise, vetted list of community-engagement practices to the community-engagement literature. The identification of the 12 practices provides a tool for further research studies in this area. A rigorous and diligent process, with the goal of creating a comprehensive list of practices demonstrating the activities or outputs of community engagement, generated the list of 12 practices. The frequency of the practices provided data beneficial to the field of community engagement as work is conducted to answer the question, "What is community engagement?"

An additional contribution to the field of community engagement is the researcher-developed survey instrument, which can be used with or without modifications for future research studies. The survey instrument's scholarly contribution was the development and measurement of the five key variables related to community engagement: (1) practice, (2) institutional benefit, (3) community benefit, (4) cost, and (5) support. The ability to measure these key elements would be useful for scholars

wishing to perform correlation studies and further explore the cause of variation in these elements among a wider range of institutions.

The prevalence and distribution of instruction- versus research-oriented practices contributes to the discussions in the community-engagement literature regarding faculty roles and faculty acceptance of community engagement ─ and more generally, acceptance of other changes that may be introduced to the academy.

Decision making

The findings of this study help inform administrative decision making related to community-engagement practices. This study further contributes to the discussion of administrator perceptions of prevalence, benefit, and cost of community-engagement practices ─ contributing to further understanding of the knowledge and assumptions that administrators hold.

Cost-Benefit

The cost and benefit data is important to the field of community engagement and higher education in general because this study was a first step toward providing empirical data addressing engagement costs and benefits. This cost-and-benefit analysis assists in filling a gap identified in the community-engagement research. The data collected and the process identified in this study are an introduction to better understanding the impact perceived costs and benefits have on decision making relevant to community-engagement practices. This study contributes to the ongoing conversations concerning the difficulty of capturing costs and benefits for community engagement (specifically) and in higher education (generally).

Innovation and Institutional Theory

This study was grounded in the theory of institutional and diffusion theories and contributes to the discussions in these areas. The findings provide insight and opportunities for further discussion on how and why institutions of higher education operationalize community engagement.

Implications for Practice

The researcher recognizes that the results of this study cannot be generalized for all institutions and that the assumption cannot be made that all institutions behave in the same manner identified by the study's findings. Based on the nature of this exemplary population and the researcher's knowledge, the assumption was made that the study's respondents had a commitment to community engagement, had established successful programs, and had made rational decisions on what to support. Based on these assumptions, the findings have meaning for a larger group, and the data provided can be used in practice by administrators and advocates of community engagement. Although the studied institutions were engaged widely in the practices, there were differences that can inform other decision makers when implementing community engagement. The findings of this study contribute to practice by providing a baseline of practices, benefit data, cost data, and professional-development guidance.

Baseline of Practices

This study provides a baseline of practices for practitioners and administrators. This robust yet concise list of practices is beneficial to community-engagement advocates and decision-makers. The list of practices allows for comparing and contrasting institutions against their own practices over time or with other aspirant institutions, to

include the model institutions of this study. This type of data is appropriate and crucial for use in strategic planning and campus-community decision making.

Benefit and Cost Data

Generally, this study provides an opportunity to make cost-and-benefit information visible and available for consideration and adds to the intentionality around cost and benefit decision making. The benefit-and-cost data is beneficial to decision-makers moving toward a more engaged institution. Administrators or community-engagement advocates can use the data to request organizational and financial support for community-engagement practices. This data also demonstrates to potential institutions or decision-makers that the benefits for both the institution and the community outweigh institutional costs. The levels of costs and benefits can assist in decision making as institutions work toward the further institutionalization of community engagement.

Professional Development

Professional development is crucial in the advancement of community engagement within higher education (Sandmann, 2006). The findings from this study contribute to the curriculum development for programs designed for administrators and those seeking to advance the community-engagement movement. Understanding the tangible practices, prevalence of practices, student- and faculty-oriented practices, and even the benefits and costs of the practices are all potential subject matter for professional development.

Future Research

This quantitative study was a beginning to further understanding administrative decision making and the influence of costs, benefits, and support on the

institutionalization of community engagement. Based on the findings of this study, a number of recommendations for future research were identified:

- This study was designed to and provided an approximate measure for frequency of practices. In this study's broad look at conducting practice, the question that was asked was whether the practice was conducted or not. Some institutions may have had a comprehensive, in-depth application and others a limited application of the practice, but both of these institutions would have provided the same response for this study. An in-depth investigation into the extent to which and the nature of the practices conducted should be a topic for future research. Other more specific questions that need to be answered are: What is the rationale behind the choice of practices? What is the intentionality in the variety and volume of practices? Is the list of practices appropriate? If so, under what conditions are these practices appropriate? Is the variety and intensity of the practices the appropriate mix for the institution? for the field of community engagement?

- Future research is needed to answer the question, "Why do organizations conduct these community-engagement practices?" For example, is the practice conducted due to isomorphic pressures or because the practice is the best option for achieving the mission of community engagement?

- This study addressed costs and benefits from the relative perspective of the respondent and only provided a scaled-mean score. A more traditional and rigorous cost-and-utility analysis study would attach monetary or numeric values to community engagement costs and benefits.

- Another opportunity for future research is a qualitative investigation of a few institutions to better understand the impact that inputs such as faculty support,

student support, administrative support, and operational supplies have on successful community-engagement programs.

- Future research on a larger population is needed to produce generalizable results. The findings of this study cannot be generalized. For example, the assumption cannot be made that all engaged institutions offer extra-curricular community-engagement activities to students or that only 89.8 percent of institutions conducted community-based research.

- Future research is needed to address the decision making that occurs in higher education institutions. How does benefit-cost ratio data impact decision making? Are the decisions unique to community-engagement practices? Would the decision process of excluding the consideration of cost occur for other functions of higher education? Would the same decisions for practices be made by non-exemplary institutions? Who's making the decisions? What is the intentionality of the decisions? Under what conditions are these decision made?

- This study collected data from administrators of community engagement institutions and asked for input based on their perceptions of faculty support. A research study is needed that investigates faculty attitudes and support for community engagement by asking faculty directly.

- The practice of providing non-credit workshops with the low ranks in institutional and community benefit and high rank in institutional cost warrants further investigation. The questions that need to be answered include: Is this ranking due to a shift in institutional priorities? Is continuing education backing away from providing free community programming? What types of programs are

administrators identifying as non-credit workshops when ranking this practice high in cost and low in benefit?

- There is a need to conduct further research with an adapted survey instrument that will capture commentary from study participants in order to identify the context in which the practices are occurring. The survey asked for general comments in each section but more pointed questions are needed to provide context. When rating the practices a brief explanation from the respondent answering why the top practice and bottom practice were ranked this way would provide insight for the study's findings.

Chapter Summary

U.S. higher education's civic and public service mission dates back to the Colonial era yet has occasionally wavered as societal and organizational demands have changed. In particular, many have argued that during the last 30 years, the private good of individuals and organizations has taken precedence over serving the public good (Bardo, 2009; Dubb, 2007; Hartley, 2009; Kallison & Cohen, 2010; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). In response to this public perception and the resulting pressure, institutions have turned to community engagement as a set of principles to address the multifaceted civic commitment and public service responsibility.

