Supporting Inclusive Excellence through Community-Engaged Scholarship and Teaching
Derek Miller, Terry Dolson, Sylvia Gale, Amy Howard
Bonner Center for Civic Engagement
University of Richmond
November 5, 2018

Introduction

The University of Richmond, per its Strategic Plan, seeks to create a "thriving and inclusive University community" where all students, faculty, and staff are able to reach "their full potential." To achieve this aim, the plan proposes that the university "recruit, hire, and retain more diverse faculty and staff" while creating an institutional space that supports "full participation" for all community members. The continued support of community-engaged teaching and scholarship can be one part of the university's "architecture of inclusion" (Sturm 2006) that attracts and retains talented and diverse faculty. In this paper, we explore the links between the support for community-engaged teaching and scholarship and inclusive excellence. This paper adopts the framework of the strategic plan – "Forging our Future, Building from Strength" – by highlighting work already being done and pointing to opportunities still to be realized.

Brief Overview

Women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in community-based scholarship and/or teaching.
-"Faculty of color are 75% more likely than white faculty to pursue a position in the academy because they draw a connection between the professoriate and the ability to affect change in society." (Antonio 2002:593-594)
The support of community-based teaching and scholarship can help address major challenges to the retention of faculty of color, including:
-Easing the overburden of service
-Creating a sense of belonging and well-being
-Valuing community-engaged scholarship
-Creating clear tenure and promotion expectations for community-engaged teaching and scholarship

Demographics of Community-Engaged Teaching and Scholarship

Research has shown that women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in community-based scholarship and/or teaching (Antonio 2002; Antonio, Astin and Cress 2000; Baez 2000; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, and Han 2009; Knowles and Harleston 1997; Stanley 2006; Vogelgesang, Denson, and Jayakumar 2010).[1] In part, this relationship is explained by the

---

[1] There was a wave of literature in the 2000s that explored the demography of community-engaged teaching and scholarship. In the ensuing years, these numbers have continued to be cited but there has been little updating.

motivations of female faculty and faculty of color. Studies drawing upon large-scale surveys, interviews, and ethnographies have shown that women and faculty of color are more likely to enter academia to create social change.

-"women faculty were substantially more likely than men (53% of all women versus 45% of men) to report that they use their scholarship to address community needs. Women were also slightly more likely than men (44% versus 41%) to say they have collaborated with the local community in research/teaching." (Vogelgesang 2010 et al.:448)

-faculty of color are more likely than white faculty to believe that preparing "students for responsible citizenship" (66.4% to 59.9%) and instilling "in students a commitment to community service" (44.1% to 31.9%) are essential goals in undergraduate education (Antonio 2002:593)

-"Faculty of color are 75% more likely than white faculty to pursue a position in the academy because they draw a connection between the professoriate and the ability to affect change in society." (Antonio 2002:593-594)

-"Faculty of color are more likely to take *personal* responsibility for applying their talents to the cause of social change." (Antonio 2002:593-594)

- "Consistent with that interpretation are the results that show faculty of color to be a third more likely to advise student groups involved in community service and 29% more likely to pledge the professional and personal goal of providing services to the community." (Antonio 2002:593-594)

-Robert A. Ibarra's 2001 study finds that Latino faculty tend to also engage in scholarly activities that specifically seek social change and/or community improvement.

-Women within STEM fields are more likely to do both interdisciplinary and problem-based research (Farrell 2002; Rhoten and Pfirman 2007).

Such statistics are likely under-representative as researchers relying upon interviews have found older African-American faculty often dissuade junior faculty of color from community-engaged teaching and scholarship because this work is seen as risky in terms of job security and advancement. These older faculty worry that encouraging young faculty to pursue community-engaged research programs within an institution that does not value such research the same as traditional research is setting these young faculty up for failure (Ellison and Eatman 2008:18-19). Faculty of color (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, and Han 2009), including Latino faculty (Ibarra 2001), often feel a tension between their desire to do engaged work with communities and the

---

However, we suspect that this will change soon as we are not the only institution exploring the links between inclusive excellence and community engagement.

traditional research and teaching agendas required for tenure leading some to give up or delay publicly engaged teaching and research projects.

While these data points just skim the surface, women and faculty of color are frequently drawn to academia to do community-engaged scholarship and teaching. This link has been seen as an opportunity for changing the demographics of the disciplines. For example, it has been suggested for STEM fields that more institutional support for problem-based community-engaged work can be an important strategy for bringing more diversity to these fields (Harkavy et al. 2015). This research suggests that demonstrating a strong institutional support for community engagement will make a university an attractive destination for talented faculty of color and female faculty.

From Recruitment to Retention

Over the past two decades, universities have employed numerous effective tactics for hiring faculty of color. However, despite the increased rate of hiring, there has not been proportionate growth in faculty of color within the promoted ranks of higher education (Johnson et al. 2018; Thompson 2008). This suggests that there are issues surrounding the retention of faculty of color. There is no single solution to increase the retention figures and support for community engagement is not a panacea. However, it is argued here that the support of community engagement can be one component in creating a more inclusive campus environment. This section looks at various issues surrounding the retention of faculty of color and highlights specific strategies related to community engagement that the University can use to recruit, support, and retain excellent faculty across disciplines.

Service Overburden

Faculty of color frequently report that they feel a significant service burden that ultimately is harmful in terms of the tenure process, particularly as teaching and research are commonly weighted heavier than service. There are three main causes for this overburden of service.

1) There are few faculty of color on campus, while most university committees seek to have diversity, resulting in a few faculty of color filling roles across various committees. Many faculty of color are reluctant to turn down a seat on a committee in fear that diverse viewpoints will not be represented (Baez 2000; Fryberg and Martínez 2014; Mayo and Chhuon 2014).
2) Faculty of color engage in a significant amount of "informal" service work. Minority students are more likely to reach out and connect with minority faculty creating an informal advising relationship. Faculty of color, despite the significant time commitment such informal relationships present, feel an obligation to support these students (Aguirre 2000; Parsons 2018).
3) Many faculty of color feel obligated to help surrounding communities; however, such community-engaged work is typically valued as "service" for tenure and

promotion considerations (Baez 2000; Mayo and Chhuon 2014; Parsons 2018: Stanley 2006).

University policies that value community-engaged work, while also supporting community-engaged teaching and scholarship, can help ease this burden. Benjamin Baez (2000) researched strategies used by faculty of color to address the challenges of too much service work. One key strategy is for scholars to link their service to the community with their teaching and research, creating productive and creative synergies. Offering support for community-engaged work, while providing guidance for ways to integrate such community engagement with teaching and scholarship, can help create such synergies. Support structures that address time-consuming challenges like arranging study trips, identifying/providing funding sources, amongst other activities free up time for faculty. Additionally, supports like the UR Downtown fellowship provide faculty a supportive environment that is well-placed to establish and strengthen links with community partners.

Sense of belonging and well-being

Social isolation is a key problem for the retention of all employees (Jayakumar et al. 2009). Faculty of color and female faculty experience alienation, marginalization, and isolation at greater rates than their white male colleagues (Brown-Glaude 2009; Diggs et al. 2009; Gregory 2001). Indeed, one of the reasons faculty of color are likely to engage with communities is to find social connections that they cannot find within the university (Baez 2000).

Creating programs that link faculty around shared passions and interests can be one way of generating connections among faculty across disciplines and developing a sense of community. Data collected from a recent survey of CCE Faculty Fellows speaks to this. Thirteen out of sixteen respondents listed community as one of the main benefits of the program. It is likely that the Office-of-the-Provost-supported Faculty Learning Communities, the CCE's exploratories that bring faculty in the region together to explore key topics like mass incarceration, and the collaborative faculty and community working groups of the CCE, called collaboratories, can be important venues for creating relationships across the university and the city. Moreover, community-engaged teaching and scholarship is communal by nature and when done well is built on the foundation of trusting relationships between faculty and community experts. Such relationships extend the networks of the faculty, while bringing non-academic expertise and diverse forms of knowledge into conversations with faculty and students, helping to generate high quality and innovative scholarship and teaching (Warren et al. 2018).

Valuing community-engaged scholarship

Faculty of color often feel that their research is not valued by other members of their department and by the university community (Jayakumar et al. 2009). For many faculty of color, their research is either engaged and/or focused on race and gender. Frequently, their work is both. For many disciplines, both public/applied work and race and gender research appear most frequently in specialty journals as opposed to the top-tier journals in the field (Gregory

2001; Settles 2018). Moreover, scholarship that holds an activist bent is often seen as subjective as opposed to objective and therefore its scholarly value questioned (Garrison-Wade et al. 2011; Morris 2015). This leads to a marginalization of this research within both the tenure structure and in the currency of respect within individual departments (O'Meara 2016; Stanley 2006; Turner et al. 2008). The ultimate effect is a feeling of tokenism, where diverse faculty are valued simply because they are diverse as opposed to being valued for the significance that their diverse perspectives bring to the university or larger disciplinary community (Settles et al. 2018). Therefore, finding ways to value community-engaged work institutionally and throughout the phases of a career will positively affect faculty of color and other marginalized faculty.

Faculty work can be valued through both support and recognition, and this can take many forms. We recognize that bringing community-engaged faculty together can in itself be rewarding. Over half of the recent CCE Faculty Fellows surveyed discussed how the opportunity to interact with other community-engaged faculty reinvigorated their passion for teaching and scholarship. With this kind of support, however, comes the need to recognize community engagement at various levels within the university, making this work visible and publicly affirming the institution's support of said work. For example, this year, as in recent years, UR honored several distinguished educators with a strong track record of community-engaged teaching and scholarship. Institutional support for community-engaged teaching is also signaled at a different register by the Provost's annual request for information about community-based learning courses. The newly established annual Engage for Change Awards, administered by the CCE, is one way to make community-engaged scholarship and teaching more visible both on and off campus. Such initiatives are key tools for the university to demonstrate that it values diverse faculty for what they bring to the university and not just simply because they are diverse.

Clarity of Tenure and Promotion

It is important to note that while revising tenure and promotion guidelines is not the only path for institutions to value and reward community-engaged teaching and scholarship, it remains significant for many faculty. Tenure-track faculty hope that the tenure process is as clear as possible. Yet, in terms of community-engaged scholarship and teaching, there continues to be confusion about whether this work should be understood as teaching, research, or service. A survey of draft departmental profiles from UR's School of Arts and Sciences in spring 2018 showed that while nearly every department mentioned some level of community engagement, there was very little consistency in whether or how such engagement should be valued within the structures of tenure and promotion. The language concerning community engagement added to this complexity with the departments using 67 different keywords and phrases to describe community-engaged scholarly activity. While there will be and should be variation between disciplines, such variety is challenging for new faculty trying to chart their nascent careers at the university. Given those ambiguities, the choice to go a non-traditional route, like community-engaged research, is risky. Scholars who enter academia with a community-engaged perspective often find themselves either sacrificing their passions to adopt a more

traditional research program that they may not find as fulfilling (Diggs et al. 2009; Urrieta and Méndez Benavídez 2007), attempting to carry on both a traditional research program and a community-engaged program (see service overburden section above), or attempting to navigate this ambiguity making an already stressful process more stressful.

To improve clarity, some colleges and universities are revising their tenure and promotion guidelines to explicitly include definitions of and criteria for community-engaged teaching and scholarship.[2] These guidelines do not replace traditional scholarship paths but rather create clear cut expectations and requirements for diverse forms of scholarship (see Boyer 1990.) To aid in our campus's conversation and self-assessment about the ways in which UR recognizes and values community-engaged faculty work, the CCE is developing a list of key terms referring to community-engaged scholarship and teaching.

Opportunities for Valuing Community-Engaged Scholarship and Teaching

Institutional support and recognition of community-engaged scholarship and teaching can happen at multiple key junctures of a faculty member's journey, including:

- Recruitment:
    - Job Ads*: How can ads explicitly acknowledge the value the University places on community-engaged scholarship and teaching?*
    - Candidate experience: *Are candidates across UR exposed to the Center for Civic Engagement while on campus? To UR Downtown? To potential colleagues whose teaching and/or scholarship integrates community engagement?*
- Acclimation:
    - Orientation: *How are new faculty invited to understand themselves as part of the greater Richmond community? Are they introduced to the supports UR offers for community-engaged teaching and scholarship (e.g., CCE faