Using Collaborative Autoethnography to Understand the Institutionalization of Engaged Scholarship

Cecile H. Sam
Brent C. Elder
Stacey E. Leftwich
Rowan University

Abstract: *The purpose of this article is to extend the literature on the institutionalization of engaged scholarship by examining it through an organizational change lens. More specifically, this article uses autoethnography to explore how a college of education at a public research institution moved towards institutionalizing policies for a scholarship of engagement for faculty working at Professional Development Schools (PDS). This article also articulates how colleges and schools of education might consider PDS partnerships as examples of engaged scholarship for the purposes of connecting research to practice.*

Keywords: school-university partnerships; institutionalization; engaged scholarship

Cecile H. Sam is an Assistant Professor in the Educational Leadership and Services Department at Rowan University.

Brent C. Elder is an Assistant Professor in the Interdisciplinary and Inclusive Education Department at Rowan University.

Stacey E. Leftwich is the Executive Director of the Office of Educator Support and Partnerships in the College of Education at Rowan University.

Introduction

Many universities in the United States have made engaged scholarship—an "integration of teaching, research, and service" with the local community (Sandmann, 2008, p.96)—a key part of their mission, taking intellectual, resource, and human capital and applying them to support the communities in which they are situated (O'Meara, 2010; Stanton, 2008). For colleges and schools of education, one prime opportunity can be through Professional Development Schools (PDS). A PDS is an example of a university-community partnership (UCP) (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Coburn & Penuel, 2016) that is a long-term, mutual relationship where faculty and school leaders use research to focus on a problem of practice (Latham & Wedwick, 2009; Zenkov, Shiveley, & Clark, 2016). Faculty working within PDS participate in engaged scholarship by working with local schools to meet their contextual needs. With over 1,000 PDS sites in the United States, there are ample opportunities for engaged scholarship. However, making engaged scholarship part of the university mission and then actually institutionalizing it are two very different steps in a larger change process (Sandmann, 2008). Research indicates that engaged scholarship is still not widely institutionalized in higher education despite its proliferation in mission statements (Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Sandmann, 2008). This lack of institutionalization can mean a lack of sustainability or only surface-level change (Colburn & Penuel, 2016).

One way to examine the institutionalization of engaged scholarship is through an organizational change lens, where we can explore how innovation is normalized within the organization (Kezar, 2001). Changing the types of scholarship that a college or university values requires more than cosmetic adjustments, it includes a shift in structure and culture (Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2001).

This collaborative autoethnography examines how a College of Education (COE) within a public research university is trying to institutionalize the engaged scholarship of PDS work. It offers perspectives by the persons directly involved in orchestrating change. We used an organizational change lens to frame our understanding of the evolution of engaged scholarship to its "fourth stage:" institutionalization (Sandmann, 2008, p.91). The following questions guided our inquiry:

1. How has the history of engaged scholarship in the COE influenced current policy related to the PDS work?
2. How has the University, and more specifically the COE, moved towards institutionalization of engaged scholarship through PDS work?
3. What are some of the needs of the faculty so they can do this PDS work?
4. How can an institution support engaged scholarship?

In this article we first provide a review of the literature on engaged scholarship. Next, we provide our conceptual framework, institutionalization (Curry, 1992), and the way we situate engaged scholarship within that framework. We follow with our methodology, collaborative autoethnography (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernandez, 2013). Next, we present our findings and discuss how institutionalization of engaged scholarship through PDS work at our university can inform our understanding of how other colleges and universities institutionalize such change. We conclude by providing implications for research and practice.

Review of the Literature

Engaged Scholarship

There are numerous ways to define public scholarship within higher education institutions. Boyer (1990) in his work, Scholarship Reconsidered, explored different forms scholarship could take. For this article, we utilize the terms "scholarship of engagement" and "engaged scholarship" to describe faculty activities that challenge more "mainstream academic scholarship" (Barker, 2004, p.125). Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara (2008) describe traditional scholarship as "pure, disciplinary, homogeneous, expert-led, supply-driven, hierarchical, peer reviewed, and almost exclusively university-based" (p. 48). Engaged scholarship differs from mainstream in two ways. First, it involves a mutually beneficial connection between faculty and the community, and second it is an "integration of teaching, research, and service" (Sandmann, 2008, p. 96). In the field of education, working with a local school community to help solve problems of practice can be one form of engaged scholarship (Zook et al., 2019), and PDS is one model of the that workd.