The community engagement movement, as an innovation within higher education, aims to revitalize the practices of civic and public service. This renewed emphasis on practicing community engagement and the current economic and political environments result in decision making challenges for administrators and engagement advocates. This study's findings provide insight into the practices of community-engagement and facilitate the intentionality of community-engagement conversations.

REFERENCES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Anderson, K. S. (2008). *Predictors and program outcomes of empowering practices of FFA chapter advisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Aronson, K. R. & Webster, N. (2007). A model for creating engaged land-grant universities: Penn state's engagement ladder model. *Innovative Higher Education*, *31(*5), 265-277.

Bardo, J. W. (2009). The impact of the changing climate for accreditation on the individual college or university: Five trends and their implications. *New Directions for Higher Education,* (145), 47-58. doi:10.1002/he.334

Boardman, A., Greenberg, D, Vining, A. & Weimer, D. (2006). *Cost-benfit analysis: Concepts and practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991a). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management, 30*(4), 509-534.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991b). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyte, H. & Hollander, E. (1998). *Wingspread declaration on the civic responsibilities of research universities*. Retrieved from

http://www.compact.org/initiatives/research_universities/wingspread_declaration

Bringle, R., Games, R., & Malloy, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. A. (1999). *Comprehensive assessment of the scholarship of engagement (CASE).* Indianapolis: Indiana university-Purdue University, Indianapolis.

Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: Terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 503-516.

Campus Compact (n.d.), retrieved from http://www.compact.org/about/

Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(2), 125-147. Retrieved from www.jstor.org

CIC Committee on Engagement. (2005). *Engaged scholarship: A resource guide*. Champaign, IL: The Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Retrieved from www.cic.uiuc.edu

Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Assessing institutionalization of curricular and pedagogical reforms. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(4). Doi:10.1023/A:1015594432215

Coleman, J., Katz, E., & Menzel, H. (1966). *Medical innovation: A diffusion study*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co.

Community-Campus Partnership for Health (2011). Retrieved from http://www.ccph.info/

Cooney, K. (2008). Fields, organizations, and agency: Toward a multilevel theory of
institutionalization in action. *Administration & Society*, *39*(6), 687-718.

Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2002). *Building and sustaining a
commitment to community outreach, development, and collaboration: Lasting
engagement*. Washington, D.C.: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
No. ED470837)

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken,
NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational
analysis* . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional
isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American
Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160. Retrieved from
http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095101

Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community engagement classification: intentions and
insights. *Change*, January/February, 38-41. Retrieved from Academic Search
Complete database.

Driscoll, A. & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting
professional service and outreach.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for
Higher Education.

Dubb, S. (2007). *Linking colleges to communities: Engaging the university for
community development*. College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative.

Retrieved from http://www.community-wealth.org/_pdfs/news/recent-articles/07-
07/report-linking.pdf

Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory, (19)*2, 105-
125.

Furco, A. (1997). *Evaluation system for experiential education.* Berkeley: University of
California at Berkeley, Service-Learning Research and Development Center.

Furco, A. (1998). Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service learning in
higher education. Berkeley: Service-Learning Research and Development Center,
University of California at Berkeley.

Furco, A. (2002). Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in
higher education. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Furco, A. & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional
engagement. In L. R. Sandmann, C. H. Thornton, & A. J. Jaeger (Eds.),
Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of
Carnegie classified institutions (pp. 47-54). *New Directions for Higher Education*,
No. 147. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley Publishing.

Gelmon, S. B., Seifer, S. D., Kauper-Brown, J., & Mikkelsen, M. (2005). Building
capacity for community engagement: Institutional self-assessment. Seattle, WA:
Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from www.ccph.info

Gibbons, M. (2006). *Engagement as a core value in a mode 2 society*. Paper presented at
the Council of Higher Education-HEQC/JET-CHESP Conference on Community
Engagement in Higher Education, Cape Town, South Africa.

Glassick, C. (2000). Boyer's expanded definitions of scholarship, the standards for

    assessing scholarship, and the elusiveness of the scholarship of teaching.

    *Academic Medicine, 7*5(9), 877–880. Retrieved from http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com/

Gorgol, L. & Hartley, M. (2009). *Institutionalizing the role of the chief civic engagement*

    officer. Proceedings of the American Society of Higher Education.

Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic and post modern*

    perspectives. New York: Oxford.

Hartley, M. & Soo, D. (2009). Building democracy's university. In M. Tight, K. H. Mok,

    J. Huisman, & C. C. Morphew (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of*

    Higher Education (pp. 397-407). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hartley, M. (2009). Leading grassroots change in the academy. *Journal of Change*

    Management, 9(3), 323-338.

Higher Education Network for Community Engagement. (n.d.). *About HENCE*. Retrieved

    from henceonline.org

Holland, B. A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key

    organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 30-41.

    Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/assessing.html

Holland, B. A. (2001). A comprehensive model for assessing service-learning and

    community-university partnerships. *New Directions of Higher Education*, 114,

    51-60.

Holland, B. A. (2005). *Scholarship and mission in the 21st century university: The role of*

    engagement. Proceedings of the 2005 Australian Universities Quality Forum:

Engaging communities. (pp. 11-17). Melbourne, Victoria: Australian Universities
Quality Agency.

Holland, B. A. (2006). *Levels of commitment to community engagement, characterized
by key organizational factors evidencing relevance to institutional mission.*
Retrieved from http://www.henceonline.org/resources/institutional

Holland, B. A. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie classified
community engagement institutions. In L. R. Sandmann, C. H. Thornton, & A. J.
Jaeger (Eds.), Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The
first wave of Carnegie classified institutions (pp. 47-54). *New Directions for
Higher Education*, No. 147. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley Publishing.

Hollander, E. L. & Saltmarsh, J. (2000). The engaged university. *Academe, 86*(4), 29-32.

Hollander, E. L., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Indicators of community
engagement. In L. Simon, M. Kenny, K. Brabeck, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to
serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning.* Norwell, MA: Kluwer.

Johnson, C. M. (2007). Preparing students to be active citizens, informed, reflective
citizens. *Wingspread Journal*, Education, 3-4.

Kallison Jr., J. M., & Cohen, P. (2010). A new compact for higher education: Funding
and autonomy for reform and accountability. *Innovative Higher Education, 35*(1),
37-49. doi:10.1007/s10755-009-9123-2

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999).
*Returning to our roots: The engaged instit*ution. Retrieved from
https://www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=183

Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (Eds.). (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails: The institutionalization and termination of innovation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Levin, H. M. & McEwan, P. J. (2001). *Cost-effectiveness analysis: Methods and applications.* Array Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

London, S. (2001). *The civic mission of higher education: From outreach to engagement. A report from the workshop on higher education and public life*. New York, NY: Kettering Foundation.

Machado-da-Silva, C. L., Silva da Fonseca, V., & Crubellate, J. M. (2005). Unlocking the institutionalization process: Insights for an institutionalizing approach. *Brazilian Administrative Review*, 2 (1), 1-20.

McMaster, T. & Wastell, D. (2005). Diffusion – or delusion? Challenging an IS research tradition. *Information Technology & People, 18*(4), 383-404. Doi: 10.1108/09593840510633851

Meekins M. & O'Meara, K. (2011, Winter). Rankings contributions to place: Developing an alternative model for competition in higher education. *Public Purpose,* 6-9.

Melchior, A. (2000). Costs and benefits of service learning. *School Administrator, 57*(7), 26-31.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (2009). *Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Eligibility requirements and standards for accreditation*. http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX06_Aug08REVMarch09.pdf

Miner, J. B. (2007). *Organizational behavior 2*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (2007). Retrieved from http://www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=224&srcid=303

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu

Newman, F. (1985). *Higher education and the American resurgence*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

North Central Association Higher Learning Commission. (2003). *Handbook of Accreditation.* Retrieved from http://www.ncahlc.org/download/Handbook03.pdf

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. (2003). *Accreditation handbook.* http://www.nwccu.org/Pubs%20Forms%20and%20Updates/Publications/Accreditation%20Handbook.pdf

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *The Academy of Management Review, 16*(1), 145-179.

Peters, S., Jordan, N., Adameck, M. & Alter, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Ramaley, J. A. (2005). Engagement and the integration of research and education: A new meaning of quality. *Proceedings of the 2005 Australian Universities Quality*

Forum: Engaging communities. (pp. 18-25). Melbourne, Victoria: Australian Universities Quality Agency.

Rogers, E. M. (2004). A prospective and retrospective look at the diffusion model. *Journal of Health Communication*, 9, 13–19. doi: 10.1080/10810730490271449

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Ross, J. A. (2008). Cost-utility analysis in educational needs assessment. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 31*, 356-367.

Ruben, B. D., Russ, T., Smulowitz, S. M. & Conaughton, S.L. (2007). Evaluating the impact of organizational self-assessment in higher education: The Malcolm Baldrige/excellence in higher education framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28*(3), 230-250. doi: 10.1108/01437730710739657

Ryan, B. & Gross, N. C. (1943). The diffusion of hybrid corn in two Iowa communities. *Rural Sociology, 8*(1). 15-24. Retrieved from web.ebscohost.com

Ryan, J. F. (2005). Institutional expenditures and student engagement: A role for financial resources in enhancing student learning and development? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(2), 235-249.

Saltmarsh, J. (2005). The civic promise of service learning. *Liberal Education,* pp. 50-55.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Ward, E. & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. In L. R. Sandmann, C. H. Thornton, & A. J. Jaeger (Eds.), Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions (pp. 47-54). *New Directions for Higher Education*, No. 147. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley Publishing.

Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher

    education: A ten-year retrospective. *Journal of Higher Education, 12*(1), pp. 91-

    104.

Sandmann, L. (2006). Building a higher education network for community engagement.

    Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 11(4), 41-54. Retrieved

    from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/141/129

Sandmann, L.R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W., & Rosaen, C. (2000).

    Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of

    outreach. *Change,* pp. 44-52.

Sandmann, L. R. & Plater, W. M. (2009). Leading the engaged institution. *New*

    Directions for Higher Education, (147), 13-24. doi: 10.1002/he.354

Sandmann, L. R. & Weerts, D. J. (2006). Engagement in higher education: Building a

    federation for action. *A Wingspread Report*. Athens: The University of Georgia.

    Retrieved from www.henceonline.org

Sandmann, L.R. & Weerts, D.J. (2008). Reshaping institutional boundaries to

    accommodate an engagement agenda. *Innovative Higher Education.* doi:

    10.1007/s10755-008-9077-9

Sandmann, L. R., Williams, J. E., & Abrams, E. D. (2009). Higher education community

    engagement and accreditation: Activating engagement through innovative

    accreditation strategies. *Planning in Higher Education 37*(3), pp. 15-26.

Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed*.*). Los

    Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, W. R. (2003). Institutional carriers: Reviewing modes of transporting ideas over time and space and considering their consequences. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 12* (4), pp. 879-894.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Shumer, R. (2000). *Shumer's self-assessment for service-learning.* St. Paul, MN: Center for Experiential and Service-Learning.

Simon, H. A. (1987). Making management decisions: The role of intuition and emotion. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(1), 57-63. Retrieved from www.jstor.org

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, ME: The John Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2000, Spring/Summer). The neo-liberal university. *New Labor Forum,*6, 73-79. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40342886

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2008). *The principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement.*

http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2008PrinciplesofAccreditation.pdf

Strang, D. & Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 265-290.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009). Classification: Community engagement elective classification. Retrieved from

http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key= 1213

The Talloires Declaration (2005, September 15). Retrieved from

> http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/downloads/TalloiresDeclaration2005.pdf

The Talloires Network (2008). Retrieved from http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork/

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC*

> *Higher Education Report*, 29, 5. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weerts, D. J. & Sandman, L. R. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and

> opportunities for community engagement at research Universities. *Review of*

> *Higher Education, 32*(1), 73-106.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems.

> *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-19. Retrieved from www.jstor.org

Wellman, J. V. (2006). Accountability for the public trust. *New Directions for Higher*

> *Education, 135*, 111-118. doi: 10.1002/he.234

Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2008). *Handbook of Accreditation.*

> http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook_of_Accreditation_2008_

> with_hyperlinks.pdf

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*,

> 13, 443-464.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FINAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

(REDUCED FORMAT)

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Introduction

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study. You have been asked to share your perceptions of relative costs and benefits of community engagement practices to higher education institutions. Section one is specific to your organization. Sections two, three and four are based on your perceptions even if your insitution does not participate in the practice.

For the purpose of this study, community engagement is defined as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, national, and international) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006). Note that community can be local, regional, state, national, and global (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

The results of this research will benefit decision makers, engagement advocates, and policy makers in regards to implementing community engagement practices and can generally contribute to the institutionalization of higher education community engagement for the public good. Therefore, as you answer these questions of perception and relevance, answer from the perspective of making tough decisions with limited resources.

This survey is designed to take no longer than 15 minutes. You can exit and return to this survey at any time. Once you have completed the survey please select 'Submit Survey.'

Please select 'next' to continue and begin the survey.

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Rights of Research Participant

This is notification of implied consent for the research study titled Higher Education Leader's Perceptions of Community Engagement Costs and Benefits. The purpose of this study is to understand the perceived costs and benefits of community engagement activities. This is an area that is not well researched, therefore the study results have the potential to help other decision makers as well as policy makers and to contribute to the better understanding and advancement of higher education and community engagement for the public good. Please know that this research activity is being conducted by Marcie Simpson, under the supervision of Dr. Lorilee R. Sandmann, and the results may be published.

Marcie A. Simpson, Graduate Student
Accountbility Coordinator, College of Ag & Env Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Bldg, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786; Fax: 706-583-0183; E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann
Professor, Program in Adult Education
University Of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-4014; E-mail: sandmann@uga.edu

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete this online survey referring to your perceptions of institutional participation in community engagement activities and associated costs and benefits. There are no foreseen risks to your participation. Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The online questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be confidential and will not be associated with your name or email address. The survey is complete and submitted when you select 'Submit Survey' at the end. If the survey remains incomplete and 'Submit Survey' is not selected at the end, the researcher will be denied access to the data and the answers will not be used as part of the study.

Please note the following: The survey software transfers data in an encrypted format but there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. Standard confidentiality procedures will be followed with the materials received by the researcher and only summary data will be reported. Individually-identifiable data and coding will be used to associate individual response data with institutional demographics. Individually-identifiable data will be destroyed upon completion of the study and submission of the dissertation.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to IRB Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia, 30602; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Select "yes" to continue this survey and "no" to end the survey.

◯ Yes

◯ No

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 1: Community Engagement Practices

In this section we are asking you to consider the actual community engagement practices that were conducted by your institution. For example, consider faculty work in the community as the practice. This specific practice is capable of producing any number of community-based outcomes, such as improved educational systems, business practices, community/economic development or economic welfare. For the purpose of this question, the important aspect of the practice above is the work conducted as partners with various external communities not the outcomes of this practice.

PRACTICES:

In which of the four time frames did your institution participate in the following community engagement practices? (Select all that apply)

	Jan-Jun 2008	Jul-Dec 2008	Jan-Jun 2009	Jul-Dec 2009
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional Comments (optional):

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 2: Benefits of Community Engagement to Institution

Community engagement practices generate benefits for your higher education institution. These benefits are manifested as improvements in the institution or the individuals of the institution. For example, benefits impact students, faculty, fund development, meeting the mission, institutional reputation, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your institution, faculty, and students.

	Little or no Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 3: Benefits to the Community

The community benefits from community engagement practices. Community can be local or global and includes individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, social groups, etc.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the appropriate response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your community(ies) and individuals of your community(ies).

	Little or No Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

133

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 4: Cost of Community Engagement

There are costs associated with the implementation of community engagement practices. Costs should be reported in relative terms related to dollars, time and other resources that constitute costs to the institution regardless of the source.

COSTS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of the practice's relative cost to your institution.

	Little or No Cost	Some Cost	Moderate Cost	High Cost
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	◯	◯	◯	◯
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	◯	◯	◯	◯
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	◯	◯	◯	◯
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	◯	◯	◯	◯
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	◯	◯	◯	◯
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	◯	◯	◯	◯
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	◯	◯	◯	◯
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	◯	◯	◯	◯
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	◯	◯	◯	◯
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	◯	◯	◯	◯
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	◯	◯	◯	◯
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	◯	◯	◯	◯

Additional Comments (optional):

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 5: Demographics

Research publications require a general description of the study participants. The individual variables below will be used for these descriptive purposes. Only aggregated data will be shared. No individual details will be published.

Institutional Variables:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Administrative support for community engagement at my institution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Faculty support for community engagement at my institution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Staff support for community engagement at my institution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Student support for community engagement at my institution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Individual Variables:

Job Title	
Number of years in your current role	
Number of years at this institution	
Terminal Degree	
Gender	
Race/Ethnicity	
Year Born	

Community Engagement at Your Institution

End the survey.

Thank you for your time.

Please select 'Submit Survey' to complete and submit this survey. Once you select 'Submit Survey' you will not be able to return to the survey and edit your responses.

Please direct any questions to:
Marcie A. Simpson
321 Hoke Smith Building
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786
Fax: 706-583-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

APPENDIX B

INITIAL 19 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PRACTICES

Items/community engagement practices or activities:

1. For-credit service learning course offerings

2. Service learning projects

3. Community engagement integration in student research

4. Community engagement integration in student leadership

5. Students working with faculty on community based research outside of the classroom

6. Community representation in institutional or departmental planning for community

7. Community-campus partnerships with a clear community engagement focus

8. Learning centers for community members

9. Extension programming in the community

10. Non-Credit community oriented courses

11. Training programs building community engagement provided for the community

12. Professional development centers for the community

13. Tutoring for community members

14. Work study/intern assignments in the community

15. Athletic events for community attendance

16. Library resources for the community

17. Faculty consultation services provided to the community

18. Faculty action research conducted in and with the community

19. Cultural offerings for community attendance

APPENDIX C

EXPERT PANEL REVIEW

An Analysis of Costs and Benefits of

Community Engagement Activities in Higher Education

Definition of Community Engagement: "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." (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009)

Audience: Institutional representatives from the institutions receiving the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to provide data on the costs and benefits of community engagement activities. Limited resources demand informed decisions for resource allocation. The data revealed in this investigation will allow for informed decisions related to resource allocation and support provided for community engagement activities.

Research Questions:
1. How is community engagement manifested in higher education institutions?
2. What is the perceived cost of activities of community engagement?
3. What is the perceived benefit of community engagement activities to faculty/staff, students and the institution?
4. What is the perceived benefit of community engagement activities to the community?

Methodology Conceptual Framework:

Characteristics: Actions and organizational structures that lead to the manifestations of community engagement.

Activities of Community Engagement: Any structured or informal activities or practices undertaken by administrators, faculty, staff or students to facilitate the outcomes of community engagement.

Outcomes: the impact of community engagement activities on the institution, faculty, students and the community.

Marcie Simpson
Doctoral Student
Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy
University of Georgia, Athens, GA
Phone: 706-542-7786
Email: simpson@uga.edu

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann
Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy
University of Georgia, Athens, GA
Phone: 706-542-4014
Email: sandmann@uga.edu

Consider the items below and mark up this list as appropriate to answer questions A thru D:

    A. Do you consider the following items community engagement activities?
    B. What should not be on this list?
    C. What is missing from this list to make it comprehensive?
    D. What needs to be clarified?

Items/community engagement activities that will be rated for each question:

1. For-credit service learning course offerings

2. Service learning projects

3. Community engagement integration in student research

4. Community engagement integration in student leadership

5. Students working with faculty on community based research outside of the classroom

6. Community representation in institutional or departmental planning for community engagement activities

7. Community-campus partnerships with a clear community engagement focus

8. Learning centers for community members

9. Extension programming in the community

10. Non-Credit community oriented courses

11. Training programs building community engagement provided for the community

12. Professional development centers for the community

13. Tutoring for community members

14. Work study/intern assignments in the community

15. Athletic events for community attendance

16. Library resources for the community

17. Faculty consultation services provided to the community

18. Faculty action research conducted in and with the community

19. Cultural offerings for community attendance

APPENDIX D

PILOT INSTRUMENT

(REDUCED FORMAT)

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Introduction

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study. You have been asked to share your perceptions of relative costs and benefits of community engagement practices to higher education institutions.

For the purpose of this study, community engagement is defined as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, national, and international) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006). Note that community can be local, regional, state, national, and global (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

The results of this research will benefit decision makers, engagement advocates, and policy makers in regards to implementing community engagement practices and can generally contribute to the institutionalization of higher education community engagement for the public good. Therefore, as you answer these questions of perception and relevance, answer from the perspective of making tough decisions with limited resources.

