

Faculty Development for Advancing Community Engagement in Higher Education: Current Trends and Future Directions

Marshall Welch and Star Plaxton-Moore

Abstract

This research involved the conduct of a conceptual review of 28 refereed journal articles and a survey of campus centers for community engagement staff to identify salient features and trends of existing faculty development programming designed to advance service-learning and community engagement in higher education. Results of this investigation are presented and discussed. The article begins with an overview of theoretical frameworks and competency-based approaches for faculty development. The narrative concludes with additional questions and suggestions for future research and practice.

Keywords: faculty development; service-learning, community engagement

Introduction

In a recent study of centers at campuses with the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement, approximately 70% of the respondents reported that they provide faculty development programming, and 90% reported offering one-on-one consultation, technical assistance, and resource materials to support faculty in developing and implementing various forms of engaged teaching and scholarship (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). From the 2015 survey of its members, Campus Compact reported that just over 75% of the respondents indicated that they provide (a) faculty development workshops/fellowships, (b) materials to assist faculty with reflection and assessment, and (c) curriculum models and sample syllabi. These reports, however, do not provide detailed descriptions of faculty development programs designed to advance community engagement in terms of content, format, duration, or impact assessment. This suggests a need for further exploration to understand what is currently being done to advance community engagement as well as to identify what is not taking place in this important work. As community engagement continues to expand and evolve, directors of campus centers for community engagement and their staff are expected to provide professional development and technical support to faculty (Chamberlin & Phelps-Hillen,

2015; Welch, 2016). Consequently, there is an emerging pedagogical and ethical incentive to identify and implement continued professional education to faculty that effectively serves not only the instructors and scholars using engaged pedagogy in the courses, but students, community partners, and those they serve as indirect beneficiaries as well.

Over 15 years ago, Van Note Chism and Szabo (1998) conducted a comprehensive study to identify evaluation procedures and measures of faculty development and reported the dominant methods incorporated in surveys and interviews of participants. The investigation described in the present article was designed to build upon and update those efforts by identifying salient features and trends of existing faculty development programming designed to advance service-learning and community engagement in higher education. The results can be used to inform community engagement professionals as they design, deliver, and assess professional development programs. For the purpose of this investigation, *faculty development* is broadly defined as educational activities designed to help faculty grow in their professional practice (McKee & Tew, 2013).

The purpose and structure of this study is twofold. First, we conducted a conceptual review of articles in refereed journals to identify salient features of existing faculty development programming in the field of service-learning and community engagement in higher education. Kennedy (2007) characterized a conceptual review under the broader umbrella term “systematic literature review” as “an approach [that shares] an interest in gaining new insights into an issue” (p. 139). She provided useful examples to illustrate the purpose and utility of conceptual reviews in which researchers “did not ask what we know, empirically, about the problem but asked instead why we don’t know more, how people have thought about the problem in the past, and what other issues are intertwined with this one” (p. 139). Second, we conducted a survey to obtain information on current practice and formats of faculty development designed to advance community engagement within higher education. Given the exponential growth of the community engagement movement and the emerging demand for community engagement professionals to provide technical support to faculty through faculty development, the survey was designed to identify how and which (if any) competencies, knowledge, and skill sets are currently disseminated through professional development.

This article continues with an overview of theoretical frameworks for adult learning through faculty development on community engagement in higher education. Using a competency-based

approach, the narrative also enumerates proposed skill sets and content knowledge relevant to advancing engaged teaching and scholarship embedded within community engagement. The theoretical framework and proposed knowledge and skill sets formed the basis of this investigation's research questions and the structure of the content analysis coding of the articles as well as the survey questions. The article continues by presenting the results of a conceptual review of the professional literature coupled with survey responses provided by directors of campus centers for community engagement. Procedures for both of the research methodologies are described for replication purposes. The review process and format is based on a model of previous studies in other related educational fields (Sheridan, Welch, & Orme, 1996; Welch, Brownell, & Sheridan, 1999). The article concludes by presenting implications for the results coupled with recommendations for future practice and research.

Theoretical Frameworks of Faculty Development in Community Engagement

Theory is a set of analytical principles or statements designed to structure the observation, understanding, and explanation of a phenomenon. A theoretical framework serves as a structure or plan consisting of concepts, constructs, or variables and the relations between them that explain a phenomenon and that can be used to translate research into practice through process models consisting of implementation steps (Nilsen, 2015). Academia incorporates theory and theoretical frameworks to guide research, scholarship, and practice. Therefore, one aspect of this investigation was to determine to what extent (if any) theory and theoretical frameworks or models inform adult learning that occurs during faculty development to advance community engagement in higher education.

Van Note Chism, Palmer, and Price (2013) provided a theoretical overview of faculty development in the context of service-learning. They noted that theoretical foundations for faculty development tend to be developmental in nature, focusing on how faculty change and grow. These researchers also observed theories of individual learning, such as the developmental model of Lewin (1947) and experiential learning described by Dewey (1933) and Kolb (1984), as the most common theoretical models incorporated. Reflective practice described by Schön (1983) and Eraut (1994) is also utilized to a degree. Van Note Chism et al. (2013) also synthesized five developmental components common to all theoretical

foundations for faculty professional development, regardless of the topical focus.

1. *An entry point based on need.* Faculty enter into continued professional education due to an exterior trigger such as an organizational mandate or an interior motivation based on personal experience.
2. *Formulating a plan to change practice.* Participants explicitly or implicitly contemplate how to revise their professional practice based on new information.
3. *Active experimentation.* Faculty will incorporate new knowledge or skills on a trial basis rather than entirely adopt and assimilate them on a permanent basis.
4. *Observation of impact.* Faculty will observe the impact of the experimental implementation of new knowledge or skills.
5. *Reflection and implications.* Based on the observation, a faculty member reflects on the impact of the trial application and determines whether to adopt or reject the new knowledge or skill.

These five developmental stages represent a chronology of technical and professional support before, during, and after applying new knowledge and skills. Hoyt (2011) refined this approach of developmental sequencing even further by incorporating a theory of systemic chronological adoption from thought to action into five stages: (1) pseudo-engagement, (2) tentative engagement, (3) stable engagement, (4) authentic engagement, and (5) sustained engagement. These stages manifest themselves at the individual faculty level as well as the institutional level.

Competency-Based Approach

A competency-based approach to faculty development has overt expectations (if not explicit requirements) that participants will assimilate and apply new information and skills, often in a developmental and chronological scaffold over time. Many programs that use this approach will include assessment methods to verify assimilation and implementation by participants. Competency-based medical education (CBME) involves continuous, ongoing criterion-based developmental assessment methods that incorporate both quantitative and qualitative measures in multiple settings or contexts, as well as the collective wisdom of supervisors in

determining the progress of health practitioners (*Holmboe, 2015*). A similar approach can be applied to faculty development programs designed to assist faculty in developing and implementing service-learning or other forms of engaged scholarship.

Blanchard et al. (2009) developed a comprehensive scope and sequence of 14 competencies that define an engaged scholar. They categorized each competency across three levels of experience and expertise ranging from novice to intermediate to advanced. These competencies include understanding and applying the concepts, principles, theory, and practice of community-engaged scholarship; transferring skills to working with partners; disseminating new knowledge gained from community-engaged scholarship through publications and presentations; balancing and integrating community-engaged scholarship within the trilogy of academic missions (teaching, research, and service); and preparation for and successful reward of promotion and tenure.

More recently, Axtell (2012) developed another in-house competency-based framework for faculty development at the University of Minnesota consisting of two broad domains, each incorporating five categories or competencies. The faculty development domain consists of (1) skills, (2) career development, (3) critical reflection, (4) building and sustaining relationships, and (5) navigating and changing the institutional system. The domain of community engaged scholarship includes (1) teaching, (2) research, (3) practice, (4) outreach, and (5) administration.