Sandmann (2008) argues engaged scholarship is currently undergoing an evolution within higher education. Using punctuated equilibrium theory, Sandmann (2008) established the first three punctuations as: (a) defining engagement, (b) enacting engagement through teaching and research, and (c) using engagement as scholarly expression. Sandmann (2008) claims that engaged scholarship is currently in its fourth stage, which is the "institutionalization of the scholarship of engagement within and across academe" (p.98). Here, institutions have generally recognized the value of engaged scholarship, but the current challenge is determining how to integrate it within its structures. The literature at this stage examines colleges/universities can support a scholarship of engagement (Beaulieu et al., 2018).

In a scoping review of the literature, Beaulieu and colleagues (2018) found that there are four categories that correspond with the institutionalization of engaged scholarship: (a) mission, (b) reward structure, (c) logistical support, and (d) student support. In regard to mission, even though many universities have made public and civic engagement part of their mission, at times it manifests itself through tokenism where programs and initiatives have "little or no real effect on the broader, overall mission and work of the academy" (Fitzgerald et al., 2012, p. 239).

Regarding the reward structures, studies have indicated that universities have made some gains in supporting multiple forms of scholarship (O'Meara, Lounder, & Hodges, 2013; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). However, many faculty reward systems in place do not place an equal value on engaged community scholarship, to the extent that some faculty felt that over time they were discouraged from engaged scholarship (Checkoway, 2013; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). For pre-tenured faculty, without a faculty reward system that aligns with an engaged scholarship mission, there may be less incentive to do that type of work. Research indicates that institutions value engaged scholarship less in the tenure and promotion process, and this difference can deter junior faculty (O'Meara, 2010).

In terms of logistical support, institutions have an important role facilitating partnerships and relationships between faculty and the community, supporting faculty work, and creating administrative teams to also support that work (Beaulieu et al., 2018; DeLugan, Roussos, &

Skram, 2014). In their study, O'Meara and colleagues (2013) found six ways faculty felt institutional leaders could support their work, ranging from personal encouragement, to funding, and tenure reforms.

The last category for institutionalizing is through graduate student support. This category focuses on providing students opportunities to work within the communities, as well as developing student-based incentive and reward structures (Sandmann, et al.,2008). It also includes opportunities to socialize graduate students who are interested in a scholarship of engagement and help them find ways to integrate it in their research, teaching, and service (O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006). The literature indicates that graduate students often do not have the support and opportunities to grow into engaged scholars (Jaeger, Sandmann, & Kim, 2011). Potential types of support include mentorship, publishing opportunities, and research opportunities (Jaeger et al., 2011; Warren, Park, & Tieken, 2016).

For this study, PDS is one of the ways scholarship of engagement is trying to become institutionalized within the COE. The following four categories play an important role in how successful faculty can be in their work with the PDS: (a) mission, (b) faculty reward structure, (c) logistical support, and (d) graduate student socialization. We have organized our findings around these categories and present them later on in the article.

When looking at engaged community scholarship, there is room for further research in higher education that illustrates what institutions can do to integrate this type of scholarship within the institution. There is also a gap in recognizing PDS work itself as a form of engaged scholarship, despite the fact that it provides faculty ample opportunity to practice engaged scholarship. This gap may exist because often educational scholars place PDS work under the purview of K-12 research, despite the fact research in schools can be a key component of higher education faculty work (Zook et al.2019).

Theoretical Framework: Institutionalization

The institutionalization of engaged scholarship requires a change in the university organization, its values, and its policies and structures (Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2001). Institutionalization theory posits that change

must undergo a series of stages before it is stable enough to be a lasting part of the institution (Gallant & Drinan, 2008, Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2001).

Innovation goes through three stages before it becomes institutionalized within the university: (a) mobilization, (b) implementation, and (c) institutionalization (Curry, 1992). In the mobilization phase, there is an impetus for change and the institution tries to be ready for that change (Kezar, 2001; Curry, 1992). Kotter (1996) calls it creating a "sense of urgency" within the organization (p. 4). During the implementation phase, the organization responds to the need for change and "change is introduced to the system" (Kezar, 2001, p.13). In the final institutionalization phase, the change has been fully incorporated into the system and the change is no longer separated from other established parts of the system (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2008, Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2001). It is important to note that these three phases are not necessarily exclusive of one another--rather they can be viewed together as part of a continuum of institutionalization (Curry, 1992; Kezar & Sam, 2013).

This article extends the empirical higher education literature on the institutionalization of engaged scholarship as it examines PDS work as scholarly expression. We do so through the use of collaborative autoethnography, a method that aligns with the philosophy of a scholarship of engagement (O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011; Sandmann 2008).

Methodology and Data Sources

Context

To have a clear idea of engaged scholarship and its future at our university, we provide some historical context. Rowan University is a public research university in the northeastern United States. In the past several years, Rowan University has moved from being a local normal college to a research university in a relatively short period of time. We found that within the last 20 years, there have been profound shifts. Beginning in the 1920's as a "normal school" that trained local teachers, it is now currently an R2 (high research) Carnegie Classified Institution of Higher Education. The biggest shifts seemed to have occurred within the last 8 years. In 2012, Rowan University gained a medical school, and

designated as a comprehensive research university. In 2017, the Carnegie Institution classified Rowan University as an R3 (moderate research) institution, and in 2018, it was reclassified again as an R2.