This survey is designed to take no longer than 15 minutes. You can exit and return to this survey at any time. Once you have completed the survey please select 'Submit Survey.'

Please select 'next' to continue.

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Rights of Research Participant

This is notification of implied consent for the research study titled Higher Education Leader's Perceptions of Community Engagement Costs and Benefits. The purpose of this study is to understand the perceived costs and benefits of community engagement activities. This is an area that is not well researched, therefore the study results have the potential to help other decision makers as well as policy makers and to contribute to the better understanding and advancement of higher education and community engagement for the public good. Please know that this research activity is being conducted by Marcie Simpson, under the supervision of Dr. Lorilee R. Sandmann, and the results may be published.

Marcie A. Simpson, Graduate Student
Accountbility Coordinator, College of Ag & Env Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Bldg, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786; Fax: 706-583-0183; E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann
Professor, Program in Adult Education
University Of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-4014; E-mail: sandmann@uga.edu

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete this online survey referring to your perceptions of institutional participation in community engagement activities and associated costs and benefits. There are no foreseen risks to your participation. Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The online questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be confidential and will not be associated with your name or email address. The survey is complete and submitted when you select 'Submit Survey' at the end. If the survey remains incomplete and 'Submit Survey' is not selected at the end, the researcher will be denied access to the data and the answers will not be used as part of the study.

Please note the following: The survey software transfers data in an encrypted format but there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. Standard confidentiality procedures will be followed with the materials received by the researcher and only summary data will be reported. Individually-identifiable data and coding will be used to associate individual response data with institutional demographics. Individually-identifiable data will be destroyed upon completion of the study and submission of the dissertation.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to IRB Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia, 30602; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Select "yes" to continue this survey and "no" to end the survey.

◯ Yes

◯ No

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Section 1: Community Engagement Practices

In this section we are asking you to consider the actual community engagement practices that were conducted by your institution. For example, consider faculty work in the community as the practice. This specific practice is capable of producing any number of community-based outcomes, such as improved educational systems, business practices, community/economic development or economic welfare. For the purpose of this question, the important aspect of the practice above is the work conducted as partners with various external communities not the outcomes of this practice.

PRACTICES:

In which of the four time frames did your institution participate in the following community engagement practices? (Select all that apply)

	Jan-Jun 2008	Jul-Dec 2008	Jan-Jun 2009	Jul-Dec 2009
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional Comments (optional):

145

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Section 2: Benefits of Community Engagement to Institution

Community engagement practices generate benefits for your higher education institution. These benefits are manifested as improvements in the institution or the individuals of the institution. For example, benefits impact students, faculty, fund development, meeting the mission, institutional reputation, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your institution, faculty, and students.

	Little or no Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Section 3: Benefits to the Community

The community benefits from community engagement practices. Community can be local or global and includes individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, social groups, etc.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the appropriate response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your community(ies) and individuals of your community(ies).

	Little or No Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Section 4: Cost of Community Engagement

There are costs associated with the implementation of community engagement practices. Costs should be reported in relative terms related to dollars to the institution regardless of the funding source.

COSTS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of the practice's relative cost to your institution.

	Little or No Cost	Some Cost	Moderate Cost	High Cost
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

```
[                                        ▲]
[                                        ▼]
```

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

Sectin 6: Demographics

Research publications require a general description of the study participants. The individual variables below will be used for these descriptive purposes. Only aggregated data will be shared. No individual details will be published.

Institutional Variables:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Administrative support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Faculty support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Staff support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Student support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○

Individual Variables:

Job Title	
Number of years in your current role	
Number of years at this institution	
Terminal Degree	
Gender	
Race/Ethnicity	
Year Born	

Community Engagement at Your Institution - PILOT

End the survey.

Thank you for your time.

Please select 'Submit Survey' to complete and submit this survey. Once you select 'Submit Survey' you will not be able to return to the survey and edit your responses.

Please direct any questions to:
Marcie A. Simpson
321 Hoke Smith Building
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786
Fax: 706-583-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

APPENDIX E

PILOT REVIEW LETTER SENT TO COMMITTEE

(REDUCED FORMAT)

TO: Dr. Lorilee Sandmann, Committee Chair
            Dr. Tom Valentine, Methodologist
            Dr. Wendy Ruona
            Dr. Libby Morris

FROM: Marcie Simpson
            PHD Candidate Adult Education
            Topic: Perceived Benefits and Costs of Community Engagement Practices

DATE: October 27, 2010

RE: Update of Activities and Results of Pilot Survey

The purpose of this communication is to inform you of the outcomes of my pilot research study and to gain your approval in proceeding with my doctoral research study. Please review the attached document and let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

I have documented the pilot study results and current course of action for the doctoral study in the *Doctoral Research Progress Update and Pilot Review* document. The proposed doctoral study survey instrument is provided as Appendix A and for your information the preliminary data analysis that Dr. Valentine and I ran can be found in Appendix B.

I can be reached at simpson@uga.edu or 706-338-1984. As instructed by Dr. Sandmann, if I have not heard from you by November 7, 2010, I will assume you are supportive of the proposed changes and my proceeding with the study.

Attachments: Doctorial Research Progress Update & Pilot Review
                   Pilot Survey Instrument
                   Preliminary Findings

DOCTORIAL RESEARCH PROGRESS UPDATE & PILOT REVIEW

Progress Update

I would like to share with you the activities that have occurred since the March prospectus defense, report the results of the pilot survey, and request your approval to proceed with the doctoral research survey.

The prospectus defense generated several items for improvement or consideration. The minor issues were addressed through discussion between Dr. Valentine, Dr. Sandmann and myself. The more significant issues that are concern for the entire committee were:

- Will the theory on decision making help inform this study?
- Improve the flow of the first two chapters and expand on the logic of a benefit and cost analysis
- Conduct a pilot
- Identify appropriate demographics for the survey instrument

I spoke with Dr. Ruona regarding the decision making literature and investigated the possibilities. I did not find this body of knowledge to be beneficial to this study. I have enrolled in the course EDHI 9050 Organization and Governance in Higher Education. This course will provide a guided journey through the institutional theory literature, allowing me to add depth, breadth, and a more fluid approach to the institutional theory aspects of my dissertation. The class project I have selected is an investigation of benefit analysis techniques and how these relate to higher education, providing a more complete approach to the cost-benefit logic in the dissertation.

Pilot Review

As per the suggestion of the research committee a pilot was conducted. The purpose of the pilot study was to test and refine the survey instrument and collection procedures.

Access to Sample:

The doctoral research study will be a population study consisting of the institutions that have received the classification of community engaged from the Carnegie Foundation. There are two groups that will be included in the doctoral research study. The population is comprised of recipients from 2006 and 2008 classification cycles for a total of 198 institutions. In order to identify contacts for these institutions, I examined institutional online web page data to identify the individual most closely related to community engagement activities. I targeted the institutions engagement officer, provost, or service learning director. These individuals were contacted by email to verify they were the appropriate contact for this survey. Contact information was updated based on individual responses, and the pilot study sample was selected.

<u>Instrumentation:</u>

The instrument presented during the prospectus defense was utilized for the pilot study with the addition of the demographic questions noted below.

Institutional Variables (Rated Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good ,or Excellent)
1-Administrative support for community engagement at my institution
2-Faculty support for community engagement at my institution
3-Staff support for community engagement at my institution
4-Student support for community engagement at my institution

Individual Variables (open text responses)
Job Title
Number of years in your current role
Terminal Degree
Gender
Race/Ethnicity
Year Born

The five-part questionnaire was implemented using the online survey software, Survey Monkey. The questionnaire included an implied consent form followed by four sections of survey items and concluded with demographic questions. A cover letter with a survey link was emailed to each potential respondent. A survey completion deadline of two week was noted in the correspondence. A second reminder was emailed one week after the initial contact. Each participant was promised a copy of the doctoral study's executive summary to be emailed upon completion of the doctoral research study.

<u>Pilot Sample:</u>

The decision was made to randomly select 25% of the total population to serve as the pilot. The 49 participants in the pilot study were randomly selected from the total population of 198. An initial contact was made by email to these 49 participants. Three emails were returned as undeliverable and these were removed from the contact list. In addition, there were 2 participants who requested to be removed from the study.

<u>Data Collection:</u>

The pilot survey was sent using the Survey Monkey software to 49 potential participants. Pilot participants were given two weeks to respond. At the end of the first week, an email reminder was sent to non-respondents. Of the 49 potential respondents, 19 participated resulting in a raw response rate of 38.8%. Taking into consideration the 3 returned emails, the resulting adjusted response rate is 40.43%.

Conclusion and Proposed Changes:

The pilot study was found to be technically adequate. In a review of the data, there was limited missing data and very few suspicious entries. Data collection procedures and instrument development will be adjusted as noted below to ensure an unquestionably sound and reliable instrument.

The pilot provided valuable insight and information regarding the survey instrument and my research. During the prospectus defense one concern was the variability of responses from this exemplary group. The data from the pilot shows that the recipients will rate the practices relevant to costs and benefits with enough variation to provide insight into perceptions of these relative benefits and costs. The initial pilot data also supports the logic that these institutions would identify high frequency in practices.

There were two items of concern related to survey instrumentation that will be addressed in the doctoral research study. Fifteen percent of the respondents expressed frustration with the ability to designate that their institution did not participate in a particular practice in section one and then forced to rate the same practice in sections two, three and four. Currently the software requires an answer to the items in sections two, three and four relevant respectively to benefit to institution, community, and cost. The survey will be changed to allow the participant to skip an individual item within the sections. The other change that will be made to the survey instrument is the descriptive text for section 4. This text will be changed to provide clarity for the survey respondent. Below is the updated survey text.

> Section 4: Cost of Community Engagement
> There are costs associated with the implementation of community engagement practices. Costs should be reported in relative terms based on dollars, time and other resources that constitute costs to the institution regardless of the source.

The pilot study identified a less than optimal participant response rate of 40.43. The optimal response rate is 60%. Response rate was low due to the small sample and the limited reminders. Increased population size, increased response time and additional reminders should significantly improve the doctoral study response rate. The timeframe for responding to the doctoral study will be expanded to 5 weeks. There will be 3 reminders emailed to participants, with each reminder expressing an increased urgency for response.

Multiple Contact Time Schedule

Date	Nature of Contact
November 10	Initial Contact: Cover email with survey link sent to all participants.
November 17	Follow-up 1: Reminder and thank you sent to all participants.
December 1	Follow-up 2: Reminder sent via email and postal mail to those who have not responded.
December 8	Follow-up 3: Final reminder emailed to those who have not responded.
December 15	Close survey and email thank you to all respondents.

After the second email reminder, non-respondents will be mailed a paper copy of the survey instrument.   The intent of the paper copy is two-fold. First, the paper copy will make it difficult to ignore the request. Second, the individual will be able to hand-off the survey to the appropriate person. The expanded timeframe, additional reminders and alternate survey instrument should increase the response rate.

The pilot study data will be included in the doctoral research study. The survey will not be changed significantly therefore the data will be included in the doctoral study results. Pilot participants were informed of the possibility that their responses would be used in the final study. The implied research consent was incorporated into the pilot survey. Participants who did not respond to the pilot will be included in the doctoral study contacts.

The research instrument will remain as presented in the prospectus hearing with the changes noted above. Given the approval of these changes, I propose to edit the instrument and open the data collection process on November 10, 2010.

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Introduction

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study. You have been asked to share your perceptions of relative costs and benefits of community engagement practices to higher education institutions.

For the purpose of this study, community engagement is defined as the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional, national, and international) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006). Note that community can be local, regional, state, national, and global (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009).

The results of this research will benefit decision makers, engagement advocates, and policy makers in regards to implementing community engagement practices and can generally contribute to the institutionalization of higher education community engagement for the public good. Therefore, as you answer these questions of perception and relevance, answer from the perspective of making tough decisions with limited resources.

This survey is designed to take no longer than 15 minutes. You can exit and return to this survey at any time. Once you have completed the survey please select 'Submit Survey.'

Please select 'next' to continue.

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Rights of Research Participant

This is notification of implied consent for the research study titled Higher Education Leader's Perceptions of Community Engagement Costs and Benefits. The purpose of this study is to understand the perceived costs and benefits of community engagement activities. This is an area that is not well researched, therefore the study results have the potential to help other decision makers as well as policy makers and to contribute to the better understanding and advancement of higher education and community engagement for the public good. Please know that this research activity is being conducted by Marcie Simpson, under the supervision of Dr. Lorilee R. Sandmann, and the results may be published.

Marcie A. Simpson, Graduate Student
Accountbility Coordinator, College of Ag & Env Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Bldg, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786; Fax: 706-583-0183; E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann
Professor, Program in Adult Education
University Of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-4014; E-mail: sandmann@uga.edu

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete this online survey referring to your perceptions of institutional participation in community engagement activities and associated costs and benefits. There are no foreseen risks to your participation. Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The online questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be confidential and will not be associated with your name or email address. The survey is complete and submitted when you select 'Submit Survey' at the end. If the survey remains incomplete and 'Submit Survey' is not selected at the end, the researcher will be denied access to the data and the answers will not be used as part of the study.

Please note the following: The survey software transfers data in an encrypted format but there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. Standard confidentiality procedures will be followed with the materials received by the researcher and only summary data will be reported. Individually-identifiable data and coding will be used to associate individual response data with institutional demographics. Individually-identifiable data will be destroyed upon completion of the study and submission of the dissertation.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to IRB Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia, 30602; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Select "yes" to continue this survey and "no" to end the survey.

◯ Yes

◯ No

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 1: Community Engagement Practices

In this section we are asking you to consider the actual community engagement practices that were conducted by your institution. For example, consider faculty work in the community as the practice. This specific practice is capable of producing any number of community-based outcomes, such as improved educational systems, business practices, community/economic development or economic welfare. For the purpose of this question, the important aspect of the practice above is the work conducted as partners with various external communities not the outcomes of this practice.

PRACTICES:

In which of the four time frames did your institution participate in the following community engagement practices? (Select all that apply)

	Jan-Jun 2008	Jul-Dec 2008	Jan-Jun 2009	Jul-Dec 2009
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional Comments (optional):

159

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 2: Benefits of Community Engagement to Institution

Community engagement practices generate benefits for your higher education institution. These benefits are manifested as improvements in the institution or the individuals of the institution. For example, benefits impact students, faculty, fund development, meeting the mission, institutional reputation, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your institution, faculty, and students.

	Little or no Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

160

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 3: Benefits to the Community

The community benefits from community engagement practices. Community can be local or global and includes individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, social groups, etc.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS:

For each of the practices below, mark the appropriate response that best represents your perception of relative benefits to your community(ies) and individuals of your community(ies).

	Little or No Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	High Benefit
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

161

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Section 4: Cost of Community Engagement

There are costs associated with the implementation of community engagement practices. Costs should be reported in relative terms related to dollars, time and other resources that consitute costs to the institution regardless of the source.

COSTS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

For each of the practices below, mark the response that best represents your perception of the practice's relative cost to your institution.

	Little or No Cost	Some Cost	Moderate Cost	High Cost
1. Offering for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	○	○	○	○
2. Offering extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	○	○	○	○
3. Integrating community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	○	○	○	○
4. Involving students in community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
5. Providing students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	○	○	○	○
6. Involving students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	○	○	○	○
7. Providing the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	○	○	○	○
8. Conducting community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	○	○	○	○
9. Maintaining reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	○	○	○	○
10. Offering non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	○	○	○	○
11. Seeking input from the community in planning engagement activities.	○	○	○	○
12. Permitting community members to use the campus library.	○	○	○	○

Additional Comments (optional):

162

Community Engagement at Your Institution

Sectin 6: Demographics

Research publications require a general description of the study participants. The individual variables below will be used for these descriptive purposes. Only aggregated data will be shared. No individual details will be published.

Institutional Variables:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Administrative support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Faculty support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Staff support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○
Student support for community engagement at my institution	○	○	○	○	○

Individual Variables:

Job Title	
Number of years in your current role	
Number of years at this institution	
Terminal Degree	
Gender	
Race/Ethnicity	
Year Born	

Community Engagement at Your Institution

End the survey.

Thank you for your time.

Please select 'Submit Survey' to complete and submit this survey. Once you select 'Submit Survey' you will not be able to return to the survey and edit your responses.

Please direct any questions to:
Marcie A. Simpson
321 Hoke Smith Building
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-3552
Phone: 706-542-7786
Fax: 706-583-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Preliminary Findings:

To what extent are institutions conducting community engagement practices?
1. What is the perceived relative benefit of community engagement practices for the institution?
2. What is the perceived relative benefit of community engagement practices for the community?
3. What is the perceived relative cost of community engagement practices to the institution?
4. How does institutional type impact community engagement practices?

The relative frequency of community engagement practices was calculated (see Table 1). The mean is calculated on the number of units selected out of a possible 4. The four units of measure are the timeframes of: January – June 2008, July – December 2008, January – June 2009, and July – December 2009. The results demonstrate a very high level of use of the 12 practices among the survey participants. This analysis supports the logical assumption that this exemplary sample would identify high participation in the engagement practices.

Table 1 – Relative frequency of community engagement (n=19)

Item	Mean	Rank
P1 Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	4.0000	1.5
P2 Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	4.0000	1.5
P3 Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	3.9474	3
P4 Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	3.7895	4.5
P5 Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	3.7895	4.5
P9 Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3.7895	4.5
P7 Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	3.6842	7
P8 Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	3.5789	8
P11 Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	3.5263	9
P6 Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	3.4211	10
P10 Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	2.8421	11
P12 Permitted community members to use the campus library.	2.7368	12

The mean rate and rating rank were calculated for each practice in sections 2, 3 and 4 of the survey instrument. The ratings for each practice were Little or No = 1, Some = 2, Moderate = 3 or, High = 4. See Tables 2, 3 and 4 for the results. See the following tables for the results.

Table 2 - Institutional benefits of community engagement practices ranked by mean rating (Little or No Benefit - 1, Some Benefit - 2, Moderate Benefit - 3, High Benefit - 4), n=19

Item	Mean	Rank
P1 Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	4.00	1
P9 Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3.89	2
P3 Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	3.79	3
P4 Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	3.68	4.5
P5 Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	3.68	4.5
P8 Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	3.68	4.5
P7 Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	3.58	7
P6 Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	3.57	8
P2 Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	3.53	9.5
P11 Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	3.53	9.5
P10 Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	3.28	11
P12 Permitted community members to use the campus library.	2.68	12

Table 3 - Community benefits of community engagement practices ranked by mean rating (Little or No Benefit - 1, Some Benefit - 2, Moderate Benefit - 3, High Benefit - 4); n=18

Item	Mean	Rank
P9 Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	3.67	1
P1 Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	3.61	2
P7 Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	3.59	3
P8 Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	3.56	4
P4 Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	3.5	5.5

166

P5 Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	3.5	5.5
P6 Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	3.5	5.5
P2 Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	3.44	8.5
P11 Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	3.44	8.5
P3 Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	3.39	10
P10 Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	3.28	11
P12 Permitted community members to use the campus library.	3.11	12

Table 4 - Costs of community engagement practices ranked by mean rating (Little or No Cost - 1, Some Cost - 2, Moderate Cost - 3, High Cost - 4), n=18

Item	Mean	Rank
P8 Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	2.50	1
P10 Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	2.39	2
P1 Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	2.28	3
P6 Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	2.22	4.5
P9 Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	2.22	4.5
P2 Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	2.17	6.5
P3 Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	2.17	6.5
P4 Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	2.17	6.5
P7 Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	2.12	9
P5 Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	1.82	10
P11 Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	1.67	11
P12 Permitted community members to use the campus library.	1.44	12

At this time, the plan is to create an index of community engagement practice frequencies and use this index to determine if there is a relationship between the institutional variables of administrative, faculty, staff and student support for community engagement. The individual variables are descriptive data that will be incorporated into Chapter 3 of the dissertation.

APPENDIX F

REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

To: [Email]
From: simpson@uga.edu

Subject: Community Engagement at Your Institution

Dear [FirstName] [LastName]:

The community engagement movement has become a way to emphasize the important work of higher education institutions and their faculty, staff, and students partnering with communities of many types in addressing critical social and economic problems. As a recipient of the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification, your institution is recognized as a leader in the area of community engagement.

We are turning to you to better understand leaders' perceptions and decision making about the costs and benefits of community-engagement practices. This is an area that is not well researched, but the study results could specifically help other decision makers as well as policy makers and could generally contribute to the better understanding and advancement of higher education community engagement for the public good.

This online survey is designed to take about 15 minutes to complete. If you are willing to complete the survey, simply follow the link below for online completion (a PDF version can be obtained by e-mailing simpson@uga.edu). All responses will be treated with confidentiality, and only summarized data will be published. An executive summary of the research findings will be provided to participants upon completion of this study. This executive summary will be e-mailed to the e-mail account used for this correspondence.

Survey Link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx
This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your e-mail address; please do not forward the message for other individuals to complete. Also, the survey works best in the Internet Explorer Web browser.

With appreciation,

Marcie Simpson
The University of Georgia
Graduate Student, Adult Education
321 Hoke Smith Annex, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-7786
Fax: 706-583-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann
Adult Education Professor
Program in Adult Education
The University of Georgia

Please Note: If you do not wish to receive further e-mails from us, please click the following link and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list: http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

APPENDIX G

SECOND REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

To: [Email]
From: simpson@uga.edu

Subject: Community Engagement at Your Institution

Dear [FirstName] [LastName]:

An online survey was sent to you on November 9, 2011 seeking your perspectives and opinions regarding costs and benefits of community engagement in higher education. For those who have responded, we sincerely appreciate your participation. Your willingness to share your expertise provides important insight into understanding costs and benefits of practices of community engagement.

If you have not yet responded or completed your response, we look forward to your participation in this 15 minute survey: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

The link above is uniquely tied to this survey and your e-mail address; please do not forward the message for other individuals to complete. Also, the survey works best in the Internet Explorer Web browser. Please send appropriate contact person's email address to simpson@uga.edu and I will send an up-dated survey link.

As an alternative or supplement to the online survey, a PDF file has been created. This file will allow you to complete or simply view the PDF version of the survey. If you decide to complete the survey in the paper form please send your response to the address below and include your contact information as a separate document in order to allow me to update the database. You can request the PDF file from simpson@uga.edu.

Thank you for contributing your time and insight to our study of benefits and costs of community engagement practices. For those who have not yet responded, we look forward to your response.

With appreciation,

Marcie Simpson
Graduate Student, Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Accountability Coordinator
College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Annex, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-7786 Fax: 706-582-0183 E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Lorilee R. Sandmann, Ph.D.
Professor
Program in Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
sandmann@uga.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further e-mails from us, please click the following link and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list: http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

APPENDIX H

THIRD REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

To: [Email]
From: simpson@uga.edu

Subject: Community Engagement at Your Institution – Response Requested
Dear [FirstName] [LastName]:

An online survey was sent to you on November 10, 2011 asking for your perceptions of the costs and benefits of community-engagement practices. To the best of our knowledge, the survey has not yet been completed. If you feel our records are incorrect please respond directly to simpson@uga.edu.

We are continuing to collect data for our study on community engagement costs and benefits and contacting you again due to the importance of your response to the collection of meaningful data and overall success of the study. The survey is designed to be completed based on your knowledge and perceptions of your institution and community engagement with no need for additional resources. This 15-minute survey can be accessed through the link below.

Survey Link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your e-mail address; please do not forward the message for other individuals to complete. Also, the survey works best in the Internet Explorer Web browser. The survey results are confidential, and respondents will receive an executive summary of the research findings.

As an alternative or supplement to the online survey, a PDF file has been created. To request the PDF version simply email simpson@uga.edu. This file will allow you to complete or simply view the PDF version of the survey. If you decide to complete the survey in the paper form please send your response to the address below and include your contact information as a separate document in order to allow me to update the database.

We appreciate you taking the time to offer your perspective and expertise to our study. Your insight provides an opportunity to better understand leadership to community engagement and how perceived benefits and costs impact the practice of community engagement.

Sincerely,

Marcie Simpson
Graduate Student, Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Accountability Coordinator
College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Annex, Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 706-542-7786 Fax: 706-582-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Lorilee R. Sandmann, Ph.D.
Professor
Program in Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
sandmann@uga.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further e-mails from us, please click the following link and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

APPENDIX I

FINAL REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

To: [Email]
From: sandmann@uga.edu

Subject: Community Engagement at Your Institution – Response Requested
Dear [FirstName] [LastName]:

During the last month, we have made several contacts regarding the important research study we are conducting related to community-engagement practices in higher education. The original correspondence was sent on November 10, 2010. As a reminder, the purpose of this study is to help administrators and advocates of community engagement understand the perceived costs and benefits of community engagement and how decisions are made relative to these costs and benefits. Also, participants completing the survey will receive an executive summary of the results upon completion of the study.

Only a few of the identified representatives of the Carnegie classified community-engaged institutions have not responded and this study is drawing to a close. The online survey will close on January 27, 2011.

We are sending this final email contact to you in hopes that your institution will be included in the study of classified institutions. Your participation is important for accurate research results and your consideration is desired and appreciated.

You can complete the confidential online 15 minute survey at:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/community_engagement_practices

This link is uniquely tied to this survey, and your e-mail address; please do not forward the message for other individuals to complete. Also, the survey works best in the Internet Explorer Web browser.

As an alternative or supplement to the online survey, a PDF file has been created. This file will allow you to complete and mail or simply view the PDF version of the survey. Please email, simpson@uga.edu, to receive the PDF file.

We are looking forward to receiving your response on or before December or Janaury [2 weeks after email is sent] and are grateful for you taking the time to contribute your expertise and opinions to our study of benefits and costs of community engagement practices.

Sincerely,

Marcie Simpson
Graduate Student, Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Accountability Coordinator
College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
321 Hoke Smith Annex, Athens, GA 30602

Phone: 706-542-7786 Fax: 706-582-0183
E-mail: simpson@uga.edu

Lorilee R. Sandmann, Ph.D.
Professor
Program in Adult Education
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
sandmann@uga.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further e-mails from us, please click the
following link and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

APPENDIX J

TABLE A1

Table A1

Relationship of Benefits and Costs for Community-Engagement Practices

	Frequency of Practice During 2008 - 2009		Mean Institutional Benefit	Mean Community Benefit	Mean Cost to Institution
	Rank	%			
2. Offered extra-curricular community engagement activities to students (e.g. non-credit, school facilitated-student volunteerism).	1	100	3.74	3.57	2.30
1. Offered for-credit engagement courses to students (e.g. for-credit service-learning).	2	98.3	3.91	3.64	2.38
5. Provided students the opportunity to participate in community-based internships.	3	96.6	3.84	3.72	2.14
3. Integrated community engagement into student leadership development opportunities.	4	94.9	3.75	3.36	2.08
11. Sought input from the community in planning engagement activities.	5	92.4	3.65	3.55	1.60
9. Maintained reciprocal and scholarly community-campus partnerships	6.5	90.7	3.83	3.68	2.10
4. Involved students in conducting community-based research (to include action research and applied research).	6.5	90.7	3.75	3.48	2.25
6. Involved students and faculty in community tutoring programs.	8	90.6	3.54	3.57	2.12
8. Conducted community-based research in and with the community (to include action research and applied research).	9	89.8	3.72	3.63	2.43
12. Permitted community members to use the campus library.	10.5	83.1	3.13	3.39	1.58
7. Provided the community with faculty consultation services (e.g. faculty expertise to solve problems).	10.5	83.1	3.43	3.49	2.21
10. Offered non-credit workshops, training, and courses to community members (on or off campus).	12	81.4	3.35	3.48	2.54