The investigation described in this article was conducted to identify which, if any, of these theoretical frameworks and competency-based skill sets and knowledge were evident in the literature and practice of faculty development designed to advance engaged teaching and scholarship through community engagement (see Appendix for articles referenced).

Methodology

This investigation incorporated a qualitative research method described by Berg (1998) consisting of a chronology of elements that begins with an idea followed by a review of the literature that leads to a design to collect and organize data into findings that are analyzed and disseminated. The scholarly idea of this study was focused on identifying current topics, formats, and skill sets related to faculty development to promote community engagement. To formulate this idea, a conceptual review (*Kennedy, 2007*) of the literature was conducted and coupled with a survey to collect

information that was analyzed and disseminated for use by community engagement professionals. Patton (1990) noted that “there are trade-offs, advantages, and disadvantages related to when to review the literature: before, during, or after the field-work or on a continual basis throughout the study” (p. 163). For the chronology of this descriptive study, the authors chose to first conduct the conceptual review of the literature to help inform the nature and content of the survey instrument. The researchers incorporated descriptive statistics to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do current faculty development programs designed to advance community engagement through engaged teaching and scholarship in higher education incorporate theoretical frameworks for adult learning?
2. What types of information regarding faculty development designed to advance community engagement through engaged teaching and scholarship in higher education exist in the professional literature?
3. What are the current formats, topics, and practice of faculty development designed to advance community engagement through engaged teaching and scholarship in higher education provided by campus centers for service-learning and community engagement? What topical skills and/or sets of competencies are included in faculty development designed to advance community engagement through engaged teaching and scholarship in higher education?
4. What new directions should the field pursue to support and enhance faculty development designed to advance service-learning and community engagement within higher education?

Conceptual Review

Each of the authors conducted an independent review of the literature using the ERIC database. The search was limited to peer-reviewed journal articles published between the years 2000 and 2015 using the following descriptors to identify possible sources: “faculty development,” “faculty training,” “professional development,” “service-learning,” “community engagement,” “higher education,” “college,” or “university.” A total of 50 articles were initially identified. Each investigator independently reviewed each article

abstract to determine whether it met the search criteria related to faculty development. Articles describing K-12 teacher preparation programs or other related topics such as faculty motivation were not included in this review. Therefore, of the initial pool of articles, the investigators agreed that 20 did not meet the topical criteria. These 20 articles were omitted from the literature review for a total of 30 articles. However, two articles were unobtainable, resulting in a total of 28 articles for this review (see Table 1; also see Appendix for complete reference listing).

Initial, cursory review of these articles revealed an emerging cluster of characteristics that were noted and incorporated into codes for use on a data summary sheet as described by Drew, Hardman, and Hart (1996) to be used in the conceptual review analysis. The authors then individually reviewed each article using a summary worksheet designed to identify and list specific components related to article type, design, outcome measures, and theoretical framework. Subsequently, the investigators exchanged their worksheet summaries to obtain interrater reliability and consensus of interpretation (Patton, 1990). By following the decision logic in reverse, researchers can come to an understanding of how and why discrepant conclusions were drawn and reconcile coding differences that naturally occur (Drew, Hardman, & Hart, 1996). The authors reviewed their initial worksheet results and achieved 59% interrater reliability. The preliminary discrepancies were generally minor, usually involving only one interpretive disagreement in review of several worksheet items. Each investigator independently revisited the articles in question to reassess their interpretations. The authors reconvened for a second review process and achieved 100% agreement for interrater reliability.

Article type. Each article was categorized by type: (1) program description (DP), (2) empirical research (ER), and (3) technical guide/method (TG).

Design or method. Some of the articles explicitly stated the design or methodology they incorporated. The investigators categorized the type of design or method based on their interpretation of the narrative for those articles that did not overtly discuss design. Design or method was generally not applicable for classifying position papers, technical guides, and theoretical narratives. Design or method classifications included (1) case study (CS), (2) correlational or factor analysis (COR), (3) descriptive data (DD), (4) quasi-experimental (QE), (5) qualitative (Q), or (6) none.

Outcome measures. A total of 14 outcome measures derived from the literature or suggestions during the field testing were listed on the investigators' review worksheet: (1) anecdotal report (AR), (2) pre/post measures (P/P), (3) participant evaluation or

Table 1. Summary of Literature Review

Author & Year	Type	Method	Measure	Theory
Becket, Refaei, & Skutar (2012)	DP	None	PR	None
Blanchard et al. (2009)	TG	None	None	None
Blanchard, Strauss, & Webb (2012)	DP	None	P/P, GA, O	None
Bowen & Kiser (2009)	DP	CS, Q	PE, SR, I, O	None
Bradshaw (2013)	DP	None	PE, PR, CD	None
Bringle et al. (2000)	DP	None	AR, CD, O	Yes
Browne & Roll (2015)	DP	None	AR	Yes
Butler (2002)	DP	None	AR, CD, GA	None
Carracelas-Juncal et al. (2009)	DP	None	CD, PR	None
DeLugan, Roussos, & Skram (2014)	DP	None	AR	Yes
Dorfman & Murty (2005)	DP	None	CD, O	Yes
Furco & Moely (2012)	ER	COR	P/P, PE	Yes
Gelmon et al. (2012)	ER	DD, QE, Q	P/P, CD, O	Yes
Hamel-Lambert et al. (2012)	DP	None	PE, CD, O	Yes
Hansen (2012)	TG	None	None	None
Harwood et al. (2005)	ER	DD, Q	AR, PE, FG, PR	None
Hughes, Huston & Stein (2011)	TG	None	AR, PE	Yes
Jaeger, Jameson & Clayton (2012)	DP	CS	CD, PR, I, O	Yes
Jameson et al. (2012)	ER	QE, Q	P/P, PE, PR	Yes
Jordan et al. (2012)	ER	DD, QE, Q	P/P, PE, CD, PR, I, O	Yes
Leh (2005)	DP	None	PE, PD, I	Yes
Litzky et al. (2010)	TG	None	AR, GA	None
Ryan (2000)	DP	None	PR	None
Seifer et al. (2012)	DP	None	AR, PE, FG, CD	None
Welch (2002)	DP	None	PE, CD, PD, O	None
Welch (2010)	TG	None	None	None
Whitley & Walsh (2014)	TG	None	None	Yes
Zlotkowski (2001)	TG	None	None	None

Note. Article type: DP = Program Description, ER = Empirical Research, TG = Technical Guide Design or Method: COR = Correlational Factor Analysis; CS = Case Study; DD = Descriptive Data; Q = Qualitative; QE = Quasi-experimental Design

Outcome Measure: AR = Anecdotal Report; CD = Course Development; FG = Focus Group/ Debriefing; GA = Goal Attainment for Community Partner; I = Interview; O = Other; PD =

Product Development; PE = Participant Evaluation or Survey; P/P = Pre/Post Measure; PR = Personal Reflection; SR = Syllabus Review or Analysis

survey (PE), (4) syllabus review/analysis (SR), (5) focus group/debriefing (FG), (6) course development (CD), (7) personal reflection (PR), (8) product development (PD), (9) community partner goal achievement (GA), (10) interview (I), (11) none or not applicable (None), and (12) other (O).

Theoretical framework. The coding process utilized a dichotomous Yes/No code to indicate whether articles specifically articulated a theory of adult learning used to inform and frame the professional development program. The investigators then noted which theoretical model (if any) was incorporated and report them in the Theoretical Framework subsection below.

Survey

The survey was intended to ascertain current trends, formats, and topics used in faculty development to advance community engagement. The authors considered and followed recommendations for effective survey development and administration provided by Drew, Hardman, and Hart (1996). This included limiting the length and number of survey items for efficiency and to increase potential response rates, piloting the prototype, and administering a follow-up to improve the response rate. The survey consisted of 22 items organized into six sections: (1) Who, (2) What, (3) Where, (4) When, (5) Impact outcomes, or how is faculty development assessed, and (6) Institutional information.

Who. This section of the survey consisted of seven items designed to determine who conducts and attends faculty development as well as how many participants typically attend faculty development activities, coupled with identifying the structural formats of the events.

What. Five questions were designed to identify the topics and structures of the faculty development programs.

Where. Only one survey item focused on location of faculty development by asking respondents to rank the frequency with which they use space on or off campus.

When. Two questions asked the duration of faculty development formats and when the activities are conducted over the course of one year.

Impact outcomes. The survey question in this section provided a list of measures of outcomes derived from the review of

the literature and input obtained during the field testing of the instrument.

Institutional information. This section of the survey asked respondents to characterize the type of their institution as well as whether it had received the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. Three remaining items asked if respondents' institution has a center or office that supports service-learning/community engagement, as well as the number of full-time staff at the center and where the center is located in the institutional structure (e.g., academic affairs, student affairs).

A prototype of the survey was developed by the investigators and field-tested by three colleagues who oversee campus centers for community engagement, each at a different type of institution: faith-based, private liberal arts, and public research university. Each colleague critiqued the prototype with one of the investigators via Skype. Revisions were made utilizing the feedback to create the final survey instrument on Survey Monkey. Based on the field test process, we estimated that respondents would spend approximately 10 to 15 minutes completing the survey. In alignment with multiple studies on electronic survey response rates (*Galesic & Bosnjak, 2009; Marcus, Bosnjak, Lindner, Pilischenko, & Schütz, 2007; Trouteaud, 2004*), the investigators kept the estimated survey response time to 10–15 minutes and notified recipients that it would require a minimal amount of time to complete. This measure was an attempt to increase the response rate.

The survey instrument and the methodology of this investigation were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of one of the authors' institutions. The survey was distributed by e-mail using the electronic database housed at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) that was used in a previous study (*Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013*). Research has shown that surveys distributed by e-mail result in higher quality of responses in terms of thoroughness and candidness than do mail or phone surveys (*Sheehan, 2001*). The survey was distributed to an array of types and sizes of institutions across the United States. A total of 609 surveys were sent, resulting in 75 undeliverable mailings for a total of 534 delivered surveys. Respondents were invited to complete and return the survey within 18 days, and an e-mail reminder was sent approximately midpoint of the response window. The investigators counted on the high issue salience of the survey topic (faculty development) for community engagement professionals to generate a strong response rate, as described by Sheehan (2001) and Marcus et al. (2007).

A total of 89 (16.6% rate) responses were received, of which 83 surveys (15.5%) were usable. The low response rate is analyzed in the Limitations section below. The authors originally hoped to compare and contrast responses by type of institution and between institutions with the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement and those without it. The small return rate and anonymity of institutional types built into the response platform did not allow for this type of comparison.

Results

Conceptual Review of the Literature

Article type. Of the 28 articles reviewed, 16 (57%) were descriptions of faculty development programs, whereas seven (25%) were categorized as technical guides on strategies or specific methods to assist faculty in developing service-learning courses. It should be noted that despite using a keyword search that included a variety of related terms within community engagement, the majority of the articles identified specifically used the term *service-learning* in their narrative—a term that has been contested or questioned by some critical theorists and practitioners. In essence, the authors of these articles employed “storytelling” to communicate how the faculty development was implemented and what was accomplished. Two articles provided descriptive data regarding participants and/or outcomes. The program descriptions, however, often lacked detail and specificity for replication purposes. Only five (17.8%) employed any type of empirical research methodology to answer research questions.

Design or method. As reported above, the majority of articles did not employ specific research methodology to answer research questions. One study (*Furco & Moely, 2012*) conducted a factor analysis as well as pre/post measures to assess impact of faculty development. Of the remaining six articles, three incorporated quasi-experimental designs utilizing pre/post measures. At least two of these also included personal reflections by participants. Another study (*Harwood et al., 2005*) used a qualitative method that included focus group debriefing and personal reflection coupled with anecdotal reports and participant evaluations. Another used mixed methods combining personal interviews, participant evaluation surveys, and review of documents (*Bowen & Kiser, 2009*).

Outcome measures. The most commonly used method for assessing outcomes and impact of faculty development was course

development and participant evaluation surveys (39%). Anecdotal reports in the form of testimonials were the third most common approach (28%) intended to document the outcome and impact of faculty development. Only five articles (17%) employed a pre/post measure to assess increase of participants' knowledge and understanding, and four articles (14%) reported using interviews to assess impact. One article reported that faculty and students attained goals that served as objectives for the course, met community partner needs, and facilitated faculty efforts to earn promotion and tenure (Blanchard, Strauss, & Webb, 2012). Likewise, only one article reviewed course syllabi as a way of assessing the extent to which faculty development participants effectively applied newly assimilated knowledge regarding course design (Bowen & Kiser, 2009). Three articles incorporated and reported a method to assess community partner satisfaction or goal attainment (Blanchard, et al, 2012; Butler, 2002; Litzky, Godshalk, & Walton-Bongers, 2010).

Theoretical framework. Most of the articles lacked any inclusion or description of a theoretical framework to guide the adult learning process. Only thirteen (47%) explicitly articulated a theoretical framework used to guide the adult learning process, not the pedagogical process embedded within engaged teaching such as service-learning. Kolb's (1984) experiential learning model, Mezirow's (1991, 2000) transformative learning model, and Rogers's (2003) diffusion of innovations model were described in two articles. An array of models was articulated in the few articles that explicitly noted incorporating theoretical frameworks: Cooks, Scharrer, and Castaneda Paredes's (2004) social approach model; Cox's (2004) faculty learning communities; Eccles et al.'s (2005) transformative change model; Swidler's (1986) social and system change model; and Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder's (2002) community of practice model.

Two articles described using a charrette method (Lindsey, Todd, Hayter, & Ellis, 2009) as an instructional approach to promote adult learning and professional development. These articles indicated that this approach was a key feature of a grant project specifically designed to promote engaged teaching and learning for faculty. A number of the articles incorporated Blanchard et al.'s (2009) competency-based approach, which is specifically designed for advancing engaged teaching and scholarship. Although this particular model did not address or influence adult learning per se, the investigators regarded this as a potentially viable and theoretically grounded approach to frame professional development through acquisition of skills at various levels of competency. Similarly, one

article by Jordan et al. (2012) built upon the work of Blanchard et al. (2009) to construct a similar competency-based program for faculty development.

Survey

A total of 89 responses out of 534 electronically distributed surveys were received, but only 83 responses were usable, resulting in a 15.5% response rate. An analysis of possible reasons for the low response rate is included in the section on limitations below. Note that the number of responses varies because some respondents chose not to answer all questions. The adjusted sample size for particular data sets has been noted where appropriate.

Characteristics of responding institutions. Five questions in the survey provide a general profile of respondent institutions. Public colleges and universities represented 40% of responses; 37% of returned surveys were from private liberal arts institutions; faith-based institutions provided 20% of the responses. Only two community colleges and one HBCU were represented in the survey data.

Approximately 76% of respondents represent institutions with the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, 23% are from institutions that do not hold the classification, and one respondent did not know their institution's status. The vast majority of respondents (89%) were from institutions that have a center or office dedicated to supporting service-learning and community engagement, and just over two thirds of those centers/offices are located in academic affairs. The investigators originally expected to receive responses that were more equitably distributed, and planned to do a comparative analysis of institutions with Carnegie Classification and without, as well as a comparison of institutions with community engagement centers located in either academic affairs or student affairs. However, the actual results apparently show that Carnegie classified institutions, and those with a community engagement center located in academic affairs, are more likely to respond to this type of survey. Perhaps this is due to greater funding, staffing, and resources for community engagement and service-learning at institutions that qualify for the Carnegie Classification and the expectation for staff at centers that report through academic affairs to contribute to scholarship in the field.

