COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

SPANNING BOUNDARIES

BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

_____

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Statewide Cooperative Ed.D. Program

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

_____

by

TRUDY G. LEE

Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts, Dissertation Advisor

DECEMBER 2012

The undersigned, appointed by the Statewide Cooperative Ed.D. Program, have examined

the dissertation entitled

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

SPANNING BOUNDARIES

BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

presented by Trudy G. Lee,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of education,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

_____
Professor Ruth Ann Roberts

_____
Professor David Stader

_____
Professor Paul Watkins

_____
Professor Margaret Noe

DEDICATION

All my love and heartfelt appreciation goes to my husband, Terry Lee, who has supported me in everything I have chosen to do throughout our marriage and has exercised a tremendous amount of patience as I have spent many hours traveling, researching, and writing this dissertation.

My sincerest appreciation and love also goes to my parents, Gaylan and Leona Friesenborg, who have supported me all my life and have been dedicated proofreaders throughout the development of this dissertation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most importantly, I would like to thank Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts for her constant guidance as my dissertation advisor. My heartfelt appreciation goes to both Dr. Roberts and Dr. Paul Watkins for their wisdom and training as my professors throughout my coursework in the EdD program at the University of Missouri-Columbia and Southeast Missouri State University. I would also like to thank Dr. Joe Donaldson who, early in the process of developing this research study, recommended a conceptual design that has helped to formulate this dissertation.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge and express my sincerest appreciation to several professors who I have been fortunate to work with during my research at the participating universities. Dr. Donna Gessell, Dr. Katherine Draughon, and Dr. Christopher Merrett were very generous with sharing their knowledge and experiences in community engagement as well as their time to help me arrange the interviews at each of the site visits.

Finally, my sincerest appreciation for the generosity of the university administrators, faculty, and staff along with the community members at each case study site who participated in this research study. Their openness in sharing their experiences was invaluable to my research, and their commitment to the betterment of their universities and communities was inspiring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Higher education has traditionally sought to meet public needs and influence

society through the fulfillment of a three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service.

Over time a variety of collaborative relationships between higher education institutions

and the larger community have been established in a broad range of areas, including the

arts, cultural programs, social services, education, technology, and business development.

This collaboration, commonly referred to as community engagement, has grown in

importance over the past decade to become a major focus for many institutions. Through

the conceptual lens of the boundary spanning theory, this research study analyzed the

influence of and opportunities offered by community engagement as perceived by both

internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles. In addition, this study

explored what policies and procedures these stakeholders suggested to promote

community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Problem Statement

Higher education serves public needs and influences society through teaching,

research, and service. In fulfilling this three-fold mission, higher education institutions

engage in mutually beneficial collaborations with the larger community, traditionally

through community-based research and service-learning opportunities. However, the

concept of community engagement has expanded in scope and importance over the past

decade. As communities throughout the United States and around the world are facing

not only economic challenges but also cultural and social change, the effort needed to

overcome these challenges requires educational institutions, government, nonprofits, businesses, and individuals to work together. A higher education institution which focuses on becoming engaged in the larger community can do much to strengthen the cultural and social fabric of its region.

To view the ways these institutions and the individuals involved can engage with the larger community, the boundary spanning theory provides a unique conceptual lens. Boundary spanning is the activity of building bridges between the organization and external partners, and those individuals who engage in activities which connect the organization with its surrounding environment are boundary spanners. Through this conceptual lens, this research study analyzed the influence of community engagement by state colleges and universities as perceived by those in boundary spanning roles, including internal stakeholders among administrators, faculty, and professional staff and external stakeholders among business, government, and nonprofit leaders. The insights of these boundary spanners are particularly instructive to the expansion of traditional engagement opportunities and the development of new opportunities for collaboration and outreach by state colleges and universities in support of regional cultural and social development. In addition, stakeholders expressed the importance of public policies and institutional policies and procedures that promote community engagement. Such policies and procedures, developed with the input of all stakeholders, are needed to encourage community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this research was to explore community engagement by state colleges and universities, as perceived by internal and external stakeholders, through the

lens of the boundary spanning theory. For this research study, the definition of community engagement promulgated by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching (Carnegie Foundation) for its elective classification system was used, which is the "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification). The type of institutions included in this research was limited to state colleges and universities, also referred to as regional comprehensive universities, to focus this study on the unique aspects of this type of institution. Participants in the study included internal stakeholders from among the administration, faculty, and professional staff, and external stakeholders from among the business, government, and nonprofit leaders in the surrounding communities.

The primary purpose was to explore the influence of community engagement by state colleges and universities as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. This study also explored community engagement opportunities, as perceived by these internal and external stakeholders, in which state colleges and universities can engage to further enhance the cultural and social development of the region. Lastly, this study explored public policies and institutional policies and procedures which stakeholders believed were needed to promote and sustain community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Three specific research questions were used to guide this study:

What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within state colleges and universities and in the communities in

3

the region, regarding the influence of community engagement on the region?

What community engagement opportunities do stakeholders believe state colleges and universities can become involved in to further the cultural and social development of the region?

What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by state colleges and universities?

Research Approach

The research approach was to study a problem of practice in higher education as state colleges and universities seek to positively influence regional cultural and social development through community engagement. This study was a qualitative design utilizing a multi-site case study approach to review the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders on community engagement by state colleges and universities and the resulting influence of community engagement on regional cultural and social development. The general population for this study was public four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Three regional comprehensive universities located in the Midwestern and Southern United States were selected as case study sites based on criteria such as the type of institution, size of community and service region, demonstrated commitment to community engagement, and willingness to participate in the study. A cross-case analysis determined similarities and differences in the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders among the case study sites.

4

The use of multiple forms of data collection in a case study was important as the purpose of case study methodology was to build an in-depth view of the experiences at each site through rich, thick description (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, a variety of data sources and collection procedures were used including –

    a. Documents and records relating to development and operation of community engagement activities;

    b. Results of existing surveys, assessments, and evaluations pertinent to community engagement activities; and

    c. Interviews and background surveys of participating stakeholders, selected through the snowballing technique.

Data analysis was primarily through coding of the documents, records, data, background survey results, and interview transcripts, and was used to develop both individual case studies of each university as well as a cross-case analysis of the programs and practices at each site. Trustworthiness of the data and data analysis were assured through the use of rich, thick description for each case study and cross-case analysis as well as triangulation of data collected both within each university and among the sites studied (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Mertens, 2005).

<center>Significance of the Research Study</center>

Recognition of the importance of community engagement by state colleges and universities on regional cultural and social development has increased over the past decade. Beere, Votruba and Wells (2011) noted that community engagement is, in fact, a national movement to which educational leadership in higher education institutions must respond. A growing number of professional organizations in academia, including Campus

<center>5</center>

Compact, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), have actively encouraged expansion of community engagement by higher education institutions. In addition, professional organizations outside academia, such as the International City/County Management Association, have increased training available for civic leaders on how to access the resources offered by the regional institutions of higher education. Still other organizations, such as the Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS) and the International Town and Gown Association, have sought a diverse membership from academic, business, and civic organizations to encourage collaboration in regions across the United States. Furthermore, the international Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has spearheaded this engagement effort around the world, especially in Europe and Australia. More research is needed to provide empirical evidence as to the benefits of community engagement for both an educational institution and its surrounding region as well as to guide those in leadership positions on how to advance and promote collaborative opportunities between the institution and the community.

This research study analyzed the influence state colleges and universities have had on regional cultural and social development and looked to the influence of higher education on regional economic development only as it supports this cultural and social development. Much of the empirical evidence collected to date regarding community engagement has focused solely on the economic impact of community-university partnerships rather than the influence of the higher education institution on the cultural and social wellbeing of the surrounding communities. Although no less complex,

economic indicators are easier to define and measure than cultural and social factors, and research relating to a region's economy can be explained in much more tangible and objective terms than the cultural and social issues. Based on a conversation with a staff member at AASCU, this lack of attention had become apparent to many in higher education and the focus of AASCU and other professional organizations had turned to how community engagement by college and universities can impact the civic health of communities. Therefore, this research study sought to add to this new body of knowledge.

Another aspect of this research study intended to supplement the current knowledge base was the focus on perceptions of internal stakeholders at higher education institutions and external stakeholders in the surrounding communities who served in boundary spanning roles. Weerts and Sandmann (2010) studied boundary spanners in research universities, but they noted additional research should be done in other types of higher education institutions. The collaborative project of ARS, AASCU, and NCHEMS entitled Making Place Matter (2006) provided in-depth case studies on the results of community engagement by several public schools and colleges, but little research had been done on how these programs were perceived by those intimately involved with the process. Of the studies that had, most research focused primarily on perceptions of internal stakeholders and few on the perceptions of external stakeholders (Creighton, 2006; Driscoll, 2008; Milewicz, Mujumdar, & Khayum, 2012; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). This research study sought to add insight into how business, government, and nonprofit leaders in the community perceived community engagement. Because both internal and external stakeholders were interviewed for each case study, the research highlighted the

differences and similarities of internal and external perceptions. Therefore, this research study sought to offer a better understanding for leadership in both educational institutions and community partners.

In addition to studying the various stakeholders' perceptions on the influence and opportunities of community engagement, this research study gathered their ideas on the public policies and institutional policies and procedures necessary to promote and sustain community engagement. Organizations such as ARS, AASCU, and NCHEMS have encouraged institutional policy review and revision to support greater community engagement. Recommendations have also been made in regard to public policies to promote community-university partnerships, the most complete of which was put forth in an NCHEMS paper on state policy by Jones (2005). The Carnegie Foundation has led the way in development of standards for success in community engagement, and such ranking systems are a form of public policy which may benefit through this research study. These organizations have been integrally involved in setting policy about community engagement on a national level, but perspectives of boundary spanners actively involved in community engagement should be taken into consideration. Therefore, this research study sought to influence development of policies and procedures relating to community engagement which will, in turn, impact educational leadership as well as community leadership in collaborative efforts toward regional cultural and social development.

Definition of Key Terms

The following definitions are provided to give context as to how they are used in this study:

1.   *Boundary Spanning* is the activity at the individual, unit, and organizational level to build bridges between the organization and external environment. Those individuals who engage in activities which directly connect the organization with its surrounding environment are *Boundary Spanners*.

2.   *Collaboration* is "a type of work in which participants share ideas, responsibility, and credit in achieving their desired goal" (Campus Compact, 2002, p. 13).

3.   *Community* "refers to groups of people united by a common location, or to groups of people that are linked intellectually, professionally, or politically" (Campus Compact, 2002, p. 3). As used in this study, community refers to local population(s) of individuals within the service region of a state college or university.

4.   *Community Engagement* refers to the "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification). The terms *Public Engagement* and *Civic Engagement* may be used interchangeably with Community Engagement.

5.   *Community-Based Research* is academic research involving "the institution with the community in a reciprocal relationship to address a local problem or issue" (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011, p. 143).

6.   *Higher Education* or *Higher Education Institutions* refer to the formal institutions which provide education to individuals after completion of high school. The terms *Colleges* and *Universities* may be used interchangeably with Higher Education

Institutions, unless they are used in the phrase State Colleges and Universities to denote a specific type of Higher Education Institution (see definition 11 below).

7.   *Partnerships* or *Community-University Partnerships* are the relationships which result from collaborations between the state college or university and organizations in the surrounding environment for the purpose of improving the community and region.

8.   *Professional Staff* are those individuals in higher education institutions who serve in staff positions but not on the executive staff or the primary duties of which are to perform clerical or technical functions. Examples include admissions officers, program directors, support services managers, and development professionals.

9.   *Region* refers to the service region of a state college or university and the communities located therein.

10.   *Service-Learning* is "a course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2004, p. 127).

11.   *State Colleges and Universities*, also referred to as *Regional Comprehensive Universities,* are defined as all "regionally accredited institutions of higher education or those in the process of securing accreditation which offer programs leading degrees at the bachelor's, master's or doctoral levels, and which are wholly or partially state supported and state controlled" (AASCU, n.d.).

12.   *Town and Gown* is a phrase used to describe the relationship between the non-academic population (town) and the academic population involved in a college or university (gown) in a community where the institution is located.

Summary

Higher education continues to meet public needs and influence society through teaching, research, and service. However, the needs of society are changing in the face of economic challenges as well as cultural and social change. Colleges and universities are interacting on an expanding global level while the need to work collaboratively on a community and regional level is also increasing. Many colleges and universities have responded to the need to focus more deliberately and proactively on community engagement for the mutual benefit of both the higher education institutions and the surrounding communities. The need for more empirical research in this emerging field is critical to inform the national discussion regarding community engagement as well as to guide educational and community leadership on best practices for community engagement. Chapter 2 provides an explanation, from the literature available, of the historical evolution of and current trends in community engagement by higher education institutions through the conceptual lens of the boundary spanning theory.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to situate this research in the context of current understanding on the

topic of community engagement, this literature review is organized into four subject

areas. The first is a brief history of the mission of higher education to provide an

historical context for community involvement by higher education institutions. The

second is an explanation of the boundary spanning theory as a conceptual lens through

which to analyze how an organization – and specifically a higher education institution –

interacts with its environment. Thirdly, the current trends in community engagement by

state colleges and universities particularly in relation to its influence on regional cultural

and social development are analyzed. Finally, the review concludes with an analysis of

the influence of public policies and institutional policies and procedures on community

engagement by state colleges and universities.

Historical Context: Higher Education Mission and Community Involvement

Higher education has traditionally sought to meet public needs and influence

society by pursuing the three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. (Thelin,

2004). Throughout the history of higher education in the United States, the emphasis has

shifted among these three missions, depending on the needs of the public and resources

available (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011; Thelin, 2004; Wade & Demb, 2009).

Beginning in colonial America of the 1600s and continuing through the mid-1800s,

teaching was the primary focus as a new country expanded and, along with it, the need

for an educated populace increased. During this period, faculty positions were not highly

sought after or well-paid but rather positions held by individuals, primarily clergy members, who were "more like volunteers engaged in public service" (Thelin, p. 27). Higher education institutions and those who taught in it existed to serve the needs of society, and the societal impact of higher education was critical as these institutions prepared the teachers, pastors, and other civic leaders who would settle the new frontier (Brukardt, Holland, Percy & Zimpher, 2006).

In the late 19th Century, access to higher education increased significantly when the United States Congress enacted the Morrill Act, which created land-grant universities, extending higher education to a predominantly agrarian society and expanding agricultural research by higher education (Fisher, Fabricant & Simmons, 2004; Wergin, 2006). As the Industrial Age took hold, the emphasis of higher education shifted more to research in a broad array of scientific disciplines (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011). At the same time, the growth of a career professoriate with an increased attention on specific academic disciplines and personal career advancement shifted the focus of higher education (Wade & Demb, 2009). Throughout the late 1800s and early 1900s, many higher education institutions worked closely with civic leadership to support regional development efforts, particularly through the extension services of the land-grant universities (Creighton, 2006). On the other hand, many colleges and universities looked inwardly to emphasize research, stating "that the mission of the university was not to engage directly with the world around it" (Fisher, Fabricant & Simmons, pp. 20-21).

In the mid-20th Century, higher education experienced its next significant expansion when the GI Bill made attending a college or university easily accessible to tens of thousands of young men returning from World War II (Wergin, 2006). Several

13

years later, the Civil Rights Act further increased accessibility to higher education to new and diverse populations. During this period, the availability of federal grants and private support for research and development reinforced the importance of research as a primary mission of higher education institutions (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011). Faculty allocated a significant amount of time to the development of research proposals and seeking grants from both public and private entities (Wade & Demb, 2009). This intensified focus on theoretical and applied research served to further insulate higher education institutions from society, and American colleges and universities were regarded "as an odd mix of scientific specialists, hopelessly out-of-touch humanities professors, and students who are there mostly to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace" (Wergin, p. 23).

Finally, in the latter decades of the 20th Century, civic responsibility through increased service to the larger community increased in importance, particularly at colleges and universities in urban areas, as economic and social struggles increased and higher education was again looked to for solutions (Brukardt, Percy & Zimpher, 2006). During this time, the public called upon higher education institutions to become more engaged in the surrounding region in order to help deal with the issues and challenges faced by these communities (Fisher, Fabricant & Simmons, 2004). In their article focusing on the role of faculty in community engagement, Wade and Demb (2009) noted this attention to "how colleges and universities address important social issues" has significantly gained momentum in recent years to "become a widespread concept, phenomenon, and movement" (p. 5). They further emphasized the importance of the role

of faculty in this engagement movement, encouraging the integration of teaching, research, and service for the benefit of the public good.

In the course of history, many community-university relationships have been established, most commonly in the form of community-based research and service-learning opportunities (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011). Community-based research was described as academic research directly involving the community to address a specific issue facing the community. Service-learning referred to an educational experience for students to serve in the community and report on their experiences in a classroom setting (Bringle & Hatcher, 2004). As higher education was called upon to increase its collaborative efforts for the benefit of society in the United States and throughout the world, new and innovative types of community-university partnerships have been created involving an array of university and community stakeholders (Boyle, Ross & Stephens, 2011). In the 2006 report on the Making Place Matter project, ARS, AASCU, and NCHEMS emphasized the critical importance of boundary-crossing among these various stakeholders in establishing these collaborative partnerships between the university and the community (AASCU, 2006). Before further analyzing the current trends in and influence of community engagement, it is necessary to address the boundary spanning theory as the conceptual lens for this research study.

<div align="center">Conceptual Lens: Boundary Spanning Theory</div>

The emphasis on boundary-crossing in the Making Place Matter report alluded to the boundary spanning theory, which was originally developed out of the open systems approach to organizational theory (AASCU, 2006). The open systems model was an organizational theory which acknowledged the interaction of an organization with its

<div align="center">15</div>

external environment. Morgan (1997) pointed to the development of the open systems theory as one which views an organization like an organism open to and maintaining a balance with its external environment in order to survive. Bolman and Deal (2008) acknowledged that "organizations are open systems dealing with a changing, challenging, and erratic environment" (p. 31). In his analysis of education, Bush (2003) stated the open systems model portrays educational institutions as interactive with the environment and noted that schools and colleges were more readily taking an open approach in interacting with the communities and external constituencies.

Bush (2003) further emphasized that the systems model introduced the concept of boundaries to organizational analysis, and an open systems approach "assumes permeable boundaries and an interactive two-way relationship between schools and colleges, and their environments" (p. 42). In his pivotal essay on organizational structure, Mintzberg (2005) noted that every organization had "boundary spanning units" which "face the environment directly and deal with its uncertainties" (p. 336). Focusing on higher education, Weerts and Sandmann (2010) used the lens of boundary spanning theory to focus on how higher education institutions engage with community partners. They referenced Scott and Aldrich and Herker when defining boundary spanning as the activity of building bridges between the organization and external partners "with the primary purpose being to process information from the environment and provide external representation to stakeholders outside the organization" (p. 704). They further relied on the work of Friedman and Podolny to point out that boundary spanning was done by both individuals within the organization and the organization itself. "This broader definition of

boundary spanning suggests that institutional relationship with community partners are multilayered and may serve various purposes at multiple levels" (p. 708).