PDS work. The COE has also shifted with the university. As part of Rowan University's commitment to building community partnerships, the COE established its first PDS partnership in 1991. Since then, PDS network has grown to 11 schools with a waiting-list of nine others. Faculty working in these schools are called Professors-in-Residence (PIRs), and their work includes, but not limited to: providing PD support for teachers, overseeing teacher candidates, increase P-12 learners' achievement and conduct research in teaching and learning for the purpose for development for all three.

Positionality

Central to this project is our positionality and how that influences how we make sense of the COE and the institutionalization of engaged scholarship. Cecile is an assistant professor not connected to PDS work, but she has conducted research on faculty work in a K-20 context. Borrowing from collaborative autoethnography methodology, Cecile acted as a "sounding board" (Chang, et al., 2013, p.23) to provide an outside perspective to the data and experiences of other authors. Brent is an assistant professor with eight years teaching experience in a public elementary school. At the time of writing, he was finishing his third year as a PIR. As a scholar, he very much centers his work in the sphere of engaged scholarship. Stacey is the executive director of the office that oversees the PDS network. She is an associate professor with 18 years in higher education, with 10 of those years working as a PIR. In her administrative role, Stacey attempts to institutionalize PDS work as a form of valid engaged scholarship to create opportunities for interested faculty to do this work.

Collaborative Autoethnography

Collaborative autoethnography takes the experiences of the researchers and turns them into data to explore a broader topic. In this case, it is their experience of institutionalizing PDS work. It is a methodology that focuses on: (a) the use of personal reflection and experience of the authors as data, and (b) finding a connection between the personal self and others using a cultural interpretation (Anderson,

2006; Denzin, 1997; Ellis, 2004). For this collaborative autoethnography Brent and Stacey were privy to the changes taking place to support PDS work as engaged scholarship. Cecile, functioned as a sounding board for the interpretation of the data. We designed our methodology after the iterative process described by Chang et al. (2013).

We chose collaborative autoethnography because it allows for the authors to tell their own narrative from their own experiences (Chang, et al., 2013; Ngunjiri & Hernandez, 2017). Two of the authors had information and experiences that focused around the change effort and not shared amongst others conducting PDS work at Rowan University.

Data Sources and Analysis

For this study there are several points of data that we used to document our experiences. We formally collected data over the course of two years. Following Chang and colleagues (2013) model, our data collection and analysis follow three phases: (a) preliminary data collection, (b) subsequent data collection, and (c) data analysis and interpretation.

Preliminary data collection. For this stage of data collection, we had several sources of data available. We wrote memos, developed PDS meeting agendas, and routinely kept meeting minutes from the following events: PDS orientations, PDS retreats, and PDS monthly meetings. The progress reports allowed the authors access to PDS site-specific details about individual PDS projects and gauge their individual progress in developing their approached to engaged scholarship. At this stage of data collection, there was time for individual self-reflection, while Brent and Stacey, working within the PDS network, also met together to share their insights and probe for further lines of inquiry.

Subsequent data collection. From the preliminary data, we felt that it was important to speak with the different faculty involved in the PDS work individually and to reflect on the information provided. At this stage of data collection, Brent interviewed five PDS faculty to talk about their experience with engaged scholarship (Patton, 2002). Interviews formalized the discussion about their work, what facilitated their work, and what further support they needed. At this stage there was time for self-reflection on the data, at least once every two weeks over the course

of six months, we would meet together to make meaning of the interviews in light of the previous data.

Data analysis and interpretation. According to Chang et al. (2013), the final stage of the autoethnography process is group meaning making and theme searching. Personal memos, reflections, and interviews were coded. We coded data in three phases: (a) open coding, (b) axial coding, and (c) selective coding (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). We analyzed all data systematically and collaboratively to ensure inter-coder reliability (Patton, 2002). Verbal and written dialogue was a key part of this process. Informed by the literature, we categorized our own reflective data into four categories that correspond to the institutionalization of the scholarship of engagement as outlined by Beaulieu and colleagues (2018). These categories are: (a) mission, (b) faculty reward structure, (c) logistical support, and (d) graduate student socialization. Using institutionalization theory as a framework, we organized our final conversation about the engaged scholarship at Rowan University, keeping in mind the three stages for mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization (Curry, 1992). We then engaged in final conversation of our meaning making, that occurred as an asynchronous written interview.

Findings: Institutionalization of PDS Work

As a means of aligning the presented data from our study with core aspects of collaborative autoethnography, we chose to present our findings using the data are sourced from the asynchronous interview process.

Mission

With major changes happening in both Rowan University and the COE in a short period of time, it makes sense that faculty, administrators, and other university stakeholders would also re-examine and refine the existing mission of the University and College.

Making space for engaged scholarship. There is a difference between implicitly leaving a space open for engaged scholarship to take place and explicitly making engaged scholarship part of the organization's mission. Though engaged scholarship is not directly

mentioned, part of the mission is to be responsive to "emerging demands" and needs of the surrounding community (Rowan University, 2017).

It is within the mission of the COE where there is a stronger connection to engaged scholarship. Through its mission, the COE directly identifies engagement with the community as a core operational value. For example, a part of the COE's mission is to "positively impact and develop" local and regional educational communities through partnerships and "integrating teaching, research, and service" (Rowan U COE, ND). These goals are very much in line with the definitions of engaged scholarship (Barker, 2014; Sandmann, 2008). More specifically, the COE states that, "What makes the College of Education relevant is our engagement with our P-12 and community partners through our Professional Development Schools (PDS) network…" By explicitly making engaged scholarship part of the mission of the COE, it at least signals and acknowledges that the work is valued. However, this public acknowledgment does not guarantee that it will be treated as such.

Redefining scholarship and its importance. Because of the rapid changes at Rowan University, the understanding of engaged scholarship and its importance is still varied amongst different populations of faculty. For example, the faculty hired in 2012 and later were under the new university expectations of increased research productivity. Meanwhile, those hired prior were functioning under the previous expectations with the emphasis placed on a more teaching-intensive model. As a result, it became increasingly difficult to define what engaged scholarship looks like. Stacey explains:

> Historically, the college has always participated in and expected faculty to be a part of engaged scholarship, but the pressures of producing scholarship that aligned to the new scholarship culture was causing faculty stress, especially for those caught within the shift. The COE has traditionally worked with and in schools, and if research came out of this work then this was an added bonus. However, research was not a great expectation compared to what faculty are expected to produce now.

The difference in understanding of scholarship and its importance proved to be challenging, especially for those faculty caught in between the teaching college-to-research institution shift. This shift

may have influenced junior faculty's ability to secure tenure and promotion. It also resulted in a fragmentation of ideas about what senior faculty believed constituted scholarship as some were operating under one set of prior faculty research expectations, while the university was establishing another. Brent elaborates:

> Many junior faculty receive[d] mixed messages from senior colleagues, and both were probably confused about scholarship expectations. I witnessed several faculty going up for tenure and promotion after 2012 and were less successful because of the shift in the institution's culture about scholarship.

This confusion about scholarship broadly had implications on engaged scholarship specifically, with some faculty being hesitant to move beyond more traditional types of scholarship for fear of missing out on promotion. Part of the work of institutionalizing engaged scholarship is trying to change the way people understand what it can look like. This can prove to be challenging as Brent explains:

> As we are a growing research institution, teaching, research, and service expectations seem to be a moving target, and at times, it feels like we are in an identity crisis as a university. I think this makes junior faculty retreat into traditional faculty roles and not take on the risks involved in engaged scholarship.

While retreating into more traditional types of research is not necessarily negative. If junior faculty are afraid to take risks due to inconsistent messaging about what the university and college value, then the process of institutionalizing engaged scholarship will rely on a fewer number of pre-tenured faculty doing such work.

Faculty Reward Structure and Process

The findings presented in the Mission section above connects directly to the need for faculty reward structures and process to support faculty who are committed to engaged scholarship. In order for a scholarship of engagement to be institutionalized, there needs to be built-in incentives and supports for faculty to decide to engage in such work (Beaulieu et al., 2018; O'Meara et al., 2013; Saltmarsh et al., 2013). In this section we discuss the faculty reward structure at our COE, and highlight issues related to course load and ways to change perceptions of engaged scholarship.

Including PDS work as part of teaching load. Because Rowan University is still an institution that wants to maintain its teaching focus, faculty teaching loads are traditionally 4-4, with reductions made for exceptional scholarship and service. With the shift towards becoming more research-focused, many pre-tenured faculty at the COE have a reduced load of at least a 3-3 until after the tenure process. Historically, PDS work was conducted in addition to the required 3-3 course load. However, this type of scholarship requires a large amount of time and effort on the part of the faculty member (Sam, Elder & Leftwich, in press), and the COE has begun to recognize that reality. Brent explains his adjusted teaching load that includes his PDS work,

> I think I am extremely well supported in my engaged scholarship. In terms of structural supports from the university, I have a 2-2 course load until tenure. Meaning, I am expected to teach two courses each semester in the fall and spring. One of the courses I teach each semester is either an undergraduate, master's, or PhD course...The other 'course' I teach isn't really a course but is directly related to my PDS work. This means I am expected to spend up to one full day each week in my PDS where I engage in a variety of activities…[which includes] conducting research.

Though PDS work can be included as a course within a faculty member's course load, it is still not considered standard policy for junior faculty. In fact, this 2-2 course reduction was a part of the hiring and negotiation process that Brent engaged in with administration. He goes on to explain how he views the reduced course load and how that has potential to change how engaged scholarship is viewed by others.

> While I definitely appreciate having a 2-2 teaching load...I recognize that I have a responsibility to honor that teaching load by producing research at a higher rate than someone with a higher teaching load. So, I try to keep a strong pace for publication and scholarship to honor the embedded university supports. While I was not told by anyone at the university to have my research, teaching, and service overlap at my PDS site, I have been given the license to craft those experiences in a way that make sense for me and my goals for each of those intersecting components of my job.

Brent acknowledges the privilege and responsibility related to his 2-2 course load. "Privilege" in the sense that not all pre-tenured faculty have such a course load (for example some faculty hired at the same time have

a 3-3 course load), and "responsibility" in that he recognizes that through his PDS work he has an opportunity to help legitimize engaged scholarship as a valued form of research and encourage other faculty to take risks to do similar work.

Changing the perception of PDS work. Historically in the COE, it has been difficult for tenure-lined PDS faculty to earn tenure. Since 2012 to date, there have been no successful promotions of junior faculty doing PDS work, and this trend had not gone unnoticed. We found that to institutionalize PDS work, perceptions needed to be changed on three levels: (a) the university as a whole, (b) the tenured COE faculty, and (c) the pre-tenured COE faculty.

At the university level, even though the COE was the first in the institution to have a doctoral degree-granting program, faculty in other colleges were unfamiliar with the types of scholarship education faculty traditionally conducted. Stacey describes how eventually there was a university-wide shift in understanding:

> In the last 20 years, I've have observed a shift in thinking because members in the [COE] had to teach our colleagues outside our college that our research is just different. Once we created an understanding across the colleges [about] what educational research looks like, more and more faculty were [received] tenure and [were] promoted.

Following a similar pattern of change in faculty perception, Stacey sees the potential for another faculty perspective shift to occur, "I think the same is true of [PDS] work. As long as [faculty] demonstrate that research can come out of their PDS work, the understanding will begin to shift once again."

For existing tenured faculty, there seems to be some changes occurring in their perspective of PDS work. When discussing the scholarship he is producing in relation to his PDS work, Brent found that tenured faculty,

> ...usually start talking about how they are happy things 'seem to be changing' with PDS from how they were before. The faculty then typically mention how [people] in the past had a hard time publishing their PDS work and getting tenure.

Though there may be movement towards viewing PDS work and engaged scholarship in a more positive light, senior faculty still may be hesitant to recommend working at a PDS for most junior faculty. Brent highlights this point with the following quote, "I wonder if tenured faculty have scared them into not even considering this work because of the way it was and for fear they won't get tenure."

Do both traditional and engaged scholarship. At the time the study was completed there were two junior faculty engaging in PDS work. The other PDS faculty consist of part-time non-tenure track faculty, many who are also PhD students. Brent recognizes that in order to change the way others view PDS work, junior faculty are tasked with maintaining a balancing act with all the expectations placed upon them.

> My biggest challenge in my position is making sure I balance university expectations with the goals of the PDS. This means establishing a research agenda that ultimately improves student outcomes and honors the goals of school partners, while simultaneously developing and maintaining a rigorous line of research that results in publications in top-tier journals and national conference presentations.

Unlike faculty hired prior to Rowan University's shift to a research institution, the junior faculty who have chosen to conduct their engaged scholarship at this time have received similar research-focused messaging from administrative leadership.

Similar to Moore and Ward's (2010) study, we found that to earn a promotion and to change perceptions of PDS work, junior faculty will have to do both engaged and traditional scholarship well. This means that junior faculty doing engaged scholarship will need to take more time to conduct research that is not directly connected to the local community and that is not as embedded in their teaching, research, and service as their PDS work. This reality reduces the time they would typically spend at their PDS conducting engaged scholarship. This can spread junior faculty thin and makes the possibility of receiving tenure more complex and challenging. These additional complexities and challenges are why Rowan University needs to provide additional logistical support for junior faculty doing this work.

Logistical Support

In order to promote faculty in the COE to do engaged scholarship, there needs to be logistical support (Beaulieu et al., 2018). At the time of writing, this support has taken multiple forms including: the creation of a new a PDS position to promote research in the COE and the provision of internal grants.

Creation of New Positions. Since the faculty are still hesitant to engage in PDS work, Stacey had to hire part-time faculty as PIRs. Many had extensive teaching experience, but few with research experience. Knowing that the adjunct faculty would require research support, Stacey asked Brent if he could take on an additional role to promote engaged research practices with PIRs. This resulted in the creation of a new position: Lead Faculty in Charge of Research.

> Stacey asked me if I could assist her in creating a framework of consistency so we can adequately value and support the diversity that exists within our PIRs. It so happens that I encountered many of my current [PDS] expectations when I was a public elementary school teacher who was committed to social justice and school reform. I also had the privilege of attending a PhD program at a rigorous research institution. So, I think Stacey asked me to be the Lead Faculty in Charge of Research from the culmination of those experiences...

Being a PDS administrator, Stacey has the ability to create structures that promote engaged scholarship at the COE. She explains her rationale for creating the new position.

> I see Brent as the role model for PIRs. Now that he has been in a [PDS] for 3 years, he is able to identify specific challenges and provide examples that might help newer [faculty doing PDS work]...I don't want to take anything away from the faculty who are not full-time tenure-track. But, full-time faculty have gone through a doctoral program and have been prepared to work in higher ed. Even the new full-time faculty that come on board, who have just as much preparation to work in higher ed as Brent, still need a roadmap for PDS work.

While having a supportive, tenured administrator committed to promoting engaged scholarship certainly helps in the institutionalization process (O' Meara & Jaeger, 2006), simply creating positions is not

enough to ensure these approaches to research become widely accepted and practiced. Faculty who wish to engage in this work still need to actively seek existing university supports and apply these resources to their scholarship of engagement.

Supporting Faculty doing PDS work. At Rowan University, there are many opportunities for faculty to procure resources that can help them pursue their respective lines of research. These supports include an annual $10,000 seed grant competition, travel grants to disseminate research, and research and teaching awards. Brent explains how he applied for these university supports and leveraged them to be able to promote his PDS work.

> In addition to the support with the teaching load, the university also provides opportunities for internal funding through seed grants and travel grants. This allows me to expand my lines of research in intentional ways and disseminate my work in ways that are valued in academia. Of course, these funding opportunities are competitive and not guaranteed, but having my research, teaching, and service overlap in one space certainly helps me focus my time and energy into one place.

Here, Brent explains how he made a case while applying for university resources to have his teaching, research, and service intersect through PDS work. By doing so, Brent streamlined his university responsibilities to intersect at his PDS, which allows him to focus his engaged scholarship in one location and not waste time trying to find meaningful outlets for more traditional forms of research to get tenure. While applying for and receiving existing university grants is important, institutionalizing engaged scholarship requires the development of structures that promote ongoing dialogue between faculty doing this work.

Because a key component of this endeavor to institutionalize PDS work was to include the feedback of those engaging with the work, Stacey and Brent made several changes to the university PDS structures over the years. To support the work, they create structured and formal opportunities for faculty to work with and learn from one another. This included convening scheduled, structured meetings where PDS faculty can connect and learn from one another. They also included one-on-one

mentorship programs between newer and more established scholars. Brent explains this process below.

> Even in my three years as PIR, I have witnessed Stacey and her office be very intentional about how to support [faculty] in their various roles. For example, we have monthly PIR meetings where expectations are explained and time for collaboration and mentorship are built into the meeting agenda. Meaning, at our meetings there is time for PIRs to ask questions, to collaborate with one another, and to support each other's work.

Stacey goes on to explain that ideally the goal would be to create a learning community amongst the PDS faculty so that, "Eventually, you get to a point where everyone is learning from each other." While one goal of these monthly meetings is to provide support for faculty, these meetings can also help to create a culture that socializes faculty and graduate students to internalize the value of engaged scholarship and encourage them to reproduce these approaches to research when they move on to their respective universities post-graduation (Jaeger, Sandmann, & Kim, 2011).

Graduate Student Socialization

In terms of student support and the institutionalization of engaged scholarship, part of PDS faculty work is to facilitate the pre-service teacher candidate experience at their respective schools (Zenkov, Shiveley, & Clark, 2016). However, PDS being part of graduate student socialization, is a newer structural change that has been implemented in line with the introduction of a new PhD program in the COE.

Creating Engaged Faculty Pipeline. As noted in the literature, graduate students may express an interest in engaged scholarship, but may not necessarily receive support to help foster and grow the skills needed to conduct the work (O'Meara, 2006; Moore & Ward, 2010). At Rowan University, PhD students can participate in engaged scholarship in a P-12 setting as adjunct faculty. For this position, PhD students have responsibilities as non-tenure track faculty, and part of that includes engaged research. Brent describes how PhD students can learn about engaged scholarship through PDS work.