Faculty development formats. Survey questions attempted to reveal formats used for faculty support, including how training time is structured, where and when such training occurs, and

the amount of time faculty engage in development for service-learning and community engagement. According to the survey results (see Table 2), faculty development most commonly takes the form of one-on-one consultations and workshops. Responses to another survey question indicate that the most common workshop format is a series of 1–2 hour workshops, which is utilized by 78% of responding institutions. One-time half-day workshops are second most popular (41%), and full-day workshops are third (31%). Referring back to the data in Table 2, the next most utilized faculty development practices include inviting community partner guest speakers and connecting with colleague mentors. It's important to note that the most common faculty development formats all require minimal time commitments and, in the case of consultations and mentors, can be organized around individual faculty schedules fairly easily. The fifth most popular intervention, implemented by about half of respondent institutions, is faculty learning communities, which consist of a group of faculty who meet on a regular basis and play a role in setting the learning agenda and contributing resources for collective improvement of community-engaged scholarly practice. It's possible that this particular format is used because research shows positive outcomes (Cox, 2004; Furco & Moely, 2012) and the responsibility for developing the curriculum is shared by participants, instead of resting solely with community engagement staff who have competing priorities for their time. Seventeen respondents indicated "other" formats for faculty development, with webinars, regional symposia, and conferences mentioned in multiple comments.

Just over a third of survey respondents indicated that they use a faculty cohort model (also referred to as a faculty fellows seminar). The cohort (or fellows seminar) is distinct from the faculty learning community in that an instructor, usually a community engagement center staff member or distinguished faculty member, designs the curriculum and facilitates the learning process. Of the respondents who reported using a cohort model, 25% require 5–10 hours of faculty participation, 32% require 11–15 hours, 18% require 16–20 hours, and 25% require over 20 hours. In comparison, just over half (54%) of the institutions that do not use a cohort model report that faculty participate in 1–3 hours of development for service-learning and community engagement each year, and 33% report 4–6 hours per faculty member. Thus, it is clear that a cohort model provides significantly more time for faculty to acquire the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed for community-engaged scholarship than sporadic faculty development program offerings.

Table 2. Structures and Formats of Faculty Development

Survey Question: What are the structures and formats used in faculty development? (Mark all appropriate.)		
Structure/Format	Responses (<i>n</i> = 83)	Percent
One-on-one consultation	75	90.36%
Workshops	71	85.54%
Community partner guest speakers	48	57.83%
Colleague mentors	44	53.01%
Learning community	42	50.60%
Faculty fellows seminar(s)	32	38.55%
Community tours	30	36.14%
Book club/readings	22	26.51%
Training videos	9	10.84%
Writing retreats	10	12.05%
Other (please specify)	17	20.48%

In general, 90% of respondents conduct faculty development during the semester or quarter, versus intersession or summer. The most common place to conduct faculty development is in a classroom or conference room on campus (74%), with campus service-learning centers and off-site locations being used much less at 16% and 10% respectively. For accumulative calculation purposes, all N/A responses were ignored, resulting in 74 usable responses. The authors surmise that these choices about when and where to conduct faculty development are guided primarily by the desire to reduce barriers to participation. Faculty may be more likely to attend programming when they are already on campus to teach, and when the location of the event is conveniently close to their offices and classrooms.

Who is involved in faculty development. Four questions in the survey gathered information about who facilitates faculty development and who participates. The majority of respondents (55%) named service-learning/community engagement center directors as the *primary* persons responsible for implementing faculty development for service-learning and community engagement. However, faculty development is clearly a collaborative effort. In a follow-up question, 59% of respondent institutions indicated that multiple community engagement center staff members contribute to programming. One third of respondents consistently reported four additional groups as co-facilitators of faculty development: staff from campus centers for teaching/learning, outside speakers and consultants, faculty fellows, and community partners.

Two survey questions asked respondents to indicate the number and type of participants in service-learning faculty development training each year. For those institutions that use a cohort model (see Table 3), the majority indicated that their cohorts consisted of 1–5 full-time tenure-track faculty, 1–5 full-time adjunct faculty, and 1–5 part-time adjunct faculty. Surprisingly, over half of respondents said that 1–5 community partners participate in faculty development cohorts. Most institutions do not include staff or undergraduate, master's, or doctoral students in faculty development cohorts. This is likely because the target audience is faculty members who are currently teaching, or plan to teach, community-engaged courses. A noteworthy anomaly is the institution that indicated that more than 16 doctoral students participate in a faculty development cohort each year. Perhaps this institution is

Table 3. Number and Type of Participants in a Faculty Cohort Model

Survey Question: If you use a faculty cohort model, indicate/estimate the number of individuals in each category who participate in the cohort each year. Please mark N/A for each item if you do not use a cohort model.

Category of cohort participant	Number of participants from each category					Total institutional responses
	0	1–5	6–10	11–15	16+	
FT tenure-track faculty	1	15	10	2	0	28
FT adjunct or clinical faculty	8	13	2	0	0	23
PT adjunct or clinical faculty	7	15	0	0	0	22
Staff	10	9	0	0	0	19
Undergraduate students	13	2	0	0	0	15
Master's students	13	2	0	0	0	15
Doctoral students	11	5	0	0	1	17
Community partners	7	9	1	0	0	17

Note. N/A responses were not included. Numbers in each column represent the number of institutions that indicated how many of each type of participant participates in the faculty development cohort. For example, one institution indicated that zero full-time tenure-track faculty members participated in their cohort.

mobilizing around O'Meara's (2008) chapter "Graduate Education and Community Engagement," in which she describes a model for

socializing and preparing future faculty for community engagement by building in relevant coursework at the doctoral level.

A similar question was asked about the total number and types of individuals that participate in all forms of faculty development for service-learning and community engagement annually (see Table 4). One promising finding is that almost one third of institutions reported that over 16 tenure-track faculty participate in faculty development offerings annually. Their participation indicates

Table 4. Number and Type of Participants in All Forms of Faculty Development

Survey Question: Indicate/estimate the TOTAL number of individuals in each category who participate in all faculty development events each year. If you use a faculty cohort model, please include cohort participants in this response.						
Category of faculty development participant	Number of participants from each category					Total institutional responses
	0	1–5	6–10	11–15	16+	
FT tenure-track faculty	3	23	19	8	22	75
FT adjunct or clinical faculty	9	26	12	7	9	63
PT adjunct or clinical faculty	10	36	6	4	7	63
Staff	9	36	13	3	4	65
Undergraduate students	28	12	2	2	3	47
Master's students	29	13	2	1	2	47
Doctoral students	27	11	5	2	1	46
Community partners	10	36	6	6	3	61

Note. N/A responses were not included. Numbers in each column represent the number of institutions that indicated how many of each type of participant engages in all types of faculty development offerings. For example, three institutions indicated that zero full-time tenure-track faculty members participated in their faculty development offerings each year.

these faculty members' commitment to improving community-engaged practice even as they balance the responsibilities of research, teaching, and service. In general, 1–5 full-time and part-time adjunct faculty participate in annual faculty development training activities at the majority of institutions. These low numbers may be related to barriers and disincentives specific to adjunct faculty, such as teaching commitments at multiple institutions, lack of

pay for professional development, and inability to create and teach community-engaged courses without department chair approval. Approximately 59% of respondents include 1–5 community partners in development offerings, an indication that institutions are making an effort to develop community partners as co-educators. Again, the great majority of institutions do not include undergraduate, master's, or doctoral students in annual faculty development trainings for service-learning and community engagement.

Faculty development curriculum. Respondents were asked to identify topics covered in their faculty development (see Table 5). Six content areas emerged as most commonly integrated into curricula (in order of frequency): reflection, course development, principles of community engagement, syllabus development, assessment, and establishing/maintaining community partnerships. These topic areas represent the basic practical building blocks for designing and teaching a community-engaged course, which seems to be the purpose of most faculty development programs offered by centers for engagement. The second most common cluster of topics includes teaching about community-based research and critical pedagogical models, signaling a focus on developing more advanced community-engaged knowledge, competencies, and practices in alignment with Blanchard et al.'s (2009) competency model. Content areas integrated by less than half of the respondents include (in order of frequency) social justice or faith tenets related to engagement, cultural competency, risk management, publishing/dissemination of research, international service experiences, theories of learning, promotion and tenure, domestic immersion experiences, Title IX, and student travel procedures. It's possible that these topics are less popular because they are (a) specific to a certain type of community-engaged course (e.g., international experience), (b) outside the purview of the community engagement center (e.g., student travel procedures), (c) outside the expertise of the community engagement center staff, or (d) not on community engagement staff radar as important aspects of community-engaged scholarship. Some topics listed in the "other" section are worth naming, including scholarship of teaching, self-reflection on identity as a community-engaged scholar, and teaching with technology.

Approximately half of respondent institutions (49%) create or develop their own faculty training curricula and materials by drawing upon resources and information from the professional and scholarly literature. Another 45% of respondents use a combination

Table 5. Content and Topics of Faculty Development

Survey Question: What content/topics are included in faculty development? (Mark all appropriate.)

Content	Responses (n = 83)	Percent
Reflection	75	90.36%
Course development	74	89.16%
Principles of community engagement	71	85.54%
Syllabus development	68	81.93%
Assessment	67	80.72%
Establishing/maintaining partnerships	66	79.52%
Community-based research	52	62.65%
Logistical coordination	50	60.24%
Critical pedagogy	48	57.83%
Social justice or faith tenets related to engagement	40	48.19%
Cultural competency	37	44.58%
Risk management	34	40.96%
Publishing/dissemination	33	39.76%
International service	29	34.94%
Theory of learning	26	31.33%
Prep for P&T review	25	30.12%
Domestic immersions	25	30.12%
Community organizing	17	20.48%
Student travel procedures	16	19.28%
Title IX	12	14.46%
Other	8	9.64%

of existing curricula from the broader field and materials developed at their own institutions, whereas 6% rely exclusively on existing curricula and training program models previously developed in the field. When asked to identify specific curriculum resources, 16 respondents replied to the open-ended question. Eight respondents referenced Campus Compact's various publications and tool-kits, three referenced the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, and two referenced American Association of Colleges and Universities publications. Six also listed specific community engagement scholars and/or their publications.

Theoretical framework for faculty development. One survey question asked respondents whether they use a theoretical framework for adult learning to inform faculty development processes and practices. Surprisingly, 61% do not use a theoretical frame-

work, in contrast to 19% who do and approximately 20% who were unsure. Respondents were invited to name the theoretical frameworks they use. Of the 13 responses, three referenced Kolb's (1984) experiential learning model and two cited Mezirow's (1991, 2000) transformative learning. Individual respondents also identified Schön's (1983) reflective practitioner model, Lawler's (2003) community of adult learners, Freire's (1970) critical learning praxis, and the framework of communities of practice described by Lave (1982) and Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002). Situated cognition, self-directed learning, critical pedagogy, and "feminist and culturally responsive teaching and learning" were also mentioned without specific citations. It was noted that the survey asked respondents to indicate whether they used a theory of learning to guide or frame the cognitive process of faculty development, yet some responses listed theoretical frameworks for *student* learning in engaged teaching and learning.

Incentives for participation in faculty development.

Respondents were asked to identify all incentives used to encourage faculty participation in development activities (see Table 6). Most commonly used incentives are food and the intrinsic benefit of participating in a professional learning community. These incentives demonstrate the power of a desire for community, which can be formed when individuals share meals and when people come together around a common interest. Access to additional resources and minigrants for course development were identified by just under half of respondents as additional incentives. These institutions, or at least the community engagement centers, appear to use incentives to address the challenge of community-engaged teaching as a labor- and time-intensive act. However, only around 7% of institutions are able to offer course releases, which effectively allow faculty to reallocate their teaching and/or research time toward community-engaged teaching and research, instead of doing this work as an "add-on" to their full workload.

Over one third of institutions provide a stipend, which varies according to the type of faculty development activity. Based on 32 responses to the open-ended question about stipend amount, it appears that participation in faculty fellows cohort programs is incentivized by stipends ranging from \$500 to \$3,500. Many institutions described stipend rates for other types of faculty development ranging from \$75 for a half day to \$200 for participation in a multi-day seminar to \$250 per day for training that falls outside contract hours. Meanwhile, almost a quarter of respondents claimed that

their institutions provide no incentives for faculty development in the area of service-learning and community engagement.

Table 6. Incentives for Participation

Survey Question: What are the incentives for participation? (Mark all appropriate.)		
Incentive	Responses (n = 83)	Percent
Food	55	66.27%
Being part of a professional learning community	47	56.63%
Minigrants for course development	39	46.99%
Access to additional resources	39	46.99%
Stipend	32	38.55%
Letter/documentation for P & T portfolio	31	37.35%
Conference attendance (e.g., travel and registration)	23	27.71%
None	18	21.69%
Student assistants	13	15.66%
Course release time	6	7.23%

Assessing outcomes of faculty development. Respondents were asked to select from a list of 12 items (including “none” and “other”) generated from the literature review and field testing of the survey to indicate all examples of assessment practices that they employ in their faculty development programs (see Table 7). The most common assessment practice is conducting a participant survey or evaluation of the training, which yields faculty members’ self-reports of their learning and satisfaction with the program. This finding aligns with more general studies of faculty development program evaluation (*Ebert-May et al., 2011; Kucsera & Svinicki, 2010*), all of which call for more robust and direct assessment of faculty learning.

All other assessment activities listed in the survey are used by less than half of respondent institutions. Direct assessment practices like syllabus review and analysis, course development and approval, and analysis of faculty participants’ personal reflections would generate more useful data on the extent to which faculty are meeting intended learning outcomes for development offerings. Further, rigorous research practices like conducting focus groups or individual interviews, administering pre/post measures of participants’ knowledge, and reviewing course evaluations could produce generalizable findings about faculty development format and content.

Again, the results suggest accountability to community partners as an area in need of attention. Only 10% of respondents reported using product delivery or goal achievement for community partners as an assessment outcome. This lack of systematic assessment of community impact mirrors what the investigators found in the conceptual literature review: a dearth of literature in the field that connects faculty development to community outcomes.

Table 7. Impact and Outcome Measures

Survey Question: Which (if any) of the following are used to assess the impact/outcomes of faculty development? (Mark all appropriate.)		
Assessment activity	Responses (n = 81)	Percent
Participant evaluation/survey	51	62.96%
Debrief with individual participants	37	45.68%
Syllabus analysis/review	31	38.27%
Course development and approval	29	35.80%
Community partner survey/feedback	27	33.33%
Personal reflection (written or oral)	26	32.10%
Focus group/debrief discussion with group	24	29.63%
Pre/post measure of participants' knowledge	19	23.46%
Course evaluations	17	20.99%
Product/goal achievement of community partner	8	9.88%
None	7	8.64%
Other (please specify)	6	7.41%

Discussion

The following is a discussion of the results of the conceptual review and survey in the context of the research questions posed above.

Theoretical Frameworks

The results of both the conceptual review of literature and the survey revealed that most faculty development programs did not employ theoretical frameworks or models. It is unclear whether theoretical constructs were intuitively, implicitly, or unconsciously embedded into the programs or whether incorporating them was simply not considered. Furthermore, it does not appear that a developmental scope and sequence approach as described by Hoyt (2011) or Van Note Chism et al. (2013) is generally incorporated. Instead, these results from both the literature review and survey suggest that a vast majority of faculty development sessions are “static” one-time presentations on a given topic rather than a series of scaffolded workshop sessions. However, the results of the literature review suggest a trend toward the development and use of competency-based models that inform the assimilation of knowledge and skills, reflecting process models of theory characterized by Nilsen (2015). These competency-based models appear to incorporate a developmental scope and sequence as described by Hoyt (2011) and Van Note Chism et al. (2013). This approach seems to provide a robust and comprehensive chronological framework for assimilating specific knowledge and skills that build upon each other.

Professional Literature

Most of the recent articles in refereed journals are descriptions of professional development programs rather than empirical studies on their efficacy or impact. The descriptive articles either do not report any measures of impact or outcomes or are limited to participant satisfaction evaluations of the training sessions or course development as a product. Even more apparent is the lack of community partner input or assessment of the engaged teaching and scholarship that was the basis of the faculty development activities. For example, to what extent do community partners assess faculty’s cultural competency and/or critical consciousness when working with diverse populations in authentic settings off campus—assuming that these topics were included over the course of faculty development. The results of the literature review and survey also

suggest there is limited empirical evidence regarding the impact or outcomes of faculty development designed to advance community engagement. Thus, we do not have an adequate sense that faculty development is, in fact, effective or whether the knowledge and skill sets are actually implemented or done so effectively. An analogy may be in order in which we consider the fact that novice drivers may successfully complete drivers' education courses, but the extent to which they effectively apply and follow the rules of the road are assumed and generally unknown until actuaries of insurance companies collect and analyze data.

These results lead to two key and related recommendations. First, the professional literature is in need of articles that go beyond description of faculty development to articulate how these programs were assessed in terms of outcomes and impact. This includes not only assessing the extent to which faculty successfully assimilated and applied knowledge and skills in developing a course proposal or syllabus, but assessing the impact these efforts had on students and community partners as discussed in more detail below. Second, continued research employing qualitative and quantitative methods is needed to provide empirical evidence on the efficacy of faculty development programs.

Formats of Faculty Development

The conceptual review of the literature and the survey results reveal that faculty development generally includes tenure-track instructors but is also accessible to adjunct/clinical faculty. Therefore, faculty development staff must be cognizant of, and address, the tensions and demands confronting various faculty groups. This includes adjunct instructors' agency to create and teach community-engaged courses and the expectations of tenure-track faculty to publish and present and to prepare for promotion/tenure review.

Most of the articles reviewed did not provide specific details in terms of duration and length of development sessions or workshops. The survey indicated that the most widely used faculty development interventions are one-on-one consultations and workshops, with the most common workshop format being a series of 1–2 hour sessions. Additionally, slightly over one third of institutions implement more robust faculty development cohort or fellows models, though the duration of these programs ranged from 5 hours to over 20 hours. Faculty development programming is happening in a variety of forms, but notably most institutions that

responded to the survey neither integrate a theoretical framework for adult learning nor utilize direct assessment strategies to measure the impact of faculty development interventions.

Knowledge and Skill Sets

This study was also designed to determine the types of information included in faculty development designed to advance community engagement through engaged teaching and scholarship in higher education that exist in the professional literature. Six core topics and skill sets consistently emerged in the literature and survey results: reflection, course development, principles of community engagement, syllabus development, assessing student learning/impact, and establishing/maintaining community partnerships. This cluster of topics appears to reflect approximately half of the topical areas and skill sets articulated by Axtell (2012) and only three of 14 proposed by Blanchard et al. (2009). The topics and skill sets evident in the results of this investigation appear to be at an introductory level and focused on basic development of courses and logistics. But as the conceptual review and theoretical frameworks suggest, professional development (as the term implies) is, indeed, a developmental scope and sequence cognitive process in which the professional progresses from assimilating entry-level knowledge and skills to sustained and advanced areas of practice. As reported above, the works by Axtell (2012), Blanchard et al. (2009), and Jordan et al. (2012) identified in the conceptual review of the literature provide a developmental hierarchy of competencies that faculty move through that can serve as a framework for designing, implementing, and assessing faculty development.

The literature and survey results also reveal what is generally missing in terms of knowledge and skill sets. It would appear that faculty development programs must also include other important topical areas, such as promotion and tenure preparation, dissemination of research related to engaged teaching and scholarship, enhancing community capacity, grant writing, and understanding cultural and systemic dynamics, as well as cultural competency and critical consciousness that impact communities. Finally, approaches described by Blanchard et al. (2012) serve as exemplars by incorporating a competency-based model coupled with a professional learning community that integrates comprehensive assessment strategies.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this investigation. Kennedy (2007) acknowledges the challenges and anomalies of literature reviews noting, "Each reviewer must decide which specific studies to include or exclude from a review and why" (p. 139). Only one database search engine was employed, and the use of additional databases might have revealed additional articles or, conversely, might have revealed redundant sources. The choice of using ERIC as the single database was based on the prior use and experience of both authors with that particular tool. The literature review was limited to articles in peer-reviewed journals and did not include conference presentations, doctoral dissertations, books, or book chapters. The rationale for this decision was twofold: to provide a consistent source and format of information, and for efficiency. Similarly, the review was limited to critiquing articles from the past 15 years with the intent of identifying relatively recent sources. Finally, other keyword descriptors might have been more effective in identifying relevant articles.

With regard to the survey, results are based on respondents' self-reports, and so the authors were unable to authenticate responses. The response rate was disappointing, despite follow-up efforts, but it aligns with Sheehan's (2001) findings that response rates for electronically distributed surveys have trended downward over the years. Sheehan speculates that this decline may reflect a general feeling of survey fatigue due to higher volumes of electronic surveys being disseminated to individuals for research and marketing purposes. Further, Drew et al. (1996) acknowledge the challenge and frustration regarding survey returns, observing that there are no set guidelines or wide consensus among researchers as to what constitutes an acceptable response rate. In hindsight, a longer response window might have been warranted, along with more follow-up e-mails prompting recipients to complete the survey. Indeed, Sheehan (2001) found that multiple follow-up emails were more effective than one at increasing the number of responses. Given the survey limitations, it is not scientifically accurate to generalize these responses to the broader field, but the results do provide a brushstroke of practice that serves as a starting point for continued research and implementation.

Future Direction

Perhaps most importantly, the final research question of this investigation asked, what new directions should the field pursue

to support and enhance faculty development that advances service-learning and community engagement within higher education? These results raise a number of questions that can serve as the basis for future research and guided practice. Why are robust approaches such as faculty learning communities and cohorts not utilized more? Is it due to limited time and resources? Are faculty development staff unaware of these approaches? Or are faculty challenged to make the necessary significant time commitments to this type of professional development? Why is assessment limited to participant satisfaction surveys and interviews? Do faculty development staff have the knowledge, skills, time, and resources to conduct comprehensive and multifaceted assessment? How can impact be assessed more directly and robustly to include students and community partners?

Clearly, there are theoretical frames and competency-based approaches to advancing community engagement that appear to be promising, but the results of this investigation suggest they are underutilized. It is unclear why this is the case. The investigators surmise that staff at campus community engagement centers are generally unaware of and unfamiliar with these frames and approaches. If this is the case, it appears that the field should prioritize professional development for “professional developers,” which appears to be a growing role and responsibility for community engagement professionals and center staff. Efforts are currently under way through Campus Compact to develop and disseminate competency-based skill sets through curriculum and professional development institutes that may address this issue.

A competency-based approach also seems promising, as it provides a structured scope and sequence of knowledge and skill sets that go beyond basic entry-level content. Similarly, this approach may be useful in extending the duration of these learning opportunities beyond the apparent trend of workshops limited to 1–2 hours, which may not be sufficient time to assimilate new knowledge and skill sets. This method tends to incorporate specific demonstrable objectives that can be used to assess the impact of professional development. Infusing these types of benchmarks affords both a measure of assimilation and a form of ethical and professional accountability in practice. This is readily applicable to assessing direct impact of the professional development on individual participating faculty members.

In response to the challenges revealed in this study, the investigators propose that a broader, comprehensive perspective is in order by including a meta-model incorporating a scope and sequence

framework of specific competencies that include assessing impact of faculty development on students and community partners (Welch & Plaxton-Moore, *in press*). Such a framework would incorporate a “train the trainer” model that entails community engagement professionals providing professional education to faculty through direct and indirect means across a complex web of interrelated domains for an array of stakeholders (e.g., students, community partners) in a variety of settings (e.g., classroom, community settings) and contexts (e.g., academic, civic, professional, career). This includes creating educational impact within subcontexts for faculty composed of their own professional and scholarly trajectory, discipline, and their home institution as described by Axtell (2012). Professional development has the potential to indirectly serve students by empowering faculty and community partners to create, implement, and assess robust engaged teaching and learning experiences going beyond traditional course-based academic objectives to include broader outcomes for professional development (Schraubelt, Welch, Lobo, & Robinson, 2015), civic responsibility (Adler & Goggin, 2005), critical consciousness (Pitner & Sakamoto, 2005), cultural competency (Ross, 2010), and even spiritual development (Astin, Astin, & Lindholm, 2011). Community engagement extends beyond the four walls of the classroom to various settings and constituencies.

A holistic framework for professional educational development for faculty and/or community engagement professionals must explicitly name the elements and contexts that should sustain the intended changes, so that interventions can be built to effectively stimulate these desired changes. This would manifest itself by helping faculty learn how to work with community partners to identify their goals and objectives for service-learning, community-based research, and other forms of engaged scholarship that can be measured and observed as an indirect assessment of faculty development impact. Such an approach would address a critical element of community partner involvement and impact that appears to be missing in both the literature and survey.

Conclusion

Faculty development continues to be a common and viable approach to empowering faculty to develop, implement, and assess engaged teaching, learning, and scholarship to advance community engagement in higher education. This conceptual review and survey presented current trends and promising practice. These results can, hopefully, provide community engagement profes-

sional ideas and information that can be used to develop and implement faculty development programs on their own campus. This investigation also provided descriptive data that addressed the research questions.

Generally speaking, theoretical frameworks are not typically incorporated into the design and delivery of faculty development. Programs appear to typically consist of short, 1–2 hour static, standalone on-campus “workshops” on specific topics, attended by five to 10 instructors, most often tenure-track faculty. A cluster of topics and skills common for initial entry into engaged teaching and scholarship include the “nuts and bolts” of course and syllabus development, reflection, and establishing community partnerships. However, sustained and continued professional education for more complex and advanced practice does not appear to be included in the examples of professional development programs reviewed in this investigation. Consequently, a scope and sequence of other important topics and skills need to be included in ongoing faculty development. Assessing impact of faculty development continues to be an area of needed growth and focus. This study also suggests that limited empirical research has been conducted to study the impact and outcomes of current faculty development programs. One-on-one technical support coupled with a series of 1–2 hour workshops is the most prominent form of faculty development but appears to be limited in scope. Competency-based approaches and faculty cohort models are emerging as promising practice. At the same time, there is much more that can be done and learned, and one area in need of attention is empowering community engagement professionals with these models and methods.

References

- Adler, R. P., & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by civic engagement. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3, 236-253.
- Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2011). *Cultivating the spirit: How college can enhance students' inner lives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Axtell, S. (2012). *Creating a community-engaged scholarship (CES) faculty development program: Phase one: Program and skill mapping*. Retrieved from University of Minnesota Office for Public Engagement website: <http://www.engagement.umn.edu/faculty/tools>
- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blanchard, L. W., Hansmann, C., Strauss, R. P., Belliard, J. C., Krichbaum, K., Waters, E., & Seifer, S. D. (2009). Models for faculty development:

- What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 47–65.
- Blanchard, L. W., Strauss, R. P., & Webb, L. (2012). Engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Campus integration and faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 97–128.
- Bowen, G. A., & Kiser, P. M. (2009). Promoting innovative pedagogy and engagement through service-learning faculty fellow programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 13(1), 27–43.
- Butler, C. (2002). Urban missions mini-grants as faculty development tools. *Metropolitan Universities*, 13(1), 85–90.
- Chamberlin, J. S., & Phelps-Hillen, J. (2015). Competencies community engagement professionals need for faculty development. In L. D. Dostilio (Ed.), *Community engagement professionals project: Establishing a preliminary competency model for second generation CEPs* (pp. 179–200). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Cooks, L., Scharrer, E., & Castaneda Paredes, M. (2004). Toward a social approach to learning in community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5–23.
- Cox, M. D. (2004, Spring). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, pp. 5–23.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Dostilio, L. (2016, March). *Understanding community engagement professionals*. Paper presented at the Campus Compact 30th anniversary conference, Boston, MA.
- Drew, C. J., Hardman, M. L., & Hart, A. W. (1996). *Designing and conducting research: Inquiry in education and social science* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ebert-May, D., Derting, T. L., Hodder, J., Momsen, J. L., Long, T. M., & Jardeleza, S. E. (2011). What we say is not what we do: Effective evaluation of faculty professional development programs. *BioScience*, 61(7), 550–558.
- Eccles, M., Grimshaw, J., Walker, A., Johnston, M., & Pitts, N. (2005). Changing the behavior of healthcare professionals: The use of theory in promoting the uptake of research findings. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 58, 107–112.
- Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Furco, A., & Moely, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128–153.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Galesic, M., & Bosnjak, M. (2009). Effects of questionnaire length on participation and indicators of response quality in a web survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73(2), 349–360.
- Harwood, A. M., Oches, L., Currier, D., Duke, S., Hammond, J., Moulds, L. . . Werder, C. (2005). *Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining*

- service-learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, 12(1), 41–51.
- Holmboe, E. S. (2015). Realizing the promise of competency-based medical education. *Academic Medicine*, 90(4), 411–413.
- Hoyt, L. (2011). Sustained city–campus engagement: Developing an epistemology for our time. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 265–288). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Jordan, C., Doherty, W. J., Jones-Webb, R., Cook, N., Dubrow, G., & Mendenhall, T. J. (2012). Competency-based faculty development in community-engaged scholarship: A diffusion of innovation approach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 65–95.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2007). Defining a literature. *Educational Researcher*, 36(3), 139–147.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kucsera, J., & Svinicki, M. (2010). Rigorous evaluations of faculty development programs. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 24(2), 5–18.
- Lave, J. (1982). A comparative approach to educational forms and learning processes. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 13(2), 181–187.
- Lawler, P. (2003, Summer). Teachers as adult learners: A new perspective. In K. P. King, & P. A. Lawler (Eds.), *New directions for adult and continuing education* (No. 98), 15–22. New York: Wiley.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. In T. N. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 197–211). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Lindsey, G., Todd, J. A., Hayter, S. J., & Ellis, P. G. (2009). *A handbook for planning and conducting charrettes for high-performance projects* (2nd ed.). Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
- Litzky, B. E., Godshalk, V. M., & Walton-Bongers, C. (2010). Social-entrepreneurialism and community leadership: A service-learning model for management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(1), 142–162.
- Marcus, B., Bosnjak, M., Lindner, S., Pilischenko, S., & Schütz, A. (2007). Compensating for low topic interest and long surveys: A field experiment on nonresponse in web surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 25(3), 372–383.
- McKee, C. W., & Tew, W. M. (2013, Spring). Setting the stage for teaching and learning in American higher education: Making the case for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 133, pp. 3–14.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Nilsen, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Science: IS*, 10(53). doi:10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Graduate education and community engagement. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 113, pp. 27–42.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pitner, R. O., & Sakamoto, I. (2005). The role of critical consciousness in multicultural practice: Examining how its strength becomes its limitation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75(4), 684–694.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Ross, L. (2010). Notes from the field: Learning cultural humility through critical incidents and central challenges in community-based participatory research. *Journal of Community Practice*, 18, 315–335.
- Schnaubelt, T., Welch, M., Lobo, K., & Robinson, G. (2015, April). *Pathways of public service: A comprehensive framework for social change and diagnostic tool*. Presentation at the 18th annual Continuums of Service Conference, Western Region Campus Compact, Long Beach, CA.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London, England: Temple Smith.
- Sheehan, K. B. (2001). E-mail Survey Response Rates: A Review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 6: 0. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2001.tb00117.x
- Sheridan, S. M., Welch, M., & Orme, S. F. (1996). Is consultation effective? A review of outcome research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 17, 341–354.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Tools and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273–286.
- Trouteaud, A. R. (2004). How you ask counts: A test of internet-related components of response rates to a web-based survey. *Social Science Computer Review*, 22(3), 385–392.
- Van Note Chism, N., Palmer, M. M., & Price, M. F. (2013). Investigating faculty development service-learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service-learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment: Volume 2A. Students and faculty* (pp. 187–214). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Van Note Chism, N., & Szabo, B. (1998). How faculty development programs evaluate their services. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development* 15(2), 55–62.
- Welch, M. (2016). *Engaging higher education: Purpose, platforms, and programs for community engagement*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Welch, M., Brownell, K., & Sheridan, S. M. (1999). What's the score and game plan on teaming in schools?—A review of the literature on team-teaching and school-based problem-solving teams. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20, 36–49.
- Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (in press). A holistic framework for educational professional development in community engagement. In P. Green

- & B. Berkey (Eds.), *Faculty development in the service of community engagement and service-learning: Defining purpose and roles, developing models of practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Welch, M., & Saltmarsh, J. (2013). Current practice and infrastructure for campus center of community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(4), 25-55.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Appendix: Articles Included in This Literature Review

- Becket, D., Refaei, B., & Skutar, C. (2012). A faculty learning community's reflection on implementing service-learning goals. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 74-86.
- Blanchard, L. W., Hansmann, C., Strauss, R. P., Belliard, J. C., Krichbaum, K., Waters, E., & Seifer, S. D. (2009). Models for faculty development: What does it take to be a community-engaged scholar? *Metropolitan Universities*, 20(2), 47-65.
- Blanchard, L. W., Strauss, R. P., & Webb, L. (2012). Engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Campus integration and faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 97-128.
- Bowen, G. A., & Kiser, P. M. (2009). Promoting innovative pedagogy and engagement through service-learning faculty fellow programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 13(1), 27-43.
- Bradshaw, G. W. (2013, Spring). Internationalization and faculty-led service-learning. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, pp. 39-53.
- Brangle, R. G., Games, R., Foos, C. L., Osgood, R., & Osborne, R. (2000). Faculty fellows program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 882-894.
- Browne, L. P., & Roll, S. J. (2015). Learning how to teach poverty: A case for community of practice. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 30(1). Abstract retrieved from ERIC database (EJ1072478). Article retrieved via Ebscohost (restricted database).
- Butler, C. (2002). Urban missions mini-grants as faculty development tools. *Metropolitan Universities*, 13(1), 85-90.
- Carracelas-Juncal, C., Bossaller, J., & Yaoyuneyong, G. (2009). Integrating service-learning pedagogy: A faculty reflective process. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 4, 28-44.
- DeLugan, R. M., Roussos, S., & Skram, G. (2014). Linking academic and community guidelines for community-engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(1), 155-168.
- Dorfman, L. T., & Murty, S. A. (2005). A diffusion of innovations approach to gerontological curriculum enrichment: Institutionalizing and sustaining curricular change. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, 26(2), 35-50.

- Furco, A., & Moely, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128–153.
- Gelmon, S., Blanchard, L., Ryan, K., & Seifer, S. D. (2012). Building capacity for community-engaged scholarship: Evaluation of the faculty development component of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus initiative. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 21–45.
- Hamel-Lambert, J. M., Millesen, J. L., Slovak, K., & Harter, L. M. (2012). Reflections on community-engaged scholarship faculty development and institutional identity at Ohio University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 129–148.
- Hansen, K. (2012). A practical guide for designing a course with a service-learning component in higher education. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 26(1), 29–36.
- Harwood, A. M., Oches, L., Currier, D., Duke, S., Hammond, J., Moulds, L. . . Werder, C. (2005). Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining service-learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 41–51.
- Hughes, B., Huston, T., & Stein, J. (2011). Using case studies to help faculty navigate difficult classroom moments. *College Teaching*, 59(1), 7–12.
- Jaeger, A., Jameson, J. K., & Clayton, P. (2012). Institutionalization of community engaged scholarship at institutions that are both land grant and research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 149–167.
- Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., Jaeger, A. J., & Bringle, R. G. (2012). Investigating faculty learning in the context of community-engaged scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(2), 40–55.
- Jordan, C., Doherty, W. J., Jones-Webb, R., Cook, N., Dubrow, G., & Mendenhall, T. J. (2012). Competency-based faculty development in community-engaged scholarship: A diffusion of innovation approach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 65–95.
- Leh, A. (2005). Lessons learned from service-learning and reverse mentoring in faculty development: A case study in technology training. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 25–41.
- Litzky, B. E., Godshalk, V. M., & Walton-Bongers, C. (2010). Social-entrepreneurialism and community leadership: A service-learning model for management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(1), 142–162.
- Ryan, S. (2000). Do no harm: Volunteerism as professional development for faculty. *Metropolitan Universities*, 11(1), 69–76.
- Seifer, S. D., Blanchard, L. W., Jordan, C., Gelmon, S., & McGinley, P. (2012). Faculty for the engaged campus: Advancing community engaged careers in the academy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 5–20.
- Welch, M. (2002). Promoting civically engaged scholarship through a study/action group. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 7(3), 111–120.

- Welch, M. (2010). OPERA: A first-letter mnemonic and rubric for conceptualizing and implementing service-learning. *Issues in Educational Research*, 20(1), 76–82.
- Whitley, M., & Walsh, D. S. (2014). A framework for the design and implementation of service-learning courses. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 85(4), 34–39.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2001, Summer). Humanistic learning and service-learning at the liberal arts college. *New Directions for Higher Education*, pp. 89–96.

About the Authors

Marshall Welch is an independent scholar living and working in the Portland, Oregon area. His research interests include service-learning, reflection, the institutionalization of community engagement, and the spirituality of service-learning. He completed his Doctor of Ministry from San Francisco Theological Seminary.

Star Plaxton-Moore is the director of community-engaged learning at the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at University of San Francisco (USF). She also directs the McCarthy Center's Public Service and Community Engagement Minor. Her research interests include faculty development for community-engaged scholarship, institutional culture and policies related to community engagement, student preparation for community-engaged learning, and assessment of student learning in community-engaged courses and programs. Star received her M.Ed. from the George Washington University and is completing her doctorate in multicultural education at USF.