Community engagement has been described as a two-way approach to collaboration between the institution and its external constituencies, and the boundary spanning theory provided important insight into the ways higher education institutions and the individuals involved engaged with surrounding communities or, in other words, spanned the boundaries between the institution and its external environment. Many professional organizations in addition to those mentioned previously have acknowledged that, although many state colleges and universities collaborated with regional partners, boundary spanning was required to expand and deepen these relationships in light of societal changes (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011). Beere, Votruba, and Wells stated that the individual on campus chiefly responsible for community engagement "must be a 'boundary spanner' who can connect across diverse constituent groups, a systems thinker who understands the relationships between community engagement and other mission dimensions, and a collaborator who can work effectively both inside and outside the university" (p. 84). With the increased focus on community engagement, more institutions have hired an individual dedicated to heading up the community engagement effort by encouraging boundary spanning activities at all organizational levels. This leads back to a review of current trends in community engagement.

Current Trends: Community Engagement and Regional Development

Community engagement has become a term used in higher education for a two-way approach to collaboration between the institution and its external constituencies, creating partnerships for the mutual benefit of the institution and the larger community

(AASCU, 2002; Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011; Campus Compact, 2002; Creighton, 2006; Weerts and Sandmann, 2010). In 1998 Campus Compact (2002) organized a conference of higher education and community leaders specifically to explore community-university collaborations, recognizing that "every sector – corporate, government and nonprofit – is being mobilized to address community needs and reinvigorate our democracy" (p. 1). The benchmarks established at this conference were published in 2002. In the same year AASCU's Task Force on Public Engagement stated, "The term 'public engagement' has become shorthand for describing a new era of two-way partnerships between America's colleges and universities and the publics they serve" (AASCU, 2002, p. 7). Over the intervening decade, the importance of community engagement has increased substantially at higher education institutions and in communities of all types, sizes, and locations.

In 2002 a collaborative effort among ARS, AASCU, and NCHEMS called Making Place Matter was launched which culminated in a 2006 publication offering guidance and recommendations on how state colleges and universities can promote regional stewardship by partnering with community stakeholders (AASCU, 2006). These groups acknowledged that, although most state colleges and universities already collaborated with regional partners, boundary-crossing was required to expand and deepen these relationships in light of societal changes and to address societal needs. Making Place Matter suggested a four-step process toward greater community engagement involving representatives of all stakeholder groups. The first step was to establish a regional context to determine the characteristics, resources, and priorities of the region. The second was a type of SWOT analysis to assess strengths, weaknesses,

18

opportunities, and threats. The third was to develop goals and how those goals will be

measured. The final step was to determine a roadmap for the future. This process had

been adopted at several state colleges and universities over the past several years.

Also in 2006 Carnegie Foundation began to offer an elective classification system

which recognizes higher education institutions across the United States committed to

community engagement (Driscoll, 2008). The Carnegie Foundation offered this

classification again in 2008 and 2010. An extensive application called the Documentation

Reporting Form provided a framework "designed to: 1) respect the diversity of

institutions and their approaches to community engagement; 2) Engage institutions in a

process of inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment; and 3) Honor institutions'

achievements while promoting the ongoing development of their programs" (p.39). The

Documentation Reporting Form used in 2008 and 2010 was divided into two sections.

The first section required the institution provide a variety of foundational indicators

which demonstrate a commitment to community engagement in the mission, strategic

plan, reward structure, policies, procedures, actions, and activities at all levels of the

organizational structure. The second section asked for examples in two categories of

community engagement. One category was curricular engagement, which included

teaching, learning, and scholarship, and the second category was outreach and

partnerships, which referred to how university resources were made available to the

region and what collaborative interactions existed between the university and the larger

community.

The Carnegie Foundation application process required a significant investment of

time and human resources to accomplish and success was not guaranteed. Approximately

50% of the colleges and universities initiating the application process during the first cycle in 2006 received the classification, including private and public institutions ranging from doctorate granting universities to community colleges (Driscoll, 2008). An increasing number of colleges and universities pursued this voluntary classification in 2008 and 2010, and the total number of institutions designated as *community engaged* by the Carnegie Foundation stood at 311 in 2012, representing about 4.6% of all eligible institutions (Milewicz, Mujumdar & Khayum, 2012). The Carnegie Foundation was preparing for a new cycle of classification and reclassification to begin in January 2013 (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification).

This engagement of educational institutions and communities had risen to priority status around the world as well as in the United States. Numerous studies in Europe and Australia acknowledged the increasing importance of community engagement, also referred to as the third stream, third mission, community service, or community outreach (Alves, Mainardes, & Raposo, 2010; Buys & Bursnall, 2008; Doyle, 2010; Munck, 2010; Webber & Jones, 2011). In its 2007 report, *Higher Education and Regions: Globally Competitive, Locally Engaged,* the international OECD noted "neither public policy nor the higher education institutions themselves have tended to focus strategically on the contribution that they can make to the development of the regions where they are located" (OECD, 2007, p. 11). In an extensive analysis of higher education's regional mission published by the OECD, Arbo and Benneworth (2007) emphasized that higher education institutions are expected to not only serve the traditional functions of education

and research but also "play an active role in the development of their economic, social and cultural surroundings" (p. 6).

As an anchor organization within the region it serves, a college or university has been noted to have significant potential to influence community and regional development (Boyle, Ross & Stephens, 2011). A variety of studies provided examples of how higher education institutions can play a vital economic role in regional development (Drabenstott, 2008; Forrant & Silka, 1999; Goddard, 1997; Goddard & Puukka, 2008). Others have stated that, in addition to economic development, higher education institutions should play a key role in the cultural and social development of the region (Doyle, 2010; Munck, 2010; Simpson, 2010; Stephenson, 2010). Higher education institutions have consistently been acknowledged as important assets to many communities and, through increased community engagement, can be even more influential in the cultural and social development of the region (Boyle, Ross & Stephens, 2011; Jones, 2005; Scheibel, Bowley & Jones, 2005).

Community engagement required the involvement of individuals in a variety of roles to span boundaries between the institution and the larger community. Community-university partnerships required commitment from these stakeholders, both within the college or university and in the community (Boyle, Ross & Stephens, 2011; McLean & Behringer, 2008). External stakeholders included community residents, businesses, governmental entities, and nonprofit organizations. Internal stakeholders were the administrators, faculty, staff, students, and the college or university as an organization. Students were an internal constituency of particular importance, and an increasing number of studies have been done regarding the influence of community engagement

activities on student learning (Anyon & Fernandez, 2007; Bourner, 2010; Vogel & Seifer, 2011). Engaged scholarship integrated "public service and academic work as an inseparable whole" (Wade & Demb, 2011, p. 6). Service-learning, volunteerism, community service, and internships have been included as types of engaged scholarship designed to meet community needs and enhance student learning (Hironimus-Wendt & Lovell-Troy, 1999). In particular, service-learning had dramatically increased in popularity as community engagement by colleges and universities has increased (Vogel & Seifer).

Although focused on student learning, all engaged scholarship has been designed to benefit multiple stakeholders. Through service-learning opportunities, faculty and students are engaged with the community "as co-learners and co-creators of knowledge" and produced "reciprocal benefits for community and university partners" (Vogel & Seifer, 2011, p. 186). Community-based research conducted by faculty and students influenced both student learning and addressed issues in the larger community (Anyon & Fernandez, 2007). Regardless of the genesis of community-university partnerships, genuine and authentic partnerships based in mutual understanding and open communication have been found to be crucial to effective collaboration (Creighton, Sweeney & Cauley, 2009; Lindenfeld, 2009; McLean & Behringer, 2008; Scheibel, Bowley & Jones; Tryon, Hilgendorf & Scott, 2009; Wattman, Schaffer, Juarez, Rogstad, Bredow & Traylor, 2009). In addition, both public policies and institutional policies and procedures must be carefully considered in developing effective community engagement opportunities.

Policy Matters: The Effect of Public and Institutional Policy on Community Engagement

In addition to demonstrating the influence of community engagement by higher education institutions, several studies have emphasized the need for public policies and institutional policies and procedures that encourage greater community engagement (AASCU, 2002; Jones, 2005; OECD, 2007). In a detailed report published by the NCHEMS, Jones stated that higher education is largely a state responsibility. Therefore, state policy must encourage institutional behaviors that will meet the needs of the state, regions, and communities. He encouraged policy that "goes beyond a one-size-fits-all approach" and recognized that all states "are comprised of subregions that differ in every imaginable way" (p. 5). Effective policy must provide a clear statement of state priorities but acknowledge regional variations and be adaptable to meeting the needs of different communities throughout the state. Jones further noted that state policy would be most effective in promoting community engagement if allocation of state funding were tied to an institution's impact on regional development. If this were done, however, clear measurements of accountability must be included to determine if the goals are being met.

Another aspect of public policy that should be considered in this regard was the ranking systems measuring the success of higher education institutions (Meekins & O'Meara, 2011). Prospective students and their parents tend to be influenced by ranking systems, such as the *U.S. News & World Report*, and certain measurements can have an effect on decisions by private funders as to awarding grants or contributions to institutions. Meekins and O'Meara pointed out there are "no major national or international rankings systems that specifically and solely focus on contributions colleges and universities make to their local communities and regions" (p. 7). They acknowledged

that a few alternative ranking systems have been developed over the past several years. For example, Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement began in 2006 as a voluntary classification based on documentation provided by institutions (Driscoll, 2008). Although more colleges and universities sought this classification in 2008 and 2010 and Carnegie Foundation was preparing for a new period of classification and reclassification to begin in January of 2013, this classification remained a voluntary process (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification). Meekins and O'Meara recommended the development of a prominent measuring system which takes into account the influence of community engagement by higher education institutions on regional development.

In addition to public policies which are external to the institutions, internal policies and procedures at higher education institutions must be reviewed and revised as necessary to encourage involvement in community engagement activities (Beere, Votruba & Wells, 2011; Buys & Bursnall, 2007; O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh & Giles, 2011; Wade & Demb, 2009; Webber & Jones, 2011). Faculty and staff may be motivated to pursue opportunities for community engagement for a variety of reasons. Whether or not the institution rewarded and encouraged community engagement impacted the extent to which these internal stakeholders integrated this role with their traditional responsibilities (O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh & Giles; Wade & Demb, 2009). Human resource policies relating to hiring and promotion, academic policies regarding promotion, tenure, and course allocation, and availability of funding as part of the internal budget process were all factors that could either enhance or detract from the pursuit of community engagement activities (Wade & Demb).

24

In order to encourage integration, Beere, Votruba and Wells strongly recommended "treating public engagement as a cross-cutting dimension" (p. 128) across the traditional functions of teaching, research, and service. They suggested community engagement should be integrated throughout the institutional structure beginning with the mission, vision, and goals and extending throughout the strategic plan, policies, and procedures. Furthermore, in order to sustain this change, Brukardt, Percy and Zimpher (2006) stressed the need for institutionalization of community engagement which "usually entails a redefinition of the university culture, includes curricular change, involves and empowers faculty and staff, and necessitates new institutional infrastructure and accountability mechanisms" (p. 10). Wade and Demb (2009) suggested establishing as part of the organizational structure a central office of outreach and engagement to support engagement activities. They acknowledged that, although this centralized approach may be important to institutionalizing community engagement, it could potentially limit "the degree to which others on the campus accept personal responsibility for developing the initiative … perhaps slowing the adoption of outreach and engagement to be truly adopted and part of an institution's culture" (p. 10). Although the details were specific to each college or university, institutional policies and procedures that weigh community engagement equally with traditional responsibilities of teaching and research provided a motivation to focus on this increasingly important role of higher education.

<center>Summary</center>

Throughout its history, higher education has sought to meet public needs and influence society through the three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. As societal needs have changed, the focus of higher education institutions has adapted to

address issues and problems in the surrounding environment. Most recently community engagement has emerged as a critical focus of higher education institutions across the United States and around the world. The boundary spanning theory is a critical concept in analyzing the many influences on and opportunities offered by community engagement activities, as the perspectives of both internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles are taken into consideration. Through the conceptual lens of the boundary spanning theory, research into the perspectives of both internal and external stakeholders on the opportunities and challenges of community engagement will add significantly to this field of study. Chapter 3 explains the research design and methodology by which data will be collected and analyzed regarding the perspectives of these individuals to more fully understand the current regional influence of community engagement by state colleges and universities, the opportunities available through these community engagement activities, and policies required to sustain and enhance community engagement.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research study was to explore community engagement by state colleges and universities, as perceived by internal and external stakeholders, through the lens of the boundary spanning theory. The type of institutions included in this research was limited to regional comprehensive universities to focus this study on the unique aspects of this type of institution. Individuals participating in the study included internal stakeholders from the administration, faculty, and professional staff at each university, and external stakeholders including business, government, and nonprofit leaders in the surrounding communities. In addition to stakeholder perceptions of community engagement, this study explored community engagement opportunities, as perceived by these internal and external stakeholders, in which state colleges and universities can participate to further the cultural and social development of the region. Lastly, this study discussed what public policies and institutional policies and procedures which stakeholders believed were needed to encourage and promote community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Three specific research questions were used to guide this study:

What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within state colleges and universities and in the communities in the region, regarding the influence of community engagement on the region?

What community engagement opportunities do stakeholders

believe state colleges and universities can become involved in to further

the cultural and social development of the region?

What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed

to encourage boundary spanning activities through community

engagement by state colleges and universities?

Research Design

The research approach was to study a problem of practice in higher education as

state colleges and universities seek to positively influence regional cultural and social

development through community engagement. This study was a qualitative design

utilizing a multi-site case study approach to review the perceptions of internal and

external stakeholders on the research questions stated above. Mertens (2005) referred to

the definition of a case study provided by the U.S. General Accounting office, stating, "A

case study is a method for learning about a complex instance, based on a comprehensive

understanding of that instance obtained by extensive descriptions and analysis of that

instance taken as a whole and in its context" (p. 237). Creswell (2007) condensed the

explanation to "the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a

bounded system" (p. 73). Because one issue, community engagement, was studied at

multiple selected research sites or bounded systems, a multi-site case study approach was

used (Creswell; Merriam, 2009). The reason for selecting several case study sites rather

than only one was to provide various perspectives on community engagement, which are

compared and contrasted due to the replication of the same procedures for collection and

analysis at each site (Creswell).

Both the single case study and multi-site case study approaches have been used effectively to research the topic of community engagement in recent years. As an example, Beere, Votruba, and Wells (2011) published a textbook on this topic which, in effect, was a case study of the process by which one Midwestern university at which the authors served as top-level administrators integrated community engagement throughout its campus. The use of a multi-site case study approach on the topic of community engagement was conducted through a collaborative effort among ARS, AASCU, and NCHEMS called Making Place Matter, which culminated in a publication offering guidance and recommendations on how state colleges and universities could promote regional stewardship by partnering with community stakeholders (AASCU, 2006). Making Place Matter incorporated case studies at four participating state colleges and universities that had implemented the program at their sites. In both of these examples, the case studies offered a detailed analysis related to the topic of community engagement in complex instances in the bounded systems of the universities and communities being studied.

For this research study, the multi-site case study provided an excellent opportunity to gain a comprehensive understanding of community engagement through the experiences of stakeholders or boundary spanners at several state colleges and universities. The interviews conducted with and surveys completed by participants at each site together with the documents, records, and data reviewed at each site provide rich, thick descriptions of the complex instances of community engagement at each institution. By replicating the same data collection procedures at each site, including categories of documents, records, and data reviewed, positions and standing of

29

participants interviewed, and questions asked of these individuals during the interviews and on the surveys, the experiences with community engagement at these institutions were compared and contrasted for a more comprehensive understanding of the topic and more comprehensive answers to the research questions guiding this study.

Population and Sample

The general population for this research study was state colleges and universities. For the purposes of this study, state colleges and universities were defined as those eligible for membership in AASCU, which was all "regionally accredited institutions of higher education or those in the process of securing accreditation which offer programs leading to degrees at the bachelor's, master's or doctoral levels, and which are wholly or partially state supported and state controlled" (AASCU, n.d.). Mertens (2005) referred to this broad group to be studied as the conceptual definition and the population which is experimentally accessible as the operational definition. To refine the operational definition toward selection of sample institutions for the multi-site case study, the Carnegie Foundation's basic classification of Master's L was used, which means Master's Level Colleges and Universities (larger programs) generally including "institutions that awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees" (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description). The purpose for this distinction was to select state colleges and universities which will provide information applicable to Southeast Missouri State University (Southeast), so the results of the research will be useful to the researcher's institution as it continues to develop its own approach to community engagement.

Creswell (2007) noted that purposeful sampling should be used in qualitative research in order to select sites that can "purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study" (p. 125). Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) noted that purposeful sampling was particularly appropriate in case studies. Therefore, to obtain useful information regarding perceptions of internal and external stakeholders on community engagement, a sample of institutions that have been actively involved in community engagement was studied. For this selection, the Carnegie Foundation was used to identify those institutions that have demonstrated a commitment to community engagement based on successful classification in either 2008 or 2010 on the elective Community Engagement Classification (Carnegie, n.d., Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification).

Creswell (2007) pointed out the need for researchers to sample at multiple levels, including the site level, the process level, or at the individual participant level. In this instance, the population and sample not only related to the sites to be studied but also to the internal and external stakeholders asked to participate at each of those sites. The individual stakeholders at these institutions were selected from those who had been directly involved in the community engagement efforts at the case study sites. The population of internal stakeholders was limited to administrators, faculty, and professional staff to focus on the perceptions of these individuals who were in boundary spanning roles participating directly with external stakeholders on community engagement projects. The population of external stakeholders included business, government, and nonprofit leaders in the region who had participated directly with the internal stakeholders noted above as boundary spanners from the community to the

31

institution. Samples from these populations were developed through review of existing data, records, and documents as well as use of the snowballing technique. Interviews began with the individual at the institution who was primarily responsible for completion of the 2008 or 2010 Documentation Reporting Form to obtain the institution's Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement and expanded to internal and external stakeholders this person recommended as appropriate to contact. Other individuals were further identified as a result of referrals from these participants.

<div align="center">Sampling Procedures</div>

At the site level, a sample of three state colleges and universities were selected from the population through an in-depth analysis of institutional data available from Carnegie. Case study site selection was based on criteria which offered some diversity of experience to collect multiple perspectives on community engagement (Creswell, 2007), but were comparable to Southeast so the result would be informative to the researcher's institution. Furthermore, the case study sites chosen were located in the Midwestern and Southern United States for accessibility purposes as well as similarity with the service region of Southeast. These sampling procedures resulted in a list of potential case study sites. Initial contacts were made with individuals at five institutions to determine the willingness of these institutions and their community partners to participate in the research study. Based on these contacts, three case study sites were selected as participants due to the willingness and ability of these three institutions to cooperate in the study.

Sampling procedures for the individual participants in the study primarily used the snowballing technique, sometimes referred to as chain or network sampling

(Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008). Research at each site began by discussion with the individual at the institution who was primarily responsible for completion of the 2008 or 2010 Documentation Reporting Form to obtain the institution's Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement. This individual was asked for existing data, records, and documents, and for referrals to others from the internal stakeholder population of administrators, faculty, and professional staff and the external stakeholder population of business, government, and nonprofit leaders who had been involved with community engagement projects. In turn these participants provided referrals to others who have participated in community engagement. Because this snowballing method resulted in names of internal and external stakeholders who partnered on specific projects, the data allowed for the collection of multiple perspectives on specific situations and resulted in a rich, thick description of examples of community engagement.

<div align="center">Data Gathering Tools and Procedures</div>

The use of multiple forms of data collection in a case study was important since the purpose of case study methodology was to build an in-depth view of the experiences at each site through rich, thick description (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, a variety of data sources and collection procedures were used including –

a. Documents and records relating to development and operation of community engagement activities;

b. Results of existing surveys, assessments, and evaluations pertinent to community engagement activities; and

c. Interviews and background surveys of participants and stakeholders.

Documents have been defined as written data prepared for personal reasons, including letters, field notes, and memos, and records generally referred to written data prepared for official reasons (Mertens, 2005). Both documents and records were available from internal and external stakeholders, although records were more accessible through the data gathering process. Results of existing surveys, assessments, and evaluations were also beneficial in assessing the influence of community engagement. Interviews were the primary data collection method used in this study. Therefore, interview transcriptions and background surveys were the primary source of data from each case study site.

Interviews and focus groups have traditionally been critical data gathering techniques in case studies (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2005). An initial discussion at each site was held with the individual who was primarily responsible for completion of the 2008 or 2010 Documentation Reporting Form to obtain the institution's Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement. Although focus groups were originally considered as a possible means of data collection, the logistics of organizing focus group interviews proved too difficult to manage. Therefore, all conversations with participants were held as interviews, and focus groups were not conducted.

A brief survey was sent to each individual prior to participation in the interview in the form attached as Appendixes A and B in order to gather preliminary background information. All but nine of the participants returned their surveys. The interview protocol attached as Appendix C was used for all interviews. The interview protocol was designed to elicit information to answer the research questions. A questioning route attached as Appendix D was developed for focus group interviews but was not used, as

explained above. Preliminary background surveys, interview protocols, and questioning

routes were based on those developed by Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and

Kerrigan (2001). These data collection tools were approved by the Institutional Review

Board of the University of Missouri and accepted by either the internal review board or

an authorized individual at each participating case study site.

<center>Data Analysis Procedures</center>

Data analysis process began by reading through the documents, records,

background survey responses, and interview transcripts to become familiar with the data

as well as winnowing through the data to identify more manageable patterns, themes, and

categories (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008; Mertens, 2005). The data was reviewed and

coded based on the conceptual framework and research questions. Through this manual

process of data analysis, the data was pulled apart and reassembled in more meaningful

ways (Creswell, 2007). The data was broken down into discrete parts for examination and

comparison through the process of open coding, and the connections among the various

categories made through the process of axial coding (Mertens). The data was used to

develop both individual case studies of each program as well as a cross-case analysis of

these programs and practices (Merriam, 2009). A cross-case analysis identified

similarities and differences in the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders.

<center>Strategies to Address Quality Issues</center>

Trustworthiness of the data and data analysis was based on two criteria commonly

used, which were validity and reliability, sometimes referred to in a qualitative study as

credibility and dependability (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008). If the research was valid or

credible, it meant that it accurately portrays the participants' perceptions. If the research

<center>35</center>

was reliable or dependable, the research process can be tracked, explained, and replicated by other researchers. The primary method of insuring the trustworthiness of this research was the use of rich, thick description of the findings for each case study as well as the detailed cross-case analysis among the case studies. In addition, triangulation of data, which was accomplished by checking the information from multiple data sources at each site and among the sites against each other for consistency, strengthens interpretations of the data collected and the conclusions drawn (Mertens, 2005).

Another type of trustworthiness stemmed from the generalizability or transferability of the research study, which was also accomplished through rich, thick description. Creswell (2007) referred to naturalistic generalization, meaning that readers can apply some of the results to their own situation or to a population. Mertens (2005) referred to this concept as transferability and noted the reader was responsible for proving this based on the rich, thick description provided by the researcher. Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) echoed this statement by saying, "Transferability is not whether the study includes a representative sample. Rather, it is about how well the study has made it possible for the reader to decide whether similar process will be at work in their own settings and communities by understanding in depth how they occur at the research site" (p. 78). However, Mertens also referenced a different type of generalizability called analytic generalizability, which was when the researcher generalized the findings from the specific instance or instances to support a broader theory. One of the primary strategies recommended for this type of generalizability was the multi-site case study. Therefore, this research study was designed to offer the reader sufficient detail to generalize to his or her own situation just as the study allowed the researcher to better understand community

engagement by the researcher's institution. In addition, the researcher was able to make generalizations to support broader theories responsive to the research questions and set forth in the conclusions and recommendations below.

Ethical Considerations

The policies of the Institutional Review Boards of the University of Missouri and each participating case study site were followed in obtaining approval for this multi-site case study. An informed consent letter in the form attached as Appendix E was signed by each participating regional comprehensive university to confirm its willingness to serve as a case study site. An informed consent letter in the form attached as Appendix F was sent to each participant prior to the interview, outlining the expectations of participation in the study, explaining the risks of involvement, confirming that participation was completely voluntary and could be terminated at any time, and ensuring complete confidentiality. Each participant signed and returned the informed consent letter, acknowledging his or her understanding and agreement. Neither the names of the higher education institutions or communities participating as case study sites nor the identities of the individual participants at each site are disclosed in this dissertation. A summary of the data obtained from each case study site will be made available to the specific institution, but the identities of the individual participants will not be disclosed to the participating institutions. Individual interviews were transcribed by the researcher personally, and all data was stored in a secure location. Such anonymity was required to encourage each participant to answer questions openly and honestly.

Anticipated Study Limitations

The primary limitation of this study was the time available to identify and interact with a quality sample of individual stakeholders at each of the case study sites, particularly in the external communities. Because multiple case study sites were selected and the researcher was limited to site visits of two days at one university and three days at two universities, time for data collection was limited at each case study site. Since the researcher was unfamiliar with the institutions chosen for case study sites prior to collecting the data, the researcher relied on individuals who were heavily involved in community engagement at these universities to refer the appropriate individuals to interview, both internally and externally. To expand interviews to others through the snowball effect was accomplished to a limited degree due to the lack of additional time required to contact those who had been referred. As a result, the ability to expand to a greater number of individuals who could provide valuable input into each case study site was limited.

In addition, because most of the individual participants were recommended by the individuals most integrally involved in community engagement at the case study sites, many of the participants might have been favorably biased in their assessment of the institution's community engagement activities. However, the findings demonstrated that participants offered a variety of opinions and perceptions, both positive and negative, in response to the interview questions. Nevertheless, by relying on referrals, the researcher has taken the chance that opinions may not offer the depth of experiences at each case study site and, therefore, limit the rich, thick description necessary for a more complete research study.

Summary

Higher education seeks to meet public needs and influence society through teaching, research, and service. The importance of community engagement has increased significantly as higher education institutions seek to work more collaboratively with external audiences on a local level while being required to interact on a global level. The selection of multiple case study sites provided breadth to this research study that would not be available by researching a single site. Furthermore, through the collection and thorough analysis of individual interviews and survey responses with both internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, along with careful review of program data, documents, and records, this research study provided a rich, thick description of the experiences at the selected case study sites. Chapter 4 presents a case study of each site along with a discussion of the findings from that university. Following the individual case studies, a cross-case analysis compares and contrasts the sites and discusses the findings of all three participating institutions. The findings from the individual case studies and the cross-case analysis are intended to provide information to the reader to evaluate and enhance community engagement by other institutions as well as to develop broader theories regarding community engagement and its influence on regional development.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND CASE STUDIES

This multi-site case study explored community engagement by three regional comprehensive universities, specifically regarding the influence of each on the cultural and social development of the larger community, through the lens of the boundary spanning theory. Each of the case study sites, referred to herein as University X, University Y, and University Z, was a regional comprehensive university that received its designation from Carnegie Foundation as a community engaged institution. University X received this designation in 2008, and University Y and University Z received the designation in 2010. In order to achieve this distinction, these institutions demonstrated an institutional commitment to community engagement through multiple foundational indicators and documented numerous examples of engagement activities in teaching, learning, scholarship, community outreach, and collaborative partnerships. Therefore, the high level of community engagement of each of these institutions at the time of this research was established and acknowledged in accordance with existing standards.

The research study was designed specifically to look through the lens of the boundary spanning theory to determine how community engagement by each university influenced the cultural and social development of the larger community. Three research questions guided this study and provided the focus for the findings and case studies which follow:

What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in boundary spanning

roles, both within state colleges and universities and in the communities in

the region, regarding the influence of community engagement on the region?

What community engagement opportunities do stakeholders believe state colleges and universities can become involved in to further the cultural and social development of the region?

What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by state colleges and universities?

With the boundary spanning theory as the conceptual lens, the primary source of data was interviews with individual participants who had been involved in boundary spanning roles, either as administrators, faculty, or professional staff within the institution or as business, government, or nonprofit leaders in the larger community. Sixty individuals who had been involved with community engagement projects at the case study sites participated in interviews. Of these 60 boundary spanners, 35 were internal stakeholders from the institutions and 25 were external stakeholders from the regions. Nineteen interviews were held at each of the three case study sites, totaling 57 interviews averaging 45-50 minutes in length. Fifty-four participants were interviewed alone, and three interviews were conducted with two individuals together from the same organization. Fifty interviews were conducted in person during the researcher's two and three day site visits, and seven interviews were conducted by telephone between six and ten weeks following the visit to that case study site. Each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed for analysis together with data collected from background surveys and other documents, records, assessments, and evaluations.

Findings

Based on the perceptions of these boundary spanners, five major findings emerged regarding the influence of community engagement by regional comprehensive universities on the cultural and social development of the region and how more can be done to encourage community-university partnerships. These findings largely satisfied the research questions used to guide this study.

Finding No. 1: Through community engagement, the university influenced the social and cultural development of the region and the community influenced university development in unique ways depending on regional characteristics and needs. *[Reciprocal Influence]*

Finding No. 2: The most successful community engagement activities were based on relationships among individuals and were focused on student learning. *[Relationship Based and Student Centered]*

Finding No. 3: Further community engagement addressing the needs of underserved populations was recommended in order to influence social and cultural development of the region. *[Underserved Populations]*

Finding No. 4: University policies and procedures, particularly in hiring, promotion, tenure, and resource allocation, were needed to support and encourage involvement of administrators, faculty, and professional staff in community engagement activities. *[Personnel Policies]*

Finding No. 5: Organizational structure and external interface should provide an easily accessible bridge between the university and the

community to encourage and promote community engagement.

[Accessibility]

The above statements were based on the perceptions of boundary spanners. These findings were generally held by both internal and external stakeholders participating in this research study, which suggests significant corroboration among the participants from within the university and in the larger community. The remainder of this chapter presents three individual case studies followed by a cross-case analysis comparing and contrasting the findings at each site. Each of the three case studies and the cross-case analysis provides introductory data followed by data analysis in support of each finding.

<div align="center">University X</div>

The first case study site, referred to herein as University X, was a regional comprehensive university located in the Midwestern United States. University X was established as a branch campus of a larger state university in the mid-1960s in response to the need for public higher education in the region. Twenty years later, in the mid-1980s, University X became independent of its parent university to become one of five public four-year universities in the state. University X grew rapidly over the past three decades, offering more than 70 majors in a wide array of disciplines, from business and education to health care and engineering as well as all facets of liberal arts. Most of the degree programs were at the baccalaureate level, but associates degrees, pre-professional and certificate programs, and graduate degrees including one doctorate were also offered. University X was accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, and many of its programs were also approved by the applicable accreditation bodies.

At the time of this research in Spring Semester 2012, the student population was estimated at nearly 11,000. Although traditionally a commuter campus, the on-campus residential facilities had grown to house 24% of the student population while 76% commuted to the campus. Approximately 77% of the students were full time, and 76% of the students were traditional students between the ages of 18 and 22. Over 60% of the student body came from the primary service region, which consisted of 13 counties in a tri-state area surrounding the university's campus. The first students graduated from University X in 1971, and the university had over 30,000 alumni at the time of this study. Approximately 74% of the graduates continued to reside in the Midwestern state in which the university was located.

The campus of University X was located on 1,400 acres about seven miles from the downtown area of a Midwestern city of approximately 117,500 people. The county in which the university's campus and the city were located was home to more than 165,000 individuals, and the six-county metropolitan area was over 350,000 in population. Throughout its 165-year history, the city had served as the economic hub and social center for a tri-state region near a major river. Traditionally, key industries in the city's metropolitan area included manufacturing, warehousing and distribution, retail, and health care. Agriculture and mining were also significant regional economic assets, and technology was rapidly growing in importance. University X was one of six higher education institutions with a presence in the metropolitan area, although it was the only public comprehensive university, since four of the others were private institutions and one was a community college. University X employed more than 1,500 full-time and part-time staff and faculty.

The researcher first made contact with University X in November of 2011 to determine whether the university would be willing to participate as a case study site. An initial phone call and emails resulted in a brief site visit in January of 2012 to discuss the feasibility and logistics of the research study. An agreement was made to proceed and the informed consent letter was signed on February 6, 2012. Contacts with a suggested list of interviewees began later that month and interviews were scheduled to be held during the researcher's official site visit on March 21-23, 2012. During the three-day site visit, 18 individuals were interviewed, and 1 interview was conducted by telephone several weeks later. Of these 19 participants, 12 were internal stakeholders, and 7 were external stakeholders in the metropolitan area.

Commitment to Community Engagement

Community engagement had been an institutional commitment of University X since its inception. The institution was, in fact, established in response to the need for public higher education in the region and, as of the time this research was conducted, the mission statement read as follows:

> [University X] is an engaged learning community advancing education and knowledge, enhancing civic and cultural awareness, and fostering partnerships through comprehensive outreach programs. We prepare individuals to live wisely in a diverse and global community.

One of the six goals in its 2010-2015 Strategic Plan was to "provide leadership to [the state] and the region" focusing on the following key strategies:

> Supply collaborative expertise and applied research for issues impacting the region. Make it easier for people to engage with our resources and/or capabilities. Elevate our visibility to a level more appropriate to the University's accomplishments and impact in higher education and on the economy.

In addition, one of the strategies noted under the goal to "enhance experiential learning opportunities" was the intention to "increase internships, co-op, study abroad, and community engagement."

The organizational structure of the university also focused on community engagement, with an Associate Provost of Outreach and Engagement reporting to the Provost and directing the Division of Outreach and Engagement. A university brochure described University X as "actively engaged in developing economic, cultural, and educational opportunities in [the region]. Many faculty and staff extend their expertise to activities throughout the region." A partial list of outreach programs described to the researcher during the site visit follows:

> Center for Applied Research
> Center for Education Services and Partnerships
> Center for Human Resource Development
> Center for Continuing Education
> Connect with Southwest [state]
> [nearby town] Gallery of Contemporary Art
> Innovation Pointe Education Partner
> Office of Planning, Research and Assessment
> Service Learning Program
> Southwest [state] Japanese School
> Southwest [state] STEM Resource Center

Because of this depth and breadth of outreach and community engagement by University X, the administration chose to submit the 2008 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement. The individual primarily responsible for completion of this document was the researcher's primary contact for the case study and was the director of one of the outreach programs during this research study. The application provided extensive documentation substantiating the required foundational indicators as well as numerous

examples of successes in curricular engagement as well as outreach and partnerships. Carnegie Foundation announced University X was successful in its application for the Community Engagement Classification on December 18, 2008. Various topics addressed in the application provided a basis for discussion with the 19 boundary spanners participating in the interviews. The perceptions of these individuals with regard to community engagement by University X, specifically in answer to the research questions guiding this study, were the focus of this research and are summarized in the following paragraphs in support of the findings.

Reciprocal Influence

Community engagement efforts by University X had influenced social and cultural development of the region from its inception when the university was established in answer to the region's need for public higher education. Throughout its history, the university maintained a solid tradition of community outreach and engagement, beginning with a strong continuing education program. Over time other unique partnerships evolved in response to regional needs and opportunities. For example, more than 25 years ago, University X established a partnership with the state museum to create a vibrant historic center for arts and education in a nearby town. This historic site, which included museums, an art gallery, and a theatre, positively influenced the region through the preservation of a cultural and historic landmark visited regularly by many from throughout the Midwestern United States and around the world. Another example was the creation of a Japanese school 15 years ago, primarily for the children of employees on temporary assignment with the Japanese businesses in the area. Through this outreach program, University X helped attract global investment, not only stimulating economic

47

development but also adding a global dimension to the regional culture. Other unique

partnerships had been created more recently, which impacted the region in a variety of

ways ranging from increasing access to innovative technologies in partnership with a

Naval research facility in the region, providing resources for K-12 educators in STEM

disciplines in conjunction with local schools, offering public health care to underserved

populations in partnership with local hospitals, schools, and social service organizations,

and improving the quality of life in low-income neighborhoods through comprehensive

community development projects in collaboration with Habitat for Humanity.

Most of the boundary spanners within the university had been engaged with the

community in multiple projects, and those in the community had collaborated with the

university for many years. As a result, these individuals had direct experience with

community-university partnerships and had seen the results of these activities, both in the

region and at the university. They described a reciprocal relationship, meaning that

community engagement had not only influenced the region but also influenced the

direction and development of University X. One university administrator shared that the

university had been "a very externally focused institution from [its] founding." Because

of this external focus, programs at the university had adapted to meet needs of the

community and to take advantage of partnership opportunities that became available. For

example, the business school had developed programs for faculty and students to interact

in meaningful ways with regional industry in the areas of research, entrepreneurship,

innovation, and product development. Other examples were in science and engineering

where, because manufacturing was a prominent regional industry, the university was

developing degree programs and curricula to train the workforce to meet the needs of

these businesses. External stakeholders described the importance of aligning the educational options available at University X with regional needs, both to attract businesses by offering a trained workforce and to provide future employment opportunities for graduates.

In addition to investment in academic programs and faculty, University X made extensive investments in facilities to be responsive to regional development needs. Participants described, and the researcher visited, an innovation center in the downtown area which had been developed in partnership with the area chamber and economic development organizations. This facility provided a presence for the university in the downtown area, offices for regional business and economic development groups, areas for incubating small business ventures, and gallery space for the local arts council. In addition, a new applied engineering center was being built on the campus at the time this research was conduct that would provide a working manufacturing facility on campus for students and faculty to collaborate with regional industry on projects of mutual benefit. Internal stakeholders expressed the importance of the external members of advisory boards to provide guidance to the university in the creation and ongoing operation of these facilities. Boundary spanners acknowledged that the development of facilities and programs to meet regional needs took time as well as human and financial resources and that University X had made a steady and concerted effort in this regard.

Relationship Based and Student Centered

Throughout the interviews conducted at this case study site, it was apparent that the most successful community engagement activities were based on interpersonal relationships. Boundary spanners repeatedly described the need to have individuals

involved from the beginning who had the right attitudes, personalities, and skills to achieve success. Collaborative relationships occurred at every level as a result of personal dedication to community engagement, beginning at the top. Each internal and external stakeholder acknowledged the university President exemplified a strong commitment to community engagement by her level of involvement with the region. She served on numerous boards and participated in many programs and activities throughout the region. Many other administrators, faculty, and professional staff at the university followed suit. Some of these relationships were encouraged as part of the position, but many were the result of the personal interests of the individual. Some of the most successful partnerships developed naturally out of informal relationships and shared interests among individuals within and outside of the university. An example was the partnership with Habitat for Humanity which began because a graduate of University X maintained a close connection with a former professor and, as a result, a successful partnership developed which significantly and positively impacted quality of life in the region.

Successful programs also required the university and community to work toward shared goals, and many participants noted that agreement on goals at the outset of a project was critical. All internal stakeholders identified student learning as the primary goal in everything it does, and community engagement activities were no exception. Traditional methods to encourage student involvement in the community were community service projects, service-learning opportunities, and internships, but more nontraditional community-university partnerships provided innovative opportunities for student learning activities. The public health care partnership, for example, offered opportunities for students in all fields of health services as well as related disciplines

across campus to provide clinical services in nursing, respiratory therapy, occupational

therapy, dental hygiene, and social work. Partnerships with business and industry gave

students an opportunity to engage in research and development to meet immediate needs

of the companies. When speaking on partnerships with local schools, one university

participant stated:

> One of our goals is to provide our students with a meaningful
> practicum experience …. So that's our primary goal. We also want to
> help those schools serve those students, so we want to have a positive
> impact on student learning. If we aren't doing that and able to validate that
> we're doing that, then there is something wrong. So that's the main goal –
> to prepare our students to be good teachers when they enter the field and
> to help those schools serve those students. That's what we all have to do.

This individual went on to explain that, when the teacher education program at University

X established a partnership agreement with a local school, the primary school

improvement goals of the school were adopted as secondary goals of the teacher

education program and the primary goals of the university's program became secondary

goals of the school. This ensured university student learning outcomes were

acknowledged as a central focus of the partnership. Any type of academic program,

classroom project, or collaborative partnership at University X kept student learning as

the primary goal to ensure the activity would be in line with its educational mission.

Underserved Populations

Several of the programs University X was engaged in focused on needs of

underserved populations in the region. The first community health center established as a

result of the public health care partnership with local hospitals, schools, and social

service organizations was opened just two months before this research study in "one of

the most medically underserved areas in [the] community" and had already served over

1,600 individuals, ages 4 to 78, through screenings, phone calls, patient services, and outreach activities. In the comprehensive community development projects, University X and Habitat for Humanity played "the role of lead convener … to collaborate with many different non-profits, the private sector, government to help facilitate the creation of a commonly shared vision among residents and external stakeholders … and then advance that kind of vision and neighborhood strategic plan." Faculty members shared experiences with other projects including service-learning projects with at-risk youth and a multicultural awareness conference in collaboration with minority groups. These programs clearly had a direct and immediate impact on the underserved populations in the region.

However, more work with these populations was needed to further influence social and cultural development of the region. As one faculty member stated, "If you really want to do good, you've got to be working with a population that doesn't have an advocate." Another faculty member acknowledged the need to "start recognizing our community stakeholders as knowledgeable, powerful partners." More service-learning opportunities and collaborative partnerships were needed to build mutually beneficial relationships between University X and these underserved populations in the surrounding area in order to serve the public good while offering valuable learning opportunities for students. Furthermore, several internal and external stakeholders felt such interactions exposed at-risk youth from minority and low-income populations with alternatives for their future. For example, one school had more than a third of its student body on the free and reduced lunch program, and the boundary spanners involved suggested the interaction with university students and exposure to the university environment might

inspire these students to complete their high school education and possibly pursue a

higher education degree. Similar recommendations were made to engage with the

community to encourage adults to further their education to improve their quality of life.

It is incumbent upon higher education institutions to provide access to education, and

community engagement can raise the awareness of these opportunities.

Personnel Policies

Internal stakeholders acknowledged work needed to be done on university

policies and procedures to support and encourage involvement of administrators, faculty,

and professional staff in community engagement activities. Several acknowledged the

strong culture of community engagement at University X but also recognized this was not

across all disciplines. Business, engineering, health professions, and education were

heavily engaged with the community, while departments in the liberal arts were not.

Through interviews with deans and faculty, it was clear this difference was, in part, due

to differing views among leadership in each college. However, all internal stakeholders

interviewed referenced the need to change policies to recognize service in promotion and

tenure and allocate resources to support faculty involvement in community outreach. One

administrator referenced "antiquated policies that are not as supportive of faculty as they

could be in terms … of providing what I would call justifiable compensation for outreach

activities." Another administrator who was supportive of service shared, "When it comes

right down to it, it's teaching and scholarship that promote people. That's the bottom line.

I mean it's valued but, when you hold it up against scholarship and teaching, it comes in

third." He further stated that he would like to see teaching, scholarship, and service

considered equally, and he felt progress was being made toward that end.

In addition, participants believed policies relating to hiring new administrators, faculty, and staff were of critical importance. One administrator noted there was a critical mass of highly engaged individuals at the university that helped in "socializing new faculty as they come on board" although she and other participants commented on the importance of making an intentional effort to hire individuals committed to outreach and engagement. University administrators felt that including a requirement for community engagement in position advertisements was a strong indication of university policy. At least two of the four colleges at University X were including this requirement in position descriptions and, in certain instances, employment contracts when hiring new faculty. One external participant provided an interesting perspective, because he admitted to having had some concern the partnership in which he was engaged would be disrupted when several individuals in critical positions retired. He explained that, because the university sought individuals for these key positions who were committed to community engagement, the change in leadership caused no difficulty. As one boundary spanner stated in his survey, "A long term perspective is essential to successful community engagement." Without institutional policies ensuring that community engagement was critical to the position, regardless of the individual in that position, this partnership and others like it would not be successful.

Accessibility

At University X community engagement had been highly centralized in the organizational structure for many years and the external interface was well established. An Associate Provost of Outreach and Engagement reported to the Provost and worked closely with the university President. The Associate Provost headed the Division of

Outreach and Engagement, which was an academic unit of University X. University administrators pointed to the importance of this division being under the Provost as an academic unit, stating that community engagement was "fundamentally an academic mission" and "the really hard work has to be done by the faculty." This division had been a part of the organizational structure for many years and housed 10 individual departments providing a variety of outreach services as well as three degree programs. Marketing materials indicated over 15,000 individuals were served annually through continuing education courses and special programs. A link to Community and Outreach was also prominently displayed on the homepage of the website, directing individuals to many outreach programs across campus, including but not limited to the programs in the Division of Outreach and Engagement.

The purpose of this organizational structure and external interface was to provide an easily accessible bridge between the university and the community. Therefore, to be fully integrated at the university and to provide resources to the larger community, facilitation of these partnerships involving faculty and students with the larger community was critical. To this end, special programs such as the Center for Applied Research, the Service Learning Program, and the Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment provided an important link to connect businesses and organizations in the region with faculty, staff, and students to conduct research, provide consulting services, and offer student assistance on projects. These have been highly successful in matching the needs of the region with the expertise and resources of the university. A few internal and external participants noted, however, the university could be more proactive in marketing and communications to direct stakeholders in the community to connect with

the university. Informing the region of the opportunities at University X was essential to continued establishment of community-university partnerships involving faculty, staff, and students with community partners and further integrating the concept of community engagement throughout the university.

University Y

The second case study site, referred to herein as University Y, was a regional comprehensive university located in the Southeastern United States. The institution was established in the early 1870s as a land grant institution for a sparsely populated, mountainous region to provide educational opportunities, primarily in agriculture and mining, as well as to serve as a military college. At the time of this research, University Y continued its long tradition of service to the region as a public four-year liberal arts institution and its service to the United States as a senior military college. Offering more than 50 academic programs in a wide array of disciplines, from business and health care to education and liberal arts, the university conferred baccalaureate and master's degrees as well as one doctorate. University Y was accredited by Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and many of its programs were also approved by the applicable accreditation bodies.

University Y was the smallest of the three case study sites with an estimated 6,000 students at the time of conducting research during Spring Semester 2012. The student population had more than doubled in size in the previous two decades as a result of steady annual growth. Traditionally a commuter campus, newly built residential facilities offered housing for 33% of the students while 67% commuted from the local area and surrounding communities. The student body was comprised of 80% full-time

and 20% part-time students, and 90% were undergraduates with 10% pursuing graduate degrees. The Corp of Cadets comprised 13% to 15% of the student body, and the long-standing military tradition of the college had a significant influence on university culture.

University Y was situated in the center of a city of more than 5,000 residents, which was the only municipality in a county surrounded by a rural area that was home to an additional 25,000 residents. The university was the only four-year public institution serving the educational needs of a service region incorporating portions of 27 counties. The area was originally settled during the first major gold rush in the 1800s as a mining community, and the culture of this historic area still played a significant role. Tourism for people wanting to enjoy the history, arts, and music of the region, as well as nature and outdoor activities, was the largest industry in the city. Mining was still present in the county, as it had been for over 150 years, and technology and manufacturing had been rapidly growing in importance throughout the region resulting in significant population growth. Just as the university had doubled in size over the past two decades, so had the population of the county and the city. A neighboring county was the sixth fastest growing county in the United States with a population of over 175,000, an increase of 77% in a decade, due to an influx of globally-based technology and manufacturing companies establishing facilities in the region. In an effort to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population, University Y was in the process of opening a branch campus in this neighboring county at the time this research was conducted.

The researcher first made contact with the individual at University Y holding the position of Executive Director of Regional Engagement in the summer of 2011 as part of preliminary fact-finding regarding the topic of community engagement. A brief visit in

September of 2011 provided an opportunity to discuss the overall research study with a

potential participant. After several contacts as the research study developed, all materials

were submitted for consideration, and a letter dated February 29, 2012, was received

from the chair of the Institutional Review Board chair at University Y approving

participation as a case study site. Contacts with a suggested list of interviewees began in

early March of 2012 and interviews were scheduled during the researcher's official site

visit on March 28-30, 2012. During the three-day site visit, 22 participants were

interviewed in 19 interviews, including 16 individual interviews and 3 interviews with

two people from the same organization. Of these 22 participants, 12 were internal

stakeholders and 10 were external stakeholders in the city and region.

Commitment to Community Engagement

The institutional commitment of University Y to community engagement had

become more focused and integrated in recent years. The vision statement set forth in the

2008-2013 Strategic Plan, in effect at the time this research was conducted, was

"education for life and leadership in a global community." One of the core values upon

which it was based was "service – giving of oneself to enhance the life and richness of

the university and all of its members, as well as the larger community." Two of the four

strategic themes contained in the plan focused on community engagement. Strategic

Theme 2 was *Leadership in Educating Engaged Citizens* which stated:

> Effective citizens are active participants in their communities,
> knowledgeable about issues and inspired by an ethic of social
> responsibility and service to others. The development of engaged citizens
> requires practice and involvement beyond the classroom that extends into
> the community. Experiential learning opportunities associated with
> community life are essential to this civic objective. We must provide

students with structured activities that encourage participation and organized reflection on these experiences.

"Promoting community engagement and development" was one of the strategic directions to support this theme. In addition, Strategic Theme 3, *Leadership in Regional Development*, stated:

> As the only comprehensive university in the region, [University Y] has an obligation to lead regional development through education and through partnerships for economic and community development. By tailoring our educational programs and services to regional needs, we can be a force for change in our region and accommodate its expanding population and its need for higher education. By building relationships with regional schools, business and industry, non-profit organizations, and community governance agencies, we can improve the quality of our lives together. By conducting research and development of interest and use to regional enterprises, we can strengthen our area's capacity as a center for the creative, knowledge-based economy while supporting the university's scholarly activities.

The strategic directions recommended to accomplish this included enhancing activities, programs, and services to "enrich the quality of regional cultural and social life" and to establish "educational partnerships that benefit both the university and the region."

The organizational structure of the university also focused on community engagement. Establishment of the Office of Regional Engagement was a result of a reorganization developed out of the strategic planning process in 2008 and, according to its webpage, this office "promotes the collaboration between [University Y] and our larger communities – [city], [region], and the world – for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." Following is a partial list of the outreach programs the researcher became aware:

Appalachian Nurse Practitioner Clinic
Appalachian Teaching Project
[state] Appalachian Center for Higher Education

59

[state] Appalachian Studies Center
Grants and Contracts Administration
[University Y] Internship Program
Hippotherapy Camp
Non-Profit and Small Business Leadership Workshop Program
Service Learning
Summer Food Drive for Community Helping Place

Because of this focus on outreach and community engagement by University Y, the administration chose to submit the 2010 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement. The individual primarily responsible for completion of this document was the Executive Director for Regional Engagement and the researcher's primary contact during this research study. The application provided extensive documentation substantiating the required foundational indicators as well as numerous examples of successes in curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships. On January 5, 2011, University Y announced it had earned the Community Engagement Classification from Carnegie, making it one of only two public universities in the state to be awarded the classification. Various topics addressed in the application and related documents provided a basis for discussion with the 22 boundary spanners participating in the interviews. The perceptions of these individuals with regard to community engagement by University Y, specifically in answer to the research questions guiding this study, were the focus of this research and are summarized in the following paragraphs in support of the findings.

Reciprocal Influence

Although community engagement at University Y was not clearly set forth as an institutional priority until the strategic plan adopted in 2008, boundary spanners described the university as having a strong history of engagement. A variety of unique community-

university partnerships had been established, particularly early in the decade prior to this research study, which influenced social and cultural development of the region. These partnerships originated primarily by faculty in certain academic disciplines seeking to respond to regional needs and opportunities. Several programs were directed toward preservation and promotion of regional culture, including history, storytelling, nature, gardening, folk art, and traditional music. These outreach activities involved departments across campus and a variety of organizations in the region. Other partnerships focused on health care, one among the department of nursing and regional health care providers to extend health services to underserved populations in the seven-county region, and another between the physical therapy department and area practitioners to conduct a hippotherapy camp for disabled individuals with the help of student volunteers from a variety of disciplines. Other collaborative efforts focused on sustainability and environmental issues impacting the region while yet another partnership sought to increase accessibility to technology to improve quality of life as well as increase economic development in the region.

The university participants interviewed had been engaged with the community in multiple projects, and community participants had collaborated with the university over a period of years. Consequently, internal and external stakeholders had experience with community-university partnerships and witnessed the influence of these collaborative efforts in the region as well as in the evolution of university programming and facilities. The increased emphasis on community engagement was itself a programmatic change impacting multiple areas of the institution. This strategic focus resulted in significant changes in academic affairs and also impacted the student affairs area. A new academic

affairs unit called the Office of Regional Engagement was established and directed by a

faculty member who worked "to promote a cultural change, so we don't look at teaching,

research, and service in isolation, but that we look at it in the larger context of

engagement with the community." In addition, the Center for Teaching and Learning

Excellence was given the task to "work with faculty and the coursework and manage the

strategic approach [to service-learning] from the Academic Affairs side." The faculty

member who oversees this center was asked by the Vice President for Academic Affairs

to chair a task force to develop and implement an operational plan for service-learning.

On the student affairs side, interviews with staff in Career Services and in Greek Life and

Community Service revealed an increased effort to facilitate connections between

students and external constituencies through internships and community service. Other

programmatic changes specific to certain disciplines included an initiative in education to

partner with K-12 schools for teacher training and a new center in the business school to

support student learning and regional economic development.

In addition to these changes in programs and administration, community

engagement significantly influenced campus facilities at University Y beginning in 2000.

Since that time, the local community development authority partnered with University Y

to finance, design, and build new buildings on campus. One community participant

explained:

> One of the main reasons for a city to create a downtown development
> authority is it has the power of issuing public bonds for construction for
> very low rates, so the university has … reached out and did a partnership
> with [us] to have us sponsor construction bonds for campus projects. So
> the past 11 years, we have sponsored four dormitory construction projects,
> a parking deck, recreation center, a new dining hall, and a new campus
> bookstore building which also has community commercial space.

This unique community-university partnership played a significant role in the growth of University Y from 3,600 students in 2000 to over 6000 students in 2012. In addition, a new branch campus nearing completion at the time of this research in a community approximately 30 miles from the main campus, which was made possible by a partnership with business and government leaders in that community. This facility was being built by the city and, according to external stakeholders, University Y had "made a concerted effort to be engaged with the community" before and during development of this new building. This new campus was in direct response to the need for accessible educational opportunities in that community.

Relationship Based and Student Centered

Interviews conducted at University Y and in the region made it clear the most successful community engagement activities were based on interpersonal relationships. Boundary spanners described the community as having a strong bond with the university and that collaborative relationships occurred at every level as a result of personal dedication to the community and the region. However, institutional commitment to community engagement had fluctuated over time depending on leadership, particularly at the presidential level. Internal and external stakeholders acknowledged the university president, who had retired just before this research was conducted, exemplified a strong commitment to community engagement by his level of involvement in the region. In addition to the president, connections with other administrators, faculty, and professional staff were made through service on boards and involvement in community organizations. Most of this community engagement was the result of the personal interests of individuals, and many of the highly successful partnerships developed naturally out of

63

informal relationships and shared interests. For example, individuals involved in a collaborative effort to bring broadband connectivity to the region shared that their first connection was through a social friendship. They began talking about the lack of fiber optic technology in the area and, within three years of creating the partnership, it was well on its way toward completion of an 1100-mile fiber optic network connecting the region to the world. Another example was the hippotherapy program, which began as a direct result of one faculty member's love for providing services to the disabled through the movement of horses. Twice each year, the camp provided hippotherapy sessions for individuals from the ages of 15 months to 53 years. The fees for these sessions were minimal, and the impact on both the clients with disabilities and the student volunteers was invaluable.

Impact on students was a key to successful community engagement programs at University Y, and the university maintained a strong focus on student learning together with community impact. As one internal boundary spanner who had collaborated with the community on many projects stated, "Our goal is to partner in a way that we're bringing something to the table and our students are bringing something away, a true symbiotic kind of relationship." An expanded focus by the institution on student learning through community engagement was apparent in its emphasis on providing support for traditional methods of engaged scholarship. The effort to support, catalog, and acknowledge student involvement in community service projects was a focus of the newly hired Greek Life and Community Service coordinator. The campus-wide task force focusing on service-learning and implementation of its findings by the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence was clearly an effort to provide support for faculty to incorporate service-

learning in course curricula. Also, Career Services proactively supported internships

through providing departmental training, making connections in the community, and

offering support for students. Community-university partnerships, such as the

hippotherapy program, provided innovative opportunities for student learning activities.

Not only did this partnership offer physical therapy students opportunities for unique

clinical experiences but also provided opportunities for students from all degree programs

to work with the clients and the horses at therapy sessions. All of these programs offering

both traditional and nontraditional forms of engaged scholarship ensured student learning

was central to the activity and would further the educational mission of the institution.

Underserved Populations

Several of the programs in which University Y was engaged focused on needs of

underserved populations in the region. The partnership to increase broadband

connectivity in the region anticipated having a direct impact on economic development,

but its true purpose from the perspective of the boundary spanners interviewed was to

build human capacity in the region. One participant described the impact they hoped to

have on underserved populations:

> I talk to so many people that quit school in the 8th grade and went to
> work at the [factory]. That's the way life worked. "My daddy was a
> mechanic. He said get a job and go work for the corporation as a
> mechanic." … So if you can just put another thing in kids' heads, a
> different direction, a different dream, a different ambition, that's what this
> stuff can do. This takes them anywhere at any time. … If you can break
> loose from some of that, unleash the power of this technology for kids to
> go anywhere and do anything with anybody, that's what this network
> brings.

The desire to make a difference in the lives of low-income residents and at-risk youth in

the region was clearly at the heart of this project. More traditional partnerships between

the university and the community existed through service-learning projects as well as volunteer efforts of faculty, staff, and students. For example, students involved in the leadership courses on campus participated in a service-learning project with Habitat for Humanity, which had dual goals of educating students and the campus community about nonprofit's mission as well as raising funds for the organization. Another nonprofit organization, which provided multiple services to the community through a food pantry, thrift store, free health care, and other programs for people in need of assistance, partnered with University Y in a number of ways. Several university personnel staff served on the board, the university hosted a large food drive each year, and students volunteered through service opportunities.

However, more work with these populations was needed to further influence social and cultural development of the region. Over 50% of the students in the county school district where the campus was located were on the free and reduced lunch program. One boundary spanner, when asked about the possibilities of further collaboration between University Y and schools in the region, stated, "I think it would be ideal because we have a 17% college-going rate in this community, which is pretty dire considering it's a university town." Several academic programs, particularly in education, focused on outreach to the schools in the region at the elementary and middle school level to encourage all youth, particularly those at risk, to consider higher education. However, the perception of most external stakeholders was the university needed better outreach to the underserved in the region to increase the awareness and accessibility of educational opportunities. Boundary spanners also suggested implementing programs which would make higher education more accessible, not only to the traditional student

population, but to adults who had not previously been able to take advantage of the educational opportunities. A few participants, both in the university and in the community, mentioned University Y was a selective institution and did not need to recruit from the region. However, most stakeholders acknowledged the need to engage more with the surrounding communities to serve the underserved and stressed the need to raise the awareness of opportunities and expand the availability of higher education to these local populations.

Personnel Policies

Administrators and faculty at University Y acknowledged the need for changes in university policies and procedures to support and encourage involvement in community engagement activities, particularly in promotion and tenure policies for faculty. Service was not recognized in the same way across all disciplines, not only due to different perspectives on engagement among the leadership of each academic unit but also because of different interpretations regarding the definition of service across campus. One university administrator shared her ideas on changes needed in policies and procedures:

> There, of course, is a service component. It's not as well-developed as it might be. So there have been a few discussions … about what we mean by service and what meaningful service might be. Unfortunately for some departments on campus, meaningful service has been associated with the number of committee assignments given on campus and less so about the extent of their professional and/or community engagement and applying their expertise to the community or their professional organization. … If I were to encourage a change in the service structure, it would be for senior faculty to be more engaged in university related service because they've developed an understanding of the institution, and to have more junior faculty be more engaged in their professional service and their service to the community where they're applying their professional expertise because that actually helps promote their career development.

Another reason for the variation among academic programs was differing requirements and expectations of each academic discipline. For example, faculty members in education were highly engaged, not only because the dean believed in the value of university-community partnerships, but also because engagement with local schools was deemed important for teacher preparation. In the liberal arts school, cultural outreach had been emphasized in the visual and performing arts, resulting in many opportunities for outreach and engagement through art exhibits, musical performances, and community events. However, the history department was not engaged in the community because its academic focus was primarily in military history rather than in historic preservation or regional history. Similarly, in the science school, which included the health professions, the academic programs relating to nursing and physical therapy were the most highly engaged in the region while other programs were strongly focused on preparation of students for graduate studies or professional schools.

Along with recognizing faculty for service on par with teaching and scholarship, the concept of resource allocation was mentioned by several internal and external boundary spanners as critical to supporting community engagement. Two aspects of resource allocation were mentioned as important – the allocation of time and the distribution of financial resources. In the survey, one faculty member stated that community engagement could be encouraged by increasing "recognition of the time requirements needed to participate in the community engagement." This was reaffirmed in interviews with several internal stakeholders who suggested course release would be helpful to faculty wishing to engage in community-university partnerships or to incorporate service-learning opportunities in their courses. As for financial resources,

budgetary allocations and external funding opportunities were noted by both internal and external boundary spanners. Providing university resources through budget allocations supporting collaborative partnerships was beneficial, not only because it provided needed resources but also because it demonstrated institutional commitment for community engagement. Seeking out opportunities for external grants and private contributions to fund community-university partnerships was also valuable, and one external participant noted collaboration often helped in obtaining these funds. Several of the programs at University Y were examples of the value of investing both time and money toward collaborative ventures as well as the impact these partnerships can have on both the university and the region.

Accessibility

Community engagement at University Y had become more centralized in the organizational structure and its external interface was becoming more established at the time of this study. The Executive Director for Regional Engagement initially reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and later to the Vice President for Executive Affairs, working closely with departments across the campus to facilitate collaborative opportunities between the university and the region. University administrators pointed to the importance of this division being closely associated with Academic Affairs and to the value of having the director of the program be a faculty member. Because the director was a faculty member and served in faculty senate, she maintained relationships as a peer and a colleague. Also, because of her years of experience in the classroom, this individual shared a common perspective and spoke the same language as other faculty members.

She was familiar with "the culture on both sides" and interviews with all participants demonstrated she was highly respected among all constituencies.

In terms of boundary spanning, the primary purpose of this organizational structure and external interface was to provide a bridge between the university and the community to identify opportunities to create partnerships and for the community to access the resources of the university. To be fully integrated within the university and to provide resources to the region, facilitation of these partnerships involving faculty and students with the larger community was critical. This was being accomplished in several ways. Most importantly the Executive Director for Regional Engagement had become a critical bridge, and external stakeholders were becoming accustomed to this connection. Several participants noted that interest on the part of a faculty member to engage in the project was also critical. The Executive Director was helpful in making those connections and facilitating the development of community-university partnerships. A Community link on the homepage of the website directed individuals to many outreach programs available at University Y, including but not limited to the work of the Office of Regional Engagement. Another effort to bridge this gap and make these connections was in the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, which was developing a service-learning web interface to allow faculty to post descriptions of service-learning projects in their courses and to let community organizations post needs and opportunities for student learning. Finally, Career Services was working to span the boundaries between University Y and the region through participating in regional career fairs, networking with communities, and monitoring an online database of opportunities for student internships.

University Z

The third and final case study site, referred to herein as University Z, was a

regional comprehensive university located in the Midwestern United States, established

at the turn of the 20th Century as a regional state normal school to provide teacher

training. The institution was designated a state teachers college in the early 1920s. By the

1950s, the institution's educational mission had broadened significantly, and the college

became a university. As a regional comprehensive university, University Z offered more

than 100 majors in a broad range of disciplines including the arts and sciences, education,

agriculture, business, sports management, law enforcement, and health care.

Baccalaureate degree programs were offered across all disciplines, and many departments

also offered pre-professional programs, professional certifications, master's degrees, and

one doctoral program. University Z was accredited by the Higher Learning Commission

of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, and many of its programs were

also approved by the applicable accreditation bodies.

University Z had, at the time of this research in Spring Semester 2012, a total

student population of approximately 12,500, with about 10,500 attending the main

residential campus and 2,000 attending a non-residential branch campus in a larger

metropolitan area approximately one hour away. For the purpose of this research, data

from only the main campus was collected and included in this case study. Traditionally a

residential campus, many students lived in the residence halls on campus and many of

those who commuted to campus lived in rental properties located in neighborhoods

adjacent to the campus. The student body included 90% undergraduates and 10%

graduate students. In addition, over 90% of the student body came from the Midwestern

state in which the university was located. There were more than 100,000 living alumni and, although data was not available regarding the location of these alumni, a significant statistic was that over 6,000 alumni lived within a five mile radius of the main campus. As a result a significant percentage of the total population of the area were alumni of University Z.

The main campus of University Z was located near the downtown area of a city of more than 20,000 residents in a county of nearly 35,000 total residents. The institution's service region included 20 counties in a tri-state area surrounding the main campus. In addition to this four-year public institution, a community college also provided higher education opportunities in the region and maintained a campus near University Z. The region surrounding the city was primarily rural farmland dotted with small communities, so agriculture and agribusiness made up a significant sector of the economy. Retail was also an economic factor, since the city served as a regional hub for an estimated 80,000 shoppers each day. In addition, tourism and recreation were promoted, because the area was on the Amtrak route from a major metropolitan area and had become more easily accessible by four-lane highways to metropolitan areas in the region. Health care and elder care were a growing industry as well in response to an aging regional population. Lastly education itself was a primary regional asset and economic force, since University Z was the largest employer in the community with more than 1,850 full-time employees at the main campus.

The researcher first made contact with University Z in November of 2011 to determine whether or not the university would be willing to participate as a case study site. After several calls and emails, all materials were submitted for consideration, and a

letter dated February 9, 2012, was received from the chair of the Institutional Review Board at University Z approving participation as a case study site. A brief site visit was held in early February of 2012 to discuss the logistics of the research study. Contacts with a suggested list of interviewees began the first week of April of 2012, and interviews were scheduled during the researcher's official site visit on April 10 and 11, 2012. During the two-day site visit, 13 individuals were interviewed from the initial list of suggested participants. Based on referrals from the initial group of participants, an additional 6 telephone interviews were conducted in June and July. Of the total 19 participants, 11 were internal stakeholders and 8 were external stakeholders in the city.

Commitment to Community Engagement

University Z demonstrated an institutional commitment to community engagement in its strategic plan *Higher Values in Higher Education* by including social responsibility as one of its four core values. Originally adopted in 2003 and updated in 2008, this strategic plan was intended to be the guiding document for University Z from 2008-2018. The mission statement clearly included service to the larger community, stating:

> By enacting our values and supporting the synergy between instruction, research, creativity and service, [University Z] prepares a socially responsible, diverse student, faculty, and staff, population to lead in the global society.

The core value of social responsibility was further elaborated upon as follows:

> [University Z] is committed to equity, social justice, and diversity, and will maintain the highest standards of integrity in our work with others. [University Z] will serve as a resource for and stimulus to economic, educational, cultural, environmental, and community development in our region and well beyond.

Most importantly, social responsibility and community engagement was integrated

throughout the detailed goals and objectives set forth in the 2008-2018 strategic planning

document. Under each of the six goals, which ranged from increasing the student body

and educational opportunities to supporting personal growth, social responsibility, and

accountability, at least one action item dealt with engagement, outreach, and service to

the larger community.

The organizational structure of University Z did not provide a centralized or

coordinated approach to community engagement, although many programs and

departments were committed to community engagement in a variety of ways. One

noteworthy example was the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs, a research and outreach

center which had been a connection point between the university and the state since 1989.

In addition to this key program, other collaborative efforts this researcher became aware

of included:

> Celebrating Town and Gown
> Community University Partnership Program
> GIS Center
> Institute for Environmental Studies
> [city] Community Garden
> Partnerships with [community college]
> Performing Arts Society
> [University Z] All Volunteer Effort
> [University Z] Survey Research Center
> Volunteer Now

Although numerous community outreach programs existed, there was no

coordinated presence on the university's homepage directing individuals to these

opportunities and resources available across campus. The link to Social Responsibility on

the website simply stated there were "countless options to contribute to … surrounding

communities through the volunteer branch of the Office of Student Activities." Indeed the Office of Student Activities had traditionally coordinated student engagement with the community and was responsible for a university-wide assessment activity in 2011 to document community engagement efforts throughout the institution. This project resulted in the university being named to the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, which "recognizes higher education institutions that reflect the values of exemplary community services and achieve meaningful outcomes in their communities."

Another significant step toward demonstrating a university-wide approach to outreach and community engagement was the submission of the 2010 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement. The individual primarily responsible for completion of this document was the director of the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs and the researcher's primary contact for the case study during this research study. The application provided extensive documentation substantiating the required foundational indicators as well as numerous examples of successes in curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships. On January 5, 2011, University Z announced it had been awarded the Community Engagement Classification from Carnegie. Various topics addressed in the application and related documents provided a basis for discussion with the 19 boundary spanners participating in the interviews. The perceptions of these individuals with regard to community engagement by University Z, specifically in answer to the research questions guiding this study, were the focus of this research and are summarized in the following paragraphs in support of the findings.

Reciprocal Influence

Community engagement activities at University Z had influenced social and cultural development of the region in a variety of ways over more than a century of service. Unique outreach programs and community-university partnerships had been established, some originating primarily by administrators and faculty at the university and others when the community approached the university to access its resources. An example of the former was a community gardening partnership begun three years prior to this research, through which faculty and students from several academic disciplines worked alongside community members from all walks of life at four community garden sites in the region. An example of the latter was the performing arts society, which raised funds to support a variety of youth arts programs and provide grants for faculty to work with students and the public. The society was established nearly 30 years previously by people from the community and university who believed "that a united effort was needed to build a sense of pride in the performing arts for the region, to enhance the quality of life through exposure to the arts, and to demonstrate a collaborative effort to ensure the arts would always be a part of our community."

Boundary spanners at the university had been engaged with multiple projects at University Z and other institutions where they had worked, and community participants had collaborated with the university for many years. Therefore, these individuals had direct experience with community engagement and had seen the impact of these activities. They described community-university partnerships as reciprocal relationships, influencing the region as well as the direction and development of the institution. Several programs at the university were established specifically to address the needs of the

region. The best example of this was the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs, which had been part of the university since 1989. This institute was a university-based research and outreach center, which was established by state mandate to provide data, research, policy development, and education to rural communities throughout the state. At the time of this research, 3 tenured faculty members and 40 full time staff members were involved in the delivery of services to communities throughout the university's service region as well as the state in which University Z was located. Other programs developed over time that also provided services to the larger community included a resource center for geographic information systems and mapping, an institute providing environmental services to address ecological issues, and a center providing survey and data analysis services. Many area businesses, organizations, and governmental entities had taken advantage of these resources provided by University Z over the years.

In addition to the investment in specific academic and service programs, University Z collaborated in several community-university partnerships, particularly with the local government and nearby community college, designed to improve the town and gown relationship and impact the quality of life. The Community University Partnership Program was developed by the previous president and mayor to address the town and gown relationship, particularly in the areas of public safety and infrastructure issues. Campus facilities were utilized as conference and meeting facilities by the community as a whole, which was of great benefit to the local convention and visitors bureau. The bus system was a unique joint venture providing public transportation across campus and throughout the community. In addition agreements between the university and the community college not only allowed students to easily transition from the community

college to the university but also allowed community college students to use many of the university's facilities and, for those who were from outside the area, live in the dormitories on campus. Each of these investments by the university in campus facilities were also investments in the community and influenced regional growth and development.

Relationship Based and Student Centered

Community engagement activities were based primarily on interpersonal relationships at University Z. Boundary spanners noted partnerships occurred as a result of peer to peer collegial interaction at every level, which was modeled at the presidential and mayoral level. This top-tier relationship was positive with the past president and mayor, who had a long-standing relationship from years of serving in those positions. The new president and mayor, who began their terms of office approximately a year prior to this research, were developing a positive relationship through formal activities, such as the Community University Partnership Program and an annual Celebrating Town and Gown event. The mayor indicated they each felt comfortable contacting the other informally to address issues or to discuss collaborative partnerships as opportunities arose. Many administrators, faculty, and professional staff at University Z also cultivated relationships, some encouraged as part of their positions, but many resulting from individual interests and informal relationships. An interesting example of an informal relationship which developed into an impactful community-university relationship was the community gardening collaboration. An internal stakeholder believed part of the success of this project was because "the relationship formed first and I think there was some trust there that we weren't just a group of college people coming to do some nice

project and we'd be gone tomorrow." The growth and development of the project had also been natural process resulting from a faculty member "just being alert and aware of what's going on."

The community garden project also exemplified the fact that student learning was at the core of community engagement efforts by University Z. This partnership provided opportunities for students in all traditional types of engaged scholarship, including community service, community-based research, internships, and service-learning. Many departments required community service hours or internships in order to graduate and included service-learning opportunities in courses. Interviews with several external stakeholders demonstrated student learning was not only important to faculty but also to the community. Several nonprofits commented on the tremendous value interns brought to their organizations, and a few nonprofit and governmental entities worked with the university to utilize the services of Peace Corps Fellows. One partnership with the regional museum was unique in its support of student learning. Not only did the museum receive the services of a Peace Corps Fellow but also employed the service of a graduate assistant and a number of student volunteers. A unique aspect of the graduate assistantship was the museum had committed to paying half of the stipend. Student learning was also top of mind when museum staff was asked what could be done in the future and the reply was,

> I would like to be able to continue to provide them with professional quality education. … I know the professional practices for handling artifacts, but I don't have the money to get archival boxes. So I think I would up my standards and feel like I could teach them a lot more. I teach them those things, but I can't show them those things.

79

Students received a top quality learning experience who participated in a collaborative partnership, such as this, where both internal and external boundary spanners stayed focused on and dedicated to student learning.

Underserved Populations

Programs at University Z, such as the community gardening effort and the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs, were specifically dedicated to making a positive impact on the needs of underserved populations in the region. With regard to the community garden, all four of the sites were on properties owned by the county housing authority, so many of the community residents who participated were low-income residents. This opportunity provided them with healthy produce to feed their families and the knowledge of growing their own food. The institute worked through nine different programs to "democratize knowledge" or, in other words, to utilize university resources, knowledge, and expertise for the benefit of the region and the state. The institute undertook projects focused on strategic visioning and sustainable development for rural communities, efforts to improve health care, housing, and transportation in rural areas, and economic development through creation and support of entrepreneurs and agribusiness. Other programs like the performing arts society had an indirect impact on at-risk youth. The society's primary efforts in youth programs in the performing arts had tremendous success in bringing over 6000 students from all backgrounds and socioeconomic situations from throughout the region. This exposed these young people not only to cultural activities but also to the environment of a higher education institution.

More outreach was needed to work with these populations in order to further influence social and cultural development of the region. One boundary spanner, noting the desperate poverty in the rural communities and schools, stated:

> Every university, every regional university says its mission is to serve that region. And we prioritize it, we put it on everything that's published, we service the local region. Because we say we do it, we believe we do it. We don't assess whether we're doing it. I think if we want to serve our community, if we truly want to serve our region, we have to intentionally do that. We have to sit down and plan how we're going to do that. We have to let the local communities tell us what their needs are. We have to find ways to serve their needs. I think until we have a campus office that's charged with doing this, it's not going to happen.

Boundary spanners both within and outside University Z suggested more should be done to reach out to the regional schools to make low-income families and at-risk youth aware of the opportunities available at the university. In addition, more effort should be made through collaboration between the university and the region to increase opportunities available to university graduates and keep the knowledge and talent leaving the area. Higher education institutions must not only provide access to education for all constituencies in the region but also opportunities for future employment of graduates, and community engagement can provide these opportunities.

Personnel Policies

Participants at University Z referenced several policies and procedures that were supportive of engagement by administrators, faculty, and professional staff in the community. The Professional Achievement Award was given to deserving faculty members each year to reward them for teaching, research, and service. Points for work in each area, including both campus and community service, accumulated and applications were reviewed annually. If successful, an individual's base salary was increased as a

reward for participation and accomplishments. There was a similar award for administrative professionals, advisors, and other personnel who also made significant contributions to the community. In addition, requirements existed in the standard personnel evaluation process for community engagement by professional staff. Their performance evaluation included a question which read, "Community and Regional Service: Does the individual contribute to the welfare of the wider community as evidenced by records of volunteer service or community leadership?" Also, in the initial hiring process, community engagement was taken into consideration for certain positions, as noted by one external stakeholder who had recently served on a university hiring committee.

Several university participants expressed the need for additional policies. On the survey, one administrator suggested the university encourage partnerships by providing "an incentive for individuals who make extraordinary efforts to engage with the community (i.e. community service awards programming)." Faculty members shared that certain departments were supportive of community engagement, offering course release time for collaborative projects and funding graduate assistantships to support partnerships in which faculty were involved. However, these individuals further stated the university had "a long way to go for compensating faculty in terms of points towards tenure and promotion" and that credit given for activities such as service-learning was "very, very small in comparison to the actual extra effort that it takes to do service-learning." To be an effective and engaged institution, the internal boundary spanners noted the incentive to be proactive in becoming engaged with the community must be an institutional initiative coming directly from the Provost. An external boundary spanner also expressed the need

for community engagement to be an institutional priority set at the top level of university administration, suggesting the university President should say, "I want my vice presidents out there and I want you to report to me on a monthly basis of what your community outreach has been." In this way, the entire university and the larger community would sense a commitment toward collaboration and partnership.

Accessibility

University Z had long functioned in a decentralized organizational structure with regard to community engagement activities. Each community-university partnership had its own contact person, which worked well for those in the community who had been in the area for several years. The Office of Student Activities also served as a bridge to the community, coordinating student engagement through a central office and an established organizational structure for community service by students across campus. Student Activities personnel also collaborated with the local chamber of commerce to develop a relational database to connect students wanting to volunteer with opportunities in the community. Certain boundary spanners in the community, such as the chamber director, also provided connections to access university resources because they knew who to contact at University Z. New community stakeholders often established relationships with the university through these highly connected individuals who could provide direction. However, as several participants observed, the university had experienced an unusually high number of retirements at the time this research was conducted, so it had become more difficult for even long-time members of the community to know where to go to make connections with university personnel and programs.

Some benefits were derived by University Z and the region from this decentralized structure, because individual programs had grown and developed in unique ways through the work of motivated and passionate individuals taking the initiative to solve regional needs. However, participants noted possible benefits of a more centralized organizational structure. One suggested that "periodic meetings on campus by all parties to let people know on a campus-wide basis what outreach is going on" would improve the overall experience for both internal and external stakeholders. Others noted that raising awareness in this way would avoid some overlap in services and provide opportunities to collaborate on projects across disciplines. Another suggested a central office, preferably within academic affairs at University Z, could provide an administrative role to facilitate community-university partnerships and help the community access resources within the university. This external interface would provide a better bridge between the university and the community. Internal participants also noted advertising the resources available at the university and providing information on the website would be extremely helpful in bridging the gap between the institution and the larger community. One administrator acknowledged, "What the university could do better is to make the surrounding communities more aware of what we offer." Several others stated that the presence for community outreach and engagement on the university's website would be highly beneficial. Without a clearer connection point between the university and the community, community-university partnerships were limited to individuals either with existing relationships or persistence in creating new relationships.

Cross-Case Analysis

Many similarities among University X, University Y, and University Z have been set forth as the basis for selection of each institution as a case study site for this research project. All were state colleges and universities, also referred to as regional comprehensive universities. All were identified by the Carnegie Foundation's basic classification as Master's L, referring to the size of the institution and the types of degrees granted. Most importantly, these universities shared a high degree of commitment to community engagement, as demonstrated in the foundational documents, carried out through ongoing programs and activities, and acknowledged by the Carnegie Foundation's classification as a community engaged university. Further similarities were discovered while conducting research at each site. All institutions provided a similar depth and breadth of academic programs, and each divided its academic disciplines into four distinct colleges. Although differences existed in how each institution organized the various programs among these colleges, the overall structure of the academic affairs unit at each university was surprisingly similar. Also, although University Y was smaller than University X and University Z, the student body of each shared similar characteristics in that the majority of students were full-time undergraduates of traditional college age. Furthermore, the majority of students came from within the state in which the institution was located, and many continued to reside in the state after graduation.

The differences among these universities were best understood through a comparison of the history of each institution. University X was a much newer institution, having been in existence for less than 50 years, as compared to nearly 140 years for University Y and over 110 years for University Z. Although encumbered by a certain

85

level of bureaucracy inherent in all large public institutions, several internal stakeholders at University X noted this institution was able to be more open and responsive to change than older institutions with which they had previously been associated. In addition to when these institutions were established, there were critical differences in why and how each was created. All three universities were established to address the needs of the region, but the needs of each region at inception were considerably different. University Y was established through a land grant from President Ulysses S. Grant to focus on agriculture and mining in order to educate a workforce for the major industries of the region. University Z was established as a regional normal school to focus on educating teachers with the goal of spreading education to rural America. University X was established in response to a regional demand for more accessible public higher education where only private education had been previously available. The impetus for establishing University Y and University Z came from governmental entities more than a century ago for the purpose of meeting the needs of sparsely populated regions. Conversely University X was placed in an already vibrant city in a metropolitan area in the mid-1960s in response to a request by a populace fully aware of regional needs for education and workforce development.

In addition to the similarities and differences among the institutions, a comparison of the populations and economies of each university's service region were distinguishing factors relevant to this research study. University X and University Z were located in cities which were regional hubs, providing retail outlets and other services for the surrounding communities and regions. The regional economy of the former was predominately manufacturing and industry while the latter was based in agriculture and

agribusiness. Conversely University Y was located in a small destination city less than two hours away from a large metropolitan area, and its economy was driven largely by attracting tourists to the area. In addition, the campus of University X was located in a larger city than the other two institutions. In the case of both University Y and University Z, the student body was similar in size to the number of full-time residents in the city, and each university was the largest employer in the city. Therefore, these universities had a much greater immediate impact on all aspects of community life than University X simply because students, employees, and their families made up a much higher proportion of the overall population. During the site visits at University Y and University Z, both internal and external stakeholders commented on how inseparable the universities and communities were. On the other hand, participants at University X and the city in which it was located described a more independent relationship between the university and the community.

The geographic location of each university's campus with respect to the city center was dissimilar at each site, which was also pertinent to this study. The campus of University X had been built in the country seven miles from downtown, although the city had grown toward the campus over the years. University Y was immediately adjacent to the downtown area, and University Z was within walking distance of downtown but surrounded by residential neighborhoods. In each case the proximity of the campus to downtown offered challenges and opportunities for the town and gown relationship. The distance from the city to University X was noted by a few participants, particularly in the community, as a barrier to collaborative interaction due to the commuting time involved as well as the lack of institutional presence in the downtown area. Yet many other

stakeholders noted the separation did not have an appreciable impact on the relationship. The close proximity of University Y to an historic downtown area presented opportunities for collaboration resulting in substantial investment by the community in capital improvements and new campus facilities. As noted by both internal and external stakeholders, however, the close proximity itself had not resulted in a close relationship until leadership in both the university and the community sought to take advantage of the opportunities provided. At University Z the location of campus near to downtown but in a residential area had allowed sharing of resources, including a successful transit system, although internal and external stakeholders referenced numerous issues relating to interaction between the students and the community in terms of public safety, rental property, and infrastructure.

Two additional points of comparison were the challenges facing each region in the areas of technology and poverty. Both of these issues were significant to the findings of this research study, because each hampered the economic stability of a region and also had an impact on the social and cultural fabric of the region. With regard to technology, each region was dealing with the lack of infrastructure available to support rapidly increasing technology needs. A difficulty in providing broadband connectivity in each region not only hindered the ability to attract new businesses into the area but also impacted educational opportunities available to area residents. With regard to poverty, each region dealt with its own form of poverty and the related problems of at-risk youth and underserved populations. The metropolitan area where University X was located faced primarily urban poverty issues, while University Y and University Z dealt with different types of rural poverty. Internal and external stakeholders at each location

88

expressed concerns regarding how the university could help address the issue of poverty and reach out to these constituencies. Addressing both of these challenges provided opportunities for community engagement by the universities to further influence the social and cultural development of the region.

Commitment to Community Engagement

All of these institutional and regional factors, together with individuals in key positions guiding the process, resulted in a unique approach to community engagement at each university. For example, University X was established in direct response to the region's expressed need for public higher education, and community leaders had been strong advocates for the institution ever since. University leaders, in turn, had been responsive to and engaged with the community. Those in leadership positions throughout its history saw the need to consistently create and sustain multi-faceted outreach and engagement programs. One boundary spanner participating in this study had retired as a key administrator after more than 30 years in a leadership role for the university's community engagement effort. He served with one president for most of that time, and they shared a vision to fully integrate community engagement by faculty as well as to encourage community stakeholders to access the resources available at the university. Under their long tenure, the Division of Outreach and Engagement and its programs grew to serve an integral role at University X and with the community. He shared that:

> Over the years as the concepts of outreach and engagement evolved in our education world, I'd like to think that my leadership role helped to implement a fairly broad-ranging array of outreach programs, engagement programs with the community through a fairly extensive organizational structure through what is now Outreach and Engagement.

89

In comparison University Y began to develop a coordinated approach to community engagement only within four to five years preceding this research study. Both internal and external stakeholders interviewed indicated that, although the community and university had always been interconnected due to proximity and shared history, the relationship had not been consistently collaborative or reciprocal. Interviews revealed several community-university partnerships had developed over the years resulting from the work of individual faculty and staff members. However, all participants acknowledged that the president who served from 2005 to 2011 was not only committed to community engagement but also highly knowledgeable about trends and opportunities in higher education, such as Campus Compact and the Carnegie Foundation designation. During his tenure, various steps were taken and opportunities pursued to increase community engagement activities. Two specific examples were an innovative community engagement program at the business school funded by a large private gift and a community-university partnership developed to address the technology needs of the region. The adoption of the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan formalized institutional commitment to community engagement, and an Office of Regional Engagement was created to serve as a central point of contact for the community.

In contrast, although the approach of University Z had not evolved into a coordinated effort across campus, there were many outstanding examples of community-university partnerships as well as several ongoing activities and programs to address issues relating to the town and gown relationship. Community engagement seemed to rely solely on relationships developed on an individual basis, and this decentralized approach seemed to fit comfortably within the institutional and regional culture from the

perspectives of many boundary spanners interviewed. One key administrator expressed a commonly shared perspective at University Z and in the region that being engaged with the larger community was simply the right thing to do:

> Because I think that it improves the greater good for the students and for the community as a whole. … Is education a public or a private good? Well, it's both. Of course the students privately benefit from being education but the greater society benefits from having a more educated society. And so you have to find that balance and, in that balance, is where you have community engagement. Universities should be open organizations to where all can come and get some type of benefit and understanding.

As a result of this cultural mindset of community engagement and the positive reputation of several community-university partnerships, the interaction between University Z and the region was strong, even though it did not mirror the type of approach at University X or University Y. Institutional history, regional demographics, cultural differences, and characteristics of individuals in key positions resulted in a variety of commonalities and contrasts in support of each of the findings of this research study.

Reciprocal Influence

Through community engagement, each university influenced the social and cultural development of the region. A boundary spanner at University Y expressed a common belief among participants at all the case study sites that community engagement was central to the mission and purpose of a regional comprehensive university:

> Because I believe the university has a direct responsibility to the community because it has resources both with students, faculty and money, that it has a direct responsibility to the community in which it lives and is housed. I absolutely believe that … if we do not do that, we are using the resources of the community and not giving back. And I believe that happens a lot, where our students go out and ask for a lot of donations and that can very much create bad harmony with the community if there is not reciprocity.

91

The specific outcomes of community engagement at each case study site differed as a result of regional characteristics and needs as well as resources available at the institution to meet those needs. With manufacturing, warehousing, distribution, and health care critical to the economic prosperity of the region where University X was located, most of the community engagement activities were focused on preparation of a workforce in these industries and providing services needed to support these types of businesses. The importance of culture, arts, and music in the area surrounding University Y encouraged many community-university partnerships focused on these regional characteristics. On the other hand, collaborative projects between University Z and the region focused more on agriculture, agribusiness, and other concerns of rural communities in the area.

In addition, the reciprocal influence of the community on university development at each location was apparent. One community participant in the city where University Z was located expressed this close reciprocal relationship as follows:

> I think the most important thing for the university to understand is, they ask the community to support them in a big way, whether it's your support through the arts or athletics. Without the community support, they would not exist. And I think it's extremely important for the university to keep that in the forefront of whatever they do. … It's extremely important for them, every single day, to keep the community connected, because we're the ones that are here 24/7, 365 days out of the year.

The evolution of degree programs, course curricula, projects, and facilities at all of the universities involved in this study had been strongly influenced by responding to the needs of the region. Development of degree programs and courses focusing on regional needs was most strongly in evidence at University X as the university had been highly responsive to regional business and industry in the science, engineering, business, and education. University X and University Z had been equally successful in creation of

programs that provided services such as applied research, surveying, assessment, and strategic planning. The services provided by University Y were also important in meeting the needs of its region, particularly in the area of cultural preservation and addressing the health care needs of its rural environment.

Development of facilities was also somewhat different at each case study site. University X had intentionally designed many of its buildings to support the education of students to meet the needs of the area and to provide opportunities for collaborative partnerships with regional business and industry. The facilities developed at University Y in conjunction with the region were primarily through partnerships with communities to grow the student population and allow more access to education throughout the region. University Z partnered with the region on facility planning in more functional areas of transportation and meeting space, providing reciprocal benefits to both the university and the larger community. Nevertheless, at each case study site, the impact of regional needs was apparent in institutional development and expansion.

Relationship Based and Student Centered

The most successful community engagement activities were based on relationships among individuals. One university administrator acknowledged the importance of personal engagement by individual boundary spanners when, in response to the survey question regarding ideas to enhance the community engagement efforts at one university, she wrote, "Our greatest success has come with investment in people – sometimes located in partner organizations. Never underestimate the power of just being there." A faculty member pointed out on his survey:

A long term perspective is essential to successful community
engagement. These projects are relationship based and there is always
some apprehension when a university faculty member approaches a group
about conducting a project – they question whether it is service
collaboration, or research. Taking the time to develop a relationship and
common goals for the collaboration is essential.

Both external and internal stakeholders at each site echoed the importance of a trusting

relationship as the basis for success in community-university partnerships, especially

where the relationship formed first out of shared interests and mutual respect. Many

boundary spanners described the beginning of a community engagement project as a

previous relationship between a professor and student, interaction through church or local

service club, or involvement with their children's activities. Where these relationships did

not previously exist, participants suggested that being aware of networking opportunities

that are taking place and being engaged in these organizations and at these functions

could provide the beginning of a meaningful collaboration. All participants at these case

study sites believed the best collaborations developed organically and naturally as a result

of these connections in the community and region.

The other key factor in successful community engagement activities was the focus

on student learning. This was explicitly stated by all internal stakeholders at each

university and was also described by external stakeholders at each site. Traditional

methods to encourage student involvement in the community were community service

projects, service-learning opportunities, and internships, and the shared goal of student

learning was clearly important in these types of activities. The increased effort at each

institution to provide more coordination and support for these types of programs

demonstrated the understanding of community engagement as an important source for

student learning opportunities. Community-university partnerships offered innovative opportunities for engaged scholarship when student learning was the guiding force in these relationships. Partnerships to provide public health care at University X and University Y, for example, offered opportunities for students to learn through clinical experiences. Partnerships supporting the arts and culture at University Y and University Z offered many student learning opportunities that also benefited the nonprofit organizations and the communities as a whole. The activities of partnerships with business and industry at each of the case study sites were centered on student learning as the ultimate goal. Boundary spanners understood student learning was the primary goal in all university activities, and community engagement was no exception. Students received top quality learning experiences through both traditional community engagement and collaborative partnerships, where both internal and external boundary spanners were dedicated to student learning.

Underserved Populations

Community engagement activities and programs at each university were designed to meet the needs of underserved populations in the region while providing learning opportunities for university students. The community health partnership in which University X was involved and the rural health outreach programs at University Y addressed the unique needs of these regions by providing medical services to underserved populations. Partnerships with regional organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity at University X and University Y as well as the community gardening project at University Z, had a direct and immediate impact on the quality of life among the underserved populations in the region. Unique outreach efforts, such as involvement with the coalition

to increase broadband connectivity by University Y and the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs located at University Z, were dedicated to economic development in ways that would build human capacity in the region and improve opportunities among low-income populations. Both internal and external boundary spanners at each case study site shared experiences with community service and service-learning projects involving university students with at-risk youth in the region. Other types of community engagement, including partnerships in science education at University X, the cultural outreach programs at University Y, and youth programs in the visual and performing arts at University Z, had an impact on at-risk youth by educating these young people as well as exposing them to the environment of a higher education institution.

More community engagement was needed to build mutually beneficial relationships between the universities and underserved populations in the regions, thereby serving the public good, offering valuable learning opportunities for students, and exposing at-risk youth from minority and low-income populations with alternatives for the future. Boundary spanners at each case study site suggested engaging in more collaborative partnerships directed toward these underserved populations would positively influence social and cultural development of the region. The high level of K-12 students on the free and reduced lunch program at the regional schools indicated a need to reach out to these low-income populations to improve access to and affordability of education. The perception of University X in its region was more positive in this regard, because this university had continued to focus on its mission of providing public education to the region throughout its history. On the other hand, University Y and University Z were not perceived by all external stakeholders as being focused on

reaching out to regional populations, and recommendations were made to increase

enrollment from the region. However, all the participating universities were perceived as

needing to increase awareness and accessibility to education for youth and adults as well

as to improve opportunities available to university graduates so knowledge and talent

would stay in the area. It is incumbent upon higher education institutions to not only

provide access to education for all constituencies but also engage with the region in ways

that will increase opportunities for future employment of graduates.

Personnel Policies

University policies and procedures, particularly in hiring, promotion, tenure, and

resource allocation, were needed to support and encourage involvement of administrators,

faculty, and professional staff in community engagement activities. All boundary

spanners, particularly the internal stakeholders most familiar with university policies,

acknowledged work needed to be done in this regard, although each university was

making strides in various ways. University X had focused on improving policies relating

to hiring new administrators, faculty, and professional staff by including a requirement

for community engagement in position descriptions and contracts, which was found to be

helpful in both encouraging and ensuring continuity of community-university

partnerships. University Y was refining its support structures and policies relating to

service-learning and internship opportunities to encourage the use of these methods of

community engagement across all disciplines. University Z had included community

engagement in personnel evaluation process for administrative staff and developed a

recognition structure for faculty engaged in service to the community. However, a lack of

consistency in community engagement across academic disciplines was noted at each

university, partly due to differences in leadership, but also caused by lack of policies and procedures to adequately define and support community engagement activities.

Promotion and tenure policies were the most commonly identified as needing improvement at each of the universities. Administrators and faculty acknowledged that service was not recognized in the same way in all departments, not only due to different perspectives on engagement but also because of different interpretations regarding the definition of service across campus. Promotion and tenure policies recognizing faculty for service on par with teaching and scholarship were needed in order to strengthen community engagement efforts across campus. Other policies needing to be addressed related to resource allocation supporting community service activities, both in terms of allocation of time as well as distribution of financial resources. As to the former, faculty members suggested course release would be helpful to faculty wishing to engage in community-university partnerships or to incorporate service-learning opportunities in their courses. As for the latter, financial resources made available through budget allocations for community-university partnerships, graduate assistantships, or other engagement activities would not only provide needed resources but also demonstrate institutional commitment for community engagement. Finally, another type of resource allocation was to encourage collaborative efforts toward seeking external funding opportunities, such as private gifts and grants, in support of community-university partnerships.

Accessibility

Organizational structure and external interface should provide an easily accessible bridge between the university and the community to encourage and promote community

engagement. Institutional history, regional demographics, cultural differences, and characteristics of individuals in key positions resulted in different approaches by each university. Centralization of community engagement at University X was a part of the organizational structure from the time the institution became an independent public university in the mid-1980s. When the Office of Regional Engagement was established at University Y, a faculty member was chosen to be the first Executive Director of Regional Engagement to serve as a central point of contact for the community. One key administrator expressed the importance of this new position:

> I think a point of contact, a very clear point of contact is part of what would help with that process. That's why identifying a professional staff member who can be part of that I think will assist in that. [She] has that as one element of many things that she does, and she does of course engage with the community a great deal.

In contrast to this centralized method, University Z continued a decentralized approach to community engagement. Although there were many outstanding examples of community-university partnerships as well as several ongoing activities and programs to address issues relating to the town and gown relationship, most of the internal and external stakeholders interviewed acknowledged an absence of a coordinated effort to provide support to internal stakeholders and accessibility to external stakeholders. Interestingly, however, this decentralized approach seemed to fit comfortably within the institutional and regional culture for many of the boundary spanners interviewed.

In addition, an external interface at University X for Community and Outreach on the website was developed under their leadership and continued to evolve, providing community access to university resources and facilitating many collaborative partnerships. As part of this increased commitment to community engagement,

University Y also improved its interface between the university and community via the website. This interface was continuing to be developed at the time of this research. As a result of this cultural mindset of community engagement and the positive reputation of several community-university partnerships at University Z, the interaction between the institution and the region was strong, even though there was no central point of contact or external interface for the community to access resources and establish partnerships. At each case study site, participants expressed the need to be more proactive in communication between the institution and the larger community and to establish connections for the mutual benefit of the university and the region.

Summary

Each of these case studies and the cross case analysis demonstrated the similarities and differences of community engagement by regional comprehensive universities as these higher education institutions sought to address societal needs and influence the regions through the fulfillment of the three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. Through the conceptual lens of the boundary spanning theory, the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders revealed that, although institutional history, regional demographics, cultural differences, community needs, and the individuals involved resulted in varying approaches by these three universities, each demonstrated a high level of commitment to community engagement and, as a result, were influential on the social and cultural development of the region. However, additional opportunities were available to these universities to enhance their community engagement efforts and further impact regional development. Chapter 5 discusses the findings offered by this multi-site case study to offer suggestions for other higher

education institutions as well as recommendations for additional research to enhance the body of knowledge in the area of community engagement by state colleges and universities.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This multi-site case study demonstrated the movement in higher education toward increased community engagement continues the strong tradition of meeting public needs and influencing society through the fulfillment of its three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. Each case study site, described through the perceptions of boundary spanners both in the university and in the region, offered insight into the many ways regional comprehensive universities have created and sustained collaborative relationships with the larger community to influence the social and cultural development of the regions.

Conclusions

Five major findings emerged from this multi-site case study regarding the influence of community engagement by regional comprehensive universities on the cultural and social development of the region and how more can be done to encourage community-university partnerships.

Finding No. 1: Through community engagement, the university influenced the social and cultural development of the region and the community influenced university development in unique ways depending on regional characteristics and needs. *[Reciprocal Influence]*

Finding No. 2: The most successful community engagement activities were based on relationships among individuals and were focused on student learning. *[Relationship Based and Student Centered]*

Finding No. 3: Further community engagement addressing the needs of underserved populations was recommended in order to influence social and cultural development of the region. *[Underserved Populations]*

Finding No. 4: University policies and procedures, particularly in hiring, promotion, tenure, and resource allocation, were needed to support and encourage involvement of administrators, faculty, and professional staff in community engagement activities. *[Personnel Policies]*

Finding No. 5: Organizational structure and external interface should provide an easily accessible bridge between the university and the community to encourage and promote community engagement. *[Accessibility]*

Three specific research questions were used to guide this study and were largely satisfied by the five findings set forth above.

What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within state colleges and universities and in the communities in the region, regarding the influence of community engagement on the region? (Findings 1 and 2)

What community engagement opportunities do stakeholders believe state colleges and universities can become involved in to further the cultural and social development of the region? (Findings 2 and 3)

What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by state colleges and universities? (Findings 4 and 5)

A better understanding of the three institutions studied and a cross-case analysis showing the differences and similarities based on the unique nature of each university will be beneficial to any regional comprehensive university seeking to integrate community engagement. For example, the perspectives gathered through this research study provided important insight to the researcher on the influence and opportunities of the community engagement effort at Southeast as well as what policies were needed to promote and sustain community engagement by Southeast.

Analysis of Southeast's current programs and activities in comparison with these case study sites revealed that Southeast was heavily engaged with the larger community and influential on the social and cultural development of the region. However, Southeast did not demonstrate many of the foundational indicators apparent at these case study sites. Community engagement was not explicitly referenced in Southeast's mission statement or included in Southeast's strategic plan. However, there were a number of successful collaborative community-university partnerships, and programs and activities in a variety of disciplines were excellent examples of community engagement. Academic programs including, for example, historic preservation, environmental analysis, agriculture, and speech pathology provided services to the community while offering experiential learning opportunities for Southeast students. Existing facilities for the performing arts, civic programs, entrepreneurial and small business ventures, and diagnosis of autism, among others, were collaborative partnerships providing a variety of services and activities for the region. Also, regional campuses located in four smaller communities as well as mobile facilities for the regional history education and rural health care provided educational, social, and cultural opportunities throughout the region.

Because Southeast and its region shared certain features with each of the sites, each case study was instructive for identifying ways to expand and enhance future community engagement activities at Southeast. For example, because the city in which Southeast was located was similar to that of University X, the interaction between the city and the university was similar and many of the programs in science and technology could be replicated at Southeast. However, the region Southeast served was predominately rural, similar to University Z, so programs like the [state] Institute for Rural Affairs could be effective if implemented at Southeast. University X and University Y both had very successful entrepreneurship programs which differed from each other and from Southeast in unique ways. Each of these programs could be instructive to Southeast and adapted to further develop the programming at Southeast to enhance interaction with the larger community. In terms of teacher education, both University Z and Southeast began as normal schools and have had a long tradition in teacher education. Although this shared history can be instructive, University X and University Y were implementing highly progressive university-community partnerships in the area of teacher education which could also enhance Southeast's training programs for educators. Finally, with regard to the campus location, Southeast shared similarities with both University Y and University Z. As a result, the success University Y has found with shared campus facilities and the methods of addressing common infrastructure issues at University Z were similar to the experiences at Southeast.

Although these individual activities and programs can be instructive to Southeast and other regional comprehensive universities, the keys to success seemed to be in discovering the unique balance of integrating community engagement into the

105

institutional structure and determining what policies and procedures were needed to successfully implement community engagement across the university. Comparison with these case study sites offered several options for centralization and integration that could be beneficial to community engagement efforts at Southeast. Each of the case study sites integrated the concept of community engagement into its foundational documents, including the mission statement and strategic plan. This seemed to be a critical factor at community engaged higher education institutions and should be considered by Southeast. The research also showed recognition of community engagement activities in the personnel policies and the reward structure of the institution was another crucial supporting factor undergoing continual improvement at each institution and should be taken into consideration at Southeast. Finally, both organizational structure and community interface were variable depending on institutional culture and commitment. Southeast had a decentralized structure for community engagement as well as outreach efforts to the community. However, a careful analysis should be done to determine if this should continue or if changes should be made to move toward a more centralized structure and external interface to enhance community engagement.

Beyond application to individual institutions, the results of this research study offered a more complete understanding of broader theories relating to community engagement. First of all, the relationship between a community engaged institution and the surrounding communities was reciprocal, in that the university positively influenced the cultural and social development of the region and, at the same time, the university benefited through unique learning experiences for students and research opportunities for faculty to advance knowledge in their chosen disciplines. Secondly, the two key factors

in truly successful partnerships were activities based on interpersonal relationships and programs focused on student learning. Therefore, higher education institutions interested in increasing community engagement should encourage the creation and development of interpersonal relationships between university personnel and community members but always with student learning at the heart of the partnership. Thirdly, greater effort should be made by higher education institutions to reach out to underserved populations and new constituencies, which can result in positive solutions to critical challenges facing the region. Fourth, leadership at state colleges and universities should be encouraged to seek out and reward administrators, faculty, and professional staff who engage with the community through personnel policies and resource allocation. Finally, it is incumbent upon higher education to offer greater accessibility to university resources for business, government, and nonprofit leaders as well as organizations and individuals in the region. However, the details of how community engagement is integrated into the organizational structure and what type of interface is extended to the larger community varies depending on both the institutional culture as well as the commitment of university leadership to community engagement.

<div align="center">Recommendations</div>

Further research should be conducted at each of the universities for a more in-depth analysis of how community engagement varies across academic disciplines and university programs. Greater time should be allowed to take advantage of the snowballing technique and reach out to more administrators, faculty, and professional staff. Boundary spanners within each university should be identified to provide a more complete picture of community engagement across the entire university. Interviews

conducted during this study and the researcher's own experience suggested certain academic disciplines, such as business, education, and health care, tend to be more engaged with the region, while other disciplines, including liberal arts and the sciences tend to not focus on the external community. Interviews or focus groups with more internal stakeholders as well as additional research in other universities across various disciplines might provide more empirical data on this subject.

In addition, greater time should be allowed to take advantage of the snowballing technique and reach out to more individuals referred by the participants. More boundary spanners in the community and region should be interviewed to provide perspectives from a greater cross-section of organizations, geographic areas, and demographic sectors. A wider variety of perspectives from external stakeholders is needed for a better understanding of the impact each university is having on the larger community. Again, due to the time limitation, the researcher was only able to visit with more prominent community leaders in close proximity to the university campus. However, more discussions with social service, arts, culture, and educational organizations would be helpful to understanding the needs of their constituencies. More boundary spanners in the service region outside of the immediate community would provide a perspective on the reach of the universities engagement efforts. Also discussions with people of various status, including individuals in the underserved populations rather than individuals in leadership roles, would offer a greater understanding of whether the university is helping to meet critical needs and, if not, how could it help to meet those needs.

Several specific areas of research were brought forward during this research study which were outside the scope of this study but merit additional research. More extensive

research should be done regarding the influence of community engagement on student learning, not only through service-learning and community service but through opportunities provided by community-university partnerships. Another area of research which offers the potential of increasing the scope and impact of community engagement is to study the possibilities for increasing the return on investment of certain activities and programs. Certainly community engagement activities are necessary for the university to invest in and provide as a service to the region, but other programs can be created to not only cover costs but to provide a return on investment. Further research may identify ways to make certain types of community engagement activities offer new and unique funding sources for the university. Furthermore, while the results of this study focused on the internal policies and procedures, further research into external funding sources, such as state appropriations, could be useful in determining ways for states to provide incentives for community engagement activities which would benefit public universities as well as regional development.

Summary

Higher education has traditionally sought to meet public needs and influence society through the fulfillment of a three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. Community engagement by regional comprehensive universities continues this long-standing tradition and influences the social and cultural development of surrounding communities in many positive ways. Through the conceptual lens of the boundary spanning theory, this research study has shown the influence of and opportunities offered by community-university partnerships as perceived by both internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles. The findings indicate that, not only does being a

109

community engaged university positively influence regional cultural and social development, it also allows the institution to benefit through reciprocal relationships and to offer unique opportunities for engaged scholarship and student learning. Although community engagement has been shown to positively influence the social and cultural development of the surrounding region, greater effort to reach out to underserved populations could address challenges facing the region, thereby further influencing regional development. Furthermore, boundary spanners recommend changes to policies and procedures to promote community engagement by state colleges and universities in order to build bridges to span the boundaries between universities and communities. Although the details may vary from institution to institution, greater community engagement strengthens the social and cultural fabric of the region and, at the same time, accomplishes the university's mission of teaching, research, and service.

REFERENCES

Alves, H., Mainardes, E.W., & Raposo, M. (2010). A relationship approach to higher education institution stakeholder management. *Tertiary Education and Management, 16*(3), 159-181.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (n.d.). Join AASCU. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from http://www.aascu.org/members/join-aascu/

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2006). *Making place matter: Tools and insights for universities called to regional stewardship.* Retrieved May 3, 2011, from http://www.aascu.org/pdf/06_mpmtools.pdf

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities.* New York: AASCU.

Anyon, Y., & Fernandez, M.A. (2007, November/December). Realizing the potential of community-university partnerships. *Change,* 40-45.

Arbo, P., & Benneworth, P. (2007). *Understanding the regional contribution of higher education institutions: A literature review.* Paris: OECD/IMHE. Retrieved November 25, 2011, from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/7/37006775.pdf

Beere, C.A., Votruba, J.C., & Wells, G.W. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: A practical guide for institutionalizing public engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloomberg, J.D., & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A roadmap from beginning to end.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourner, T. (2010). A compatible partnership? Student-community engagement and traditional university education. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 3,* 139-154.

Boyle, M., Ross, L., & Stephens, J.C. (2011). Who has a stake? How stakeholder processes influence partnership sustainability. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 4,* 100-118.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2004). Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis: Advancing civic engagement through service-learning. In M.

111

Langseth & W.M. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy: An academic administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning* (pp. 125-145). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Brukardt, M.J., Holland, B., Percy, S.L., & Zimpher, N.L. (2006). The path ahead: What's next for community engagement. In S.L. Percy, N.L. Zimpher, & M.J. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university: Institutionalizing community-university engagement* (pp. 242-257). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Brukardt, M.J., Percy, S.L., & Zimpher, N.L. (2006). Moving forward along new lines. In S.L. Percy, N.L. Zimpher, & M.J. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university: Institutionalizing community-university engagement* (pp. 3-22). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: Process and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 29*, 73-86.

Campus Compact (2002). *Benchmarks for campus/community partnerships.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (n.d.). Classification Description. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (n.d.). Classification Description: Community Engagement Elective Classification. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php

Creighton, S. (2006). *Community partner indicators of engagement: An action research study on campus-community partnership* (Doctoral dissertation, Antioch University). Retrieved October 15, 2011, from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Creighton%20Sean%20J.pdf?antioch1158867184

Creighton, S., Sweeney, R.J., & Cauley, K. (2009). Consortium, university, and program impact on regional economy and community. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 1*(2), 1-11.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

112

Doyle, L. (2010). The role of universities in the 'cultural health' of their regions: Universities' and regions' understandings of cultural engagement. *European Journal of Education, 45*(3), 466-480.

Drabenstott, J. (2008). Universities, innovation and regional development: A view from the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 20*(2), 43-55.

Driscoll, A. (2008, January/February). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change,* 38-41. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/elibrary/Driscoll.pdf

Fisher, R., Fabricant, M., & Simmons, L. (2004). Understanding contemporary university-community connections: Context, practice, and challenges. In T. M. Soska & A.K. Johnson Butterfield (Eds.), *University-community partnerships: Universities in civic engagement* (pp. 13-34). Binghamton, NY: Hayworth Social Work Practice Press.

Forrant, R., & Silka, L. (1999). Thinking and doing – doing and thinking: The University of Massachusetts Lowell and the community development process. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*(5), 814-826.

Gelmon, S.B., Holland, B.A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Goddard, J. (1997). Managing the university/regional interface. *Higher Education Management, 9*(3), 7-28.

Goddard, J., & Puukka, J. (2008). The engagement of higher education institutions in regional development: An overview of opportunities and challenges. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 20*(2), 11-41.

Hironimus-Wendt, R.J., & Lovell-Troy, L. (1999). Grounding service learning in social theory. *Teaching Sociology, 27,* 360-372.

Jones, D.P. (2005). *Shaping state policy to encourage stewardship of place.* Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Retrieved October 8, 2012, from http://www.nchems.org/pubs/docs/Shaping%20State%20Policy.pdf

Lindenfeld, L. (2009). Working outside the box: Advertising campaigns, downtown revitalization, and community engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 1*(2), 1-10.

McLean, J., & Behringer, B. (2008). Establishing and evaluating equitable partnerships. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 1*(1), 66-71.

113

Meekins, M., & O'Meara, K. (2011, Winter). Ranking contributions to place. *AASCU Public Purpose,* 6-9. Retrieved May 3, 2011, from http://www.aascu.org/media/public_purpose/2010/10winter_ranking.pdf

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D.M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milewicz, C., Mujumdar, S., & Khayum, M. (2012). *A qualitative examination of university 'engagement' through the lens of business executives.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern Indiana.

Mintzberg, H. (2005). The power game and the players. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Jang, Y. S., *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 334 - 341). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Munck, R. (2010). Civic engagement and global citizenship in a university context: Core business or desirable add-on? *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 31-41.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L.R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D.E., Jr. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 36*, 83-96.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2007). *Higher education and regions: Globally competitive, locally engaged.* Paris: OECD Publications.

Scheibel, J., Bowley, E.M., & Jones, S. (2005). *The promise of partnerships: Tapping into the college as a community asset.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Simpson, T.L. (2010). Regional stewardship and the redefinition of higher education. *Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society, 41*, 106-115.

Stephenson, J., Jr. (2011). Conceiving land grant university community engagement as adaptive leadership. *Higher Education, 61*, 95-108.

Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E. (2009). Unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning. In R. Stoecker & E. Tryon (Eds.), *The unheard voices: Community voices and service learning* (pp. 1-18)*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

Thelin, J.R. (2004) *A history of American higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tryon, E., Hilgendorf, A., & Scott, I. (2009). The heart of partnership: Communication and relationships. In R. Stoecker & E. Tryon (Eds.), *The unheard voices: Community voices and service learning* (pp. 96-115). Philadelphia: Temple University.

United States Census 2010 (n.d.). 2010 Census Interactive Population Search. Retrieved September 3, 2012 from http://2010.census.gov/2010census/popmap/

Vogel, A.L., & Seifer, S.D. (2011). Impacts of sustained institutional participation in service-learning: Perspectives from faculty, staff and administrators. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 4,* 186-202.

Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 5-16.

Wattman, J.E., Schaffer, M.A., Juarez, M.J., Rogstad, L.L, Bredow, T., & Traylor, S.E. (2009). Community partner perceptions about community engagement experiences for nursing students. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 1*(1), 1-11.

Webber, R., & Jones, K. (2011). Re-positioning as a response to government higher education policy development – an Australian case study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 33*, 17-26.

Weerts, D.J., & Sandmann, L.R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 81*(6), 702-727.

Wergin, J.F. (2006). Elements of effective community engagement. In S.L. Percy, N.L. Zimpher, & M.J. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university: Institutionalizing community-university engagement* (pp. 23-42). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Appendix A
Background Survey (Community Partners)

We would like to better understand the influence of community engagement activities on our community partners. Please assist us by taking 15-20 minutes to complete this survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope.

I. First we would like some information about you.

A) How long have you been working with the university in a collaborative partnership?

☐ Less than one year ☐ 1-3 years ☐ More than 3 years

B) What is your organizational status?

☐ Public OR ☐ Private
☐ For-profit OR ☐ Non-profit

C) What are the primary community needs addressed by your organization?

☐ Education ☐ Health ☐ Safety
☐ Youth Services ☐ Environment ☐ Public Services

II. The next set of questions relates to your most recent experiences with the university. In answer to each question, mark any that apply.

D) How did your interactions with the university influence your capacity to fulfill the mission of your organization?

☐ New insights about organizational operation ☐ Changes in organizational direction
☐ Increase in number of clients served ☐ Increase in services offered
☐ Enhanced offerings of services ☐ No influence
☐ Increased leverage of financial/other resources ☐ New connections/networks other
☐ Other (please specify)_____ community members/groups

E) What are some of the challenges you encountered?

☐ Demands upon staff time ☐ Mismatch between university/organization goals
☐ Project time period insufficient ☐ Little contact/interaction with staff/faculty
☐ Students not well prepared ☐ Students did not perform as expected
☐ Other (please specify)_____

F) What were some of the measurable effects of your work with the university?

☐ Increased value of services ☐ New products, services, materials generated
☐ Increased organizational services ☐ Increased funding opportunities
☐ Completion of projects ☐ Identification of new staff
☐ Access to university technology ☐ Identification of additional volunteers
    and expertise ☐ Other (please specify)_____

G) In what ways do you believe that you were able to influence the university as a result of your connection through this collaborative partnership?

☐ Influence on course content ☐ Influence on university awareness of community
☐ Influence on university policies ☐ Influence on student learning experiences
☐ Other (please specify)_____

H) As a result of your connection to this university, how has your awareness of the university changed?

- □ I learned more about university programs and services
- □ I know whom to call upon for information and assistance
- □ I am more involved with activities on campus
- □ I have an increased knowledge of university resources
- □ I have more interactions with faculty, staff, and administrators
- □ I have taken or plan to take classes at the university
- □ Other (please specify) _____

I) Do you plan to continue working with the university in this or another activity?

- □ Yes   □ No

III. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your connection to the university in the following areas.

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
J) Overall communication with students, faculty, and staff.					
K) Level and quality of interaction with students, faculty, and staff.					
L) Quality of student work, if applicable.					
M) Feedback and input into planning and execution.					
N) Scope and timing of activity.					
O) Level of trust with faculty, staff, and students.					
P) Level of mutual respect and sharing of ideas.					

Q) How did you handle the logistics of your collaborative partnership with the university? (Please mark the one most accurate response.)

- □ I made the arrangements
- □ University representatives made the arrangements
- □ We handled the arrangements collaboratively

R) What was the best aspect of this experience for you?

S) What aspects of the experience would you change?

T) Please add any additional comments.

Thank you for your time, your consideration and your comments.
Please return this by _____ in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Appendix B
Background Survey (University Participants)

We would like to better understand the influence of community engagement activities on our faculty and staff. Please assist us by taking 15-20 minutes to complete this survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope.

I. First we would like some information about you.

A) How long have you been employed in higher education? _____ [number of years]

B) Approximately how many times have you been engaged directly with the community in your professional capacity at the university?

      □ Once   □ 2-5 times   □ 6-10 times   □ More than 10

C) Are there other faculty or professional staff in your department/program who are similarly engaged directly with the community?

      □ Yes   □ No

D) With what type of community engagement activities have you been involved? *(Check all that apply)*

      □ Teaching a service learning course
      □ Conducting community based research
      □ Engaging in collaborative partnerships with other organizations
      □ Other (please specify) _____

E) In those activities where students take part in community engagement activities, what academic level of students are involved? *(Check all that apply)*

      □ Freshmen □ Sophomore   □ Junior   □ Senior   □ Graduate

II. The next set of questions relates to the concept of community engagement and your most recent experiences with community engagement activities.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
F) I had previous community volunteer experience prior to my first community engagement activity.					
G) I believe that the community engagement activities I have been involved in on behalf of the university have benefited the community.					
H) I will continue to volunteer or participate in the community after my current project is complete.					
I) My community engagement work has deepened my understanding of community needs.					
J) Activities through which students become engaged in the community have a positive effect on the students' educational experience.					
K) I believe that, as a university administrator/faculty/staff member, I have a responsibility to serve my community.					

III. Next we would like to know the influence of your service on your personal and professional development. *(Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.)*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
L) Performing work in the community has helped me to focus on specific areas in my area of professional expertise.					
M) Participating with the community has resulted in a change in my approach to my areas of professional responsibility.					
N) Participating with the community has helped me enhance my leadership skills.					
O) Participating with the community has resulted in advancement at the university.					
P) I found that my relationship with students, faculty, and staff was enhanced because of the community work we perform.					

IV. Finally we would like you to comment on future community engagement.

Q) Having participated in community engagement activities, what concerns do you have about community engagement activities? Please mark any of the following that are concerns of yours.

□ Time constraints   □ Communication with community representatives
□ Coordination of projects   □ Reduced time for classroom instruction
□ Supervision of students   □ Unpredictable nature of community work
□ Assessment of student learning   □ Costs
□ Impact on future advancement   □ Other (please specify)_____

R) Reflecting back on your community engagement experiences, what ideas do you have to improve the overall experience for faculty, staff, students, and community partners?

S) Reflecting back on your community engagement experiences, what ideas do you have to encourage and enhance community engagement by the university?

T) Please add any additional comments.

Thank you for your time, your consideration and your comments.
Please return this by _____ in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Appendix C
Interview Protocol

The purpose of this interview is to gather your perceptions on community engagement activities between the university and the community in which you have been involved. Your feedback, positive and negative, will help us (i) analyze the influence of community engagement by the university on the cultural and social development of the region, (ii) explore opportunities for future collaborative partnerships between the university and the community, and (iii) determine ways community engagement may be encouraged and sustained. The interview is recorded for the purpose of capturing detail, but all comments are confidential and never attributed to individual participants.

Let's begin with some basic information:

1. Please provide a brief overview, from your perspective, of the most recent community engagement partnership between the university and community in which you have participated.

2. Why did you get involved in this partnership? How did it come about?

Let's talk about the outcomes of the project:

3. What were your expectations? Did you have specific goals? Were your expectations met?

4. What would you say was the key to the outcome? What went particularly well, and why?

5. What obstacles/barriers did you encounter and how did you deal with them?

We're interested in the influence of the project on the community and the region:

6. Describe the nature of interaction between the university and the community partner(s).

7. What were the benefits to the community partner(s) (e.g., influence on staff, insights about operations, capacity to serve clients)? What were the benefits to the community/region as a whole (e.g., social, cultural, economic)?

8. Knowing what you know now, what would you do differently that would make the partnership better?

9. What should the various collaborators in the project do differently next time?

Finally, we want to encourage you to reflect again on your experience of working in partnership between the university and community:

10. Describe any new information you have learned about your community and/or the university during this community engagement activity. What is the most important thing you'd like the university to hear from you? What is the most important thing you'd like the community to hear from you?

11. What collaborative relationships between the university and the community, if any, do you anticipate you will develop/maintain in the future?

12. What ways do you believe would be effective in encouraging future collaborative efforts between the university and the community? How might policies at the university or within your community/region encourage such activities?

Appendix D
Focus Group Questioning Route

The purpose of this focus group is to gather your perceptions on community engagement activities between the university and the community in which you have been involved. Your feedback, positive and negative, will help us (i) analyze the influence of community engagement by the university on the cultural and social development of the region, (ii) explore opportunities for future collaborative partnerships between the university and the community, and (iii) and determine ways community engagement may be encouraged and sustained.

The discussion is recorded for the purpose of capturing detail, but all comments are confidential and never attributed to individual participants. As participants, you can make the focus group successful by being both candid and as specific as possible when discussing different issues. As facilitator, I will offer no opinions. My role is to guide you through a conversation based on a set of relevant questions. Please be sure to speak one at a time so the tape will be clear. During this discussion, please be brief and specific. Where there is disagreement, you should talk about your different perspective, but we will not spend time pressing for consensus or reaching agreement. The purpose is not to reach a common view, but to learn about all possible views.

1. Please introduce yourself and briefly describe the nature of your work in collaborative partnerships between the university and the community.

2. What went well? What factors contributed to successful outcomes? What was the most important factor in achieving success?

3. How would you describe the burdens (if any) of the partnership?

4. What obstacles or barriers affected the partnership?

5. How would you describe the benefits of the partnership from your perspective, particularly to the community partner(s) (e.g., influence on staff, insights about operations, capacity to serve clients) and the community/region as a whole (e.g., social, cultural, economic)?

6. Knowing what you know now, what would you do differently that would make the partnership better?

7. What might the other collaborators in the project do differently next time?

8. As a result of this community engagement activity, what do you know about the university and/or community now that you didn't know before?

9. How would you describe this experience to a colleague at the university or in another community organization? What would you emphasize?

10. Reflect again on your experience of working in this collaborative partnership between the university and the community. What's the most important thing you'd like the university to hear from you? What's the most important thing the community should hear from you?

11. What ways do you believe would be effective in encouraging future collaborative efforts between the university and the community? How might policies at the university or within your community/region encourage such activities?

12. Is there anything we haven't discussed you feel is important to share at this time?

Appendix E
Informed Consent Letter (Higher Education Institution)

Researcher's Name: Trudy G. Lee
Researcher's Contact Information: 1738 Westridge Drive
                                               Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
                                               tglee@semo.edu
                                               (573) 576-8479

Project Title:
Community Engagement: Spanning Boundaries between University and Community

YOUR INSTITUTION IS BEING ASKED TO VOLUNTEER TO PARTICIPATE AS A CASE STUDY SITE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Introduction
Your institution is being asked to participate in a research study. This research is being conducted to help analyze perceptions of stakeholders both within state colleges and universities and in the surrounding communities who are involved with community engagement activities, and how these activities impact the cultural and social development of the region. When you are invited to participate in research, you have the right to be informed about the study procedures so you can decide whether you want to consent to participation. This form may contain words or concepts you do not know. Please ask the researcher to explain any information you do not understand.

Voluntary Participation
Your institution has the right to know what you will be asked to do, so you can decide whether or not to be in the study. Participation is voluntary. Your institution does not have to be in the study if it does not want to. Your institution may refuse to be in the study and nothing will happen. If your institution does not want to continue to be in the study, you may stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which it is otherwise entitled.

Purpose of the Research
The purpose of this research is to explore community engagement by state colleges and universities, as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. For this research study, community engagement is defined as "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity." The primary purpose is to explore perceptions of internal and external stakeholders as to the influence of community engagement by state colleges and universities, what community engagement opportunities could further the cultural and social development of the region, and what public policies and institutional policies are needed to encourage community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Procedures and Duration
This study will take approximately three to four days at your institution to complete. There are three phases to this project. First, the researcher will review data, records, and documents pertinent to the research study. Second, each individual participant will be asked to complete a brief background survey, which will take 15-20 minutes. Third, each individual participant will be asked to participate in either an individual interview or a focus group discussion at a convenient location, which will take 60 minutes. Interview and focus group sessions will be audio recorded for the purpose of capturing detail, but all comments are confidential and never attributed to individual participants.

Participant Selection
There will be a total of 60-75 individuals asked to participate in the study in three different case study sites, which will include administrators, faculty, and professional staff at the university and nonprofit, business, and government leaders in the community.

Risks
Participation in this study will result in no more than minimal risk to your institution and is not expected to cause your institution any risks greater than those encountered in every day operation. Similarly, participation in this study will result in no more than minimal risk to any individual participants.

Benefits
Participation will benefit your institution and the surrounding communities and region. These benefits will include an increase in the knowledge of the influence of community engagement on regional cultural and social development and best practices relating to community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Reimbursements
Your institution will not be provided any financial incentive for participation as a case study site.

Confidentiality
Your institutional identity and participation in this study will remain confidential. No information you provide will be shared by the researcher and nothing will be attributed to your institution by name. The knowledge resulting from this research will be shared with your institution before it is made widely available to the public. Your institution will also receive a complete summary of the results specific to your institution.

Changes in the Study
Informed consent is an ongoing process that requires communication between the researcher and participants. The participating institutions should comprehend what they are being asked to do so they can make an informed decision about whether they will participate in the research study. Your institution will be informed of any new information discovered during the course of this study that might influence its or willingness to be in this study.

Who to Contact

Please contact Trudy G. Lee, researcher, or Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts, advisor, if you have any questions about this study.

Trudy G. Lee	Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts
1738 Westridge Drive	Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701	One University Plaza
Cell Phone: (573) 576-8479	Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
Email: tglee@semo.edu	Email: raroberts@semo.edu

In addition, this research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Missouri-Columbia, with which the researcher affiliated. The task of this committee is to make sure research participants are protected from harm. You may contact the IRB if you have any questions about your institution's concerns, complaints or comments as a research case study site. You can contact the IRB directly by telephone or email to voice any concerns, questions, input or complaints about the research study.

University of Missouri-Columbia
Institutional Review Board   Phone: (573) 882-9585
483 McReynolds Hall   Email: umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu
Columbia, MO 65211   Website:http://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm

Copy of Informed Consent

A copy of this Informed Consent form will be given to your institution before participation in the research.

Respectfully yours,

Trudy G. Lee

Certificate of Consent

I have read this consent form and my questions have been answered. I am duly authorized to enter into this agreement on behalf of the institution. My signature below means the institution I represent wants to be in the study. I know the institution can remove itself from the study at any time without any problems.

CONSENTING INSTITUTION

_____   _____

Authorized Signature   Date

Appendix F
Informed Consent Letter (Individual)

Researcher's Name: Trudy G. Lee
Researcher's Contact Information: 1738 Westridge Drive
                                                Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
                                                tglee@semo.edu
                                                (573) 576-8479

Project Title:
Community Engagement: Spanning Boundaries between University and Community

YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO VOLUNTEER TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH
STUDY

Introduction
You are being asked to participate in a research study. This research is being conducted
to help analyze perceptions of stakeholders, both within state colleges and universities
and in the surrounding communities who are involved with community engagement
activities, and how these activities impact the cultural and social development of the
region. When you are invited to participate in research, you have the right to be informed
about the study procedures so you can decide whether you want to consent to
participation. This form may contain words or concepts you do not know. Please ask the
researcher to explain any information you do not understand.

Voluntary Participation
You have the right to know what you will be asked to do, so you can decide whether or
not to be in the study. Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to be in the study
if you do not want to. You may refuse to be in the study and nothing will happen. If you
do not want to continue to be in the study, you may stop at any time without penalty or
loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Purpose of the Research
The purpose of this research is to explore community engagement by state colleges and
universities, as perceived by internal and external stakeholders. For this research study,
community engagement is defined as "collaboration between institutions of higher
education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the
mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership
and reciprocity." The primary purpose is to explore perceptions of internal and external
stakeholders as to the influence of community engagement by state colleges and
universities, what community engagement opportunities could further the cultural and
social development of the region, and what public policies and institutional policies are
needed to encourage community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Procedures and Duration
This study will take approximately one and one-half hours of your time. There are two phases to your participation in this project. First, you will be asked to complete the enclosed background survey on your own, which will take 15-20 minutes. Secondly, you will be asked to participate in either an individual interview or a focus group discussion at a convenient location, which will take 60 minutes. Interview and focus group sessions will be audio recorded for the purpose of capturing detail, but all comments are confidential and never attributed to individual participants.

Participant Selection
There will be a total of 60-75 individuals asked to participate in the study in three different case study sites, which will include administrators, faculty, and professional staff at the university and community members including nonprofit, business, and government leaders.

Risks
Your participation in this study will result in no more than minimal risk to your institution and is not expected to cause you any risks greater than those encountered in everyday life. If you feel uncomfortable answering any of the questions asked in the group discussions, you may choose to respond to such questions in a follow up interview.

Benefits
Your participation will not benefit you personally but will benefit the educational institution with which you are affiliated and the community and region in which you live. These benefits will include an increase in the knowledge of the influence of community engagement on regional cultural and social development and best practices relating to community engagement by state colleges and universities.

Reimbursements
You will not be provided any financial incentive for participation in this study. The minimal costs of travel or telephone communication will be incurred by the participant.

Confidentiality
Your identity and participation in this study will remain confidential. No information you provide will be shared by the researcher and nothing will be attributed to you by name. The information provided in the group discussions will be shared among the individuals present, but all participants will be asked to hold in confidence all information shared during the group discussions. The knowledge resulting from this research will be shared with you and the educational institution you are affiliated with before it is made widely available to the public. Each individual participant and participating institution will receive a summary of the results specific to their institution.

Changes in the Study
Informed consent is an ongoing process that requires communication between the researcher and participants. The participant should comprehend what they are being

asked to do so they can make an informed decision about whether they will participate in the research study. You will be informed of any new information discovered during the course of this study that might influence your health, welfare, or willingness to be in this study.

Who to Contact
Please contact Trudy G. Lee, researcher, or Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts, advisor, if you have any questions about this study.

Trudy G. Lee	Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts
1738 Westridge Drive	Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701	One University Plaza
Cell Phone: (573) 576-8479	Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
Email: tglee@semo.edu	Email: raroberts@semo.edu

In addition, this research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Missouri-Columbia, with which the researcher affiliated. The task of this committee is to make sure research participants are protected from harm. You may contact the IRB if you have any questions about your rights, concerns, complaints or comments as a research participant. You can contact the IRB directly by telephone or email to voice any concerns, questions, input or complaints about the research study.

University of Missouri-Columbia
Institutional Review Board   Phone: (573) 882-9585
483 McReynolds Hall   Email: umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu
Columbia, MO 65211   Website:http://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm

Copy of Informed Consent
A copy of this Informed Consent form will be given to you before you participate in the research.

Respectfully yours,

Trudy G. Lee

Certificate of Consent
I have read this consent form and my questions have been answered. My signature below means I do want to be in the study. I know I can remove myself from the study at any time without any problems.

_____   _____

Participant's Signature   Date

Appendix G
University and Community Resources

University X and its region

www.usi.edu

www.evansvillechamber.com

www.southwestindiana.org

2010-2015 Strategic Plan

At a Glance 2011-2012

2008 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective
Classification for Community Engagement

A Blueprint for Success: A Master Plan for Economic Redevelopment, dated July
14, 2010, by Garner Economics, LLC

Interviews conducted at the site on March 21, 22, and 23, 2012

Interview conducted by telephone on June 29, 2012

Background surveys submitted by 15 participants

University Y and its region

www.northgeorgia.edu

thechamber.dahlonega.org

www.cummingforsythchamber.org

Strategic Plan, 2008-2013

Come Home to North Georgia. Published 2008 by Booksmith Group

2010 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective
Classification for Community Engagement

Interviews conducted at the site on March 28, 29, and 30, 2012

Background surveys submitted by 18 participants

University Z and its region

www.wiu.edu

www.iira.org/

www.macombareachamber.com

Strategic Plan. 2008-2018

Fast Facts (Fall 2011)

2010 Documentation Reporting Form for the Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement

Interviews conducted at the site on April 10 and 11, 2012

Interviews conducted by telephone between June 15 and July 24, 2012

Background surveys submitted by 16 participants

VITA

Trudy Lee was born Trudy Friesenborg in a small town in central Nebraska and was raised in Oklahoma and Ohio. She received her Bachelor of Science in Legal Administration from University of Evansville in 1983. Upon moving to Albuquerque, New Mexico, she worked as a paralegal for over twelve years and attained her designation as Certified Legal Assistant (CLA). In 1995 Trudy entered the charitable gift planning profession, serving as Planned Giving Manager for the University of New Mexico for six years. Since moving to Cape Girardeau, Missouri, Trudy has served as Director of Planned Giving for Southeast Missouri State University for eleven years.

During her career in charitable gift planning, Trudy has worked with hundreds of donors to create philanthropic gifts in support of higher education and has been involved in all aspects of development and fundraising. She has also completed study at the National Planned Giving Institute, achieved her designation as Certified Specialist in Planned Giving (CSPG), and received her Master's in Public Administration (MPA) from Southeast Missouri State University. Trudy has served as an officer and board member in various professional and community organizations and has been a presenter at conferences on the topic of charitable gift planning.

In addition to her professional activities, Trudy enjoys singing as a soloist, in small ensembles, and in choral groups. She has been married to Terry Lee for 26 years, and they have two sons. Erik is married with two children, and Bryndon is a student at Southeast Missouri State University. She and her family live in Southeast Missouri.