I love how the PhD students fit into this model at Rowan University. First of all, they are learning about research methods, so I get to see them grow as researchers while they are in essentially a laboratory school for PDS work. It is exciting to see when they realize that they are immersed in potential data at every turn and then dive right in...I see PhD students as one source of innovative and current ideas for education research which elevates all of our practices.

Stacey concurs with Brent about the benefits of having PhD students engage in PDS work, "the benefits of [having] PhD students [do this work] is the student has a site to collect data for research, which will ultimately lead to data needed for the dissertation, at least that was the vision for this structure." In addition to PhD students writing dissertations that are founded on engaged scholarship, the hope is that their research conducted at PDS sites will continue to influence their future scholarly endeavors and amplify these practices as they begin their lines of research at their respective universities. Because the PhD students have a dual role and are also considered faculty, the supports provided to them to conduct engaged work include the same logistical supports provided to other PDS faculty.

Discussion

As we explore the institutionalization of this one type of engaged scholarship within one university, it is clear that despite many moves towards institutionalization, there still much work to be done. From this study, we argue that in order for the entirety of engaged scholarship to be institutionalized, smaller changes and innovations need to also take place on all four fronts: (a) mission, (b) faculty reward structure and process, (c) logistical support, and (d) graduate student socialization. It is possible for the different areas to be in different phases of institutionalization at the same time, but without all four areas being in more advanced stages, it would be difficult to say that engaged scholarship is a meaningful part of the cultural fabric of this COE.

With regards to mission, we found that both the institutional context of the Rowan University and the smaller organizational context of the COE played an important role in shaping engaged scholarship within the mission and vision of the College. The university's existing mission only implies a dedication to engaged scholarship, indicating that

it has some ways to go before it can be considered institutionalized. As the COE continues thinking about how research will play a larger role in its future, we understand that the college cannot abandon its normal school roots.

In terms of the faculty rewards structure and process, there have been moves to align PDS work with the teaching, research, and service requirements for tenure-lined faculty. Contrary to the experience at some other institutions (Checkoway, 2013), there has been some effort by faculty and administration to encourage PDS work. We recognize that encouragement does not equate to faculty success, but it fares better than discouraging faculty from pursuing engaged scholarship. One of the key factors preventing this area from being institutionalized is the current lack of PDS faculty earning tenure. At the time this article was written, none of the faculty engaged in the work had yet gone-up for tenure. While faculty have received letters of support at different levels of the institution encouraging the continuance of their work, until these faculty receive tenure, it is difficult to determine if the faculty reward structure and process have indeed changed (O'Meara, 2006; 2010).

The logistical support for faculty engaged in PDS work seems an area where the COE is moving closer towards institutionalization. The establishment of two college-recognized positions is an important step towards institutionalizing the logistical support (Beaulieu et al., 2018). This move signals three ideas: (a) the COE is willing to allocate resources (e.g., human, revenue, and time) to support PDS work, (b) the COE recognized the growing need for research support by developing a new position of "Lead PDS Faculty in Charge of Research," and (c) the COE intends on continuing PDS relationships. The other aspects of logistical support (e.g., internal grants and awards, mentorship, or administrative support) may also become further institutionalized if they seem to be helpful for PDS work

In the final area for engaged scholarship, we found that the socialization of graduate students is still predominantly in the implementation phase. One of the key challenges in this particular area relies on sustainability of the initiatives in place to socialize graduate students, specifically to ensure that there will be continued support for PhD students to also act as PDS faculty. With the PhD program also being in its first three years, it seems that the ability to socialize graduate

students is also contingent upon another organizational innovation to be successful.

Broadly speaking, amongst all four areas of engaged scholarship, issues of sustainability will need to be addressed at the college and university level. Sustainability is concern for the institutionalization of engaged scholarship since research indicates that most organizational changes tend to be unsuccessful (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2001). For this study, there appears to be two levels of change that need to be addressed for sustainability purposes. For those first-order changes that are structural or incremental (e.g., policies or operating procedures), ensuring that there are sufficient resources available to maintain those changes are important. An even more daunting task are those second-order changes (Boyce, 2003). These changes require a shift in the underlying values and culture. These shifts can include an integrated understanding of engaged scholarship that takes into consideration previous and current expectations; the understanding of work faculty do with and within PDS; and the value of socializing students to continue the work. To change the way that people view engaged scholarship and PDS work within the COE and the university, this requires a myriad of approaches to shift people's assumptions, and even then, may not be successful.

Implications for Research

From a research perspective, our study reaffirms the literature on engaged scholarship and its institutionalization within the university. Even though there are movements towards valuing engaged scholarships, there are still challenges to institutionalization (Moore & Ward, 2010; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). For example, there are still issues regarding the definition of scholarship, what it entails, and how engaged scholars simultaneously had to fulfill traditional scholarship expectations (Moore & Ward, 2010; Zook, et al. 2019).

Where this study adds to the literature on engaged scholarship is being able to provide a more detailed narrative of one organization's process of trying to bring recognition to engaged scholarship as a core component of faculty work that combines teaching, research, and service within the context of PDS work. This study also highlights how the

different components of engaged scholarship can simultaneously be at different phases of institutionalization and that change leaders must keep in mind progress in all four areas if they want to increase their chances of institutionalizing engaged scholarship.

We can see several avenues for future research on the institutionalization of engaged scholarship broadly and PDS work more specifically. Though we realize that our study is only of one college within a university, future research could help determine if what we experienced is a common phenomenon for engaged scholarship at institutions across the United States. Similarly, with the numerous opportunities for faculty to work with PDS, it would be important to understand their work viewed through the lens of higher education faculty work.

As colleges and universities move to incorporate engaged scholarship as part of their overall mission, it is not enough to only set the directive and expect academics to accomplish the task. Even though many academics may be interested in scholarship that both aligns with their interest and benefits the broader community, without proper support and incentives it may not be an attractive option.

References

Anderson, L. (2006) Analytical autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373-395l.

Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *9*(2), 123-137.

Beaulieu, M., Breton, M., & Brousselle, A. (2018). Conceptualizing 20 years of engaged scholarship: A scoping review. *PloS one*, *13*(2), e0193201.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (Vol 5). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyce, M.E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 28(2), 119-136.

Bringle, R. C., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2012). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *1*(1), 1-20.

Chang, H., Longman, K. A., & Franco, M. A. (2014). Leadership development through mentoring in higher education: A collaborative autoethnography of leaders of color. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *22*(4), 373-389. DOI: 10.1080/13611267.2014.945734

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. New York, NY Routledge.

Checkoway B. (2013) Strengthening the scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 17(4), 7-22.

Coburn, C.E., & Penuel, W.R. (2016). Research-practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics and open questions. *Educational Researcher*, *45*(1), 48-54.

Colburn, A. (1993). *Creating Professional Development Schools*. Fastback 352. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Curry, B. K. (1992). *Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7*, 1992*

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.

Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnography practices for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA; Alta Mira.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 16*(3), 7-28.

Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2008). Toward a model of academic integrity institutionalization: Informing practice in postsecondary education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *38*(2), 25-43.

Jaeger, A. J., Sandmann, L. R., & Kim, J. (2011). Advising graduate students doing community-engaged dissertation research: The advisor-advisee relationship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *15*(4), 5-26.

Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations.* Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C., (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(1), 56-87.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Latham, N., & Wedwick, L. (2009). Teacher candidates' attitudes that influence preparation choice: Traditional versus Professional Development School options. *School-University Partnerships*, *3*(1), 90-99.

Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *17*(1), 44-58.

Ngunjiri, F.W., & Hernandez, K.C. (2017). Problematizing authentic leadership: A collaborative autoethnography of immigrant women of color leaders in higher education. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 19*(4) 393–406.

O'Meara, K. (2008). Graduate education and community engagement. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2008*(113), 27-42.

O'Meara, K. (2010). Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship: Promotion and tenure. *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, *1*, 271-94.

O'Meara, K., and A. Jaeger. (2006). Preparing future faculty for engagement: History, barriers, facilitators, models, and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 11*(4), 3-27.

O'Meara, K., Lounder, A., & Hodges, A. (2013). University leaders' use of episodic power to support faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(2), 5-20.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative education and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles Jr, D. E., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research. Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 3-29). Charlotte, NC: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Sam, C. H., Elder, B. C., & Leftwich, S. E. (in press). Supporting university-community partnerships: A case study with contingent faculty to understand their scholarship of engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 24(*3).

Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996–2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *12*(1), 91-104.

Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47–64.

Stanton, T. (2008) New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice, 3*(1), 19-42. doi 10.1177/1746197907086716

Warren, M. R., Park, S. O., & Tieken, M. C. (2016). The formation of community-engaged scholars: A collaborative approach to doctoral training in education research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *86*(2), 233-260.

Zenkov, K., Shiveley, J., & Clark, E. (2016). Why we must answer the question, "What is a professional development school?" *School-University Partnerships, 9*(3), 1-10.

Zook, K. B., Price, G., Rogers, A., & Curci, J. (2019). Scholarship Re-reconsidered: An Alternative Approach to Scholarship for Professors of Education and Applied Disciplines. *Journal of the Professoriate*, *10*(2), 1-22. Retrieved from https://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Zook-et-al.-Scholarship-Re-reconsidered.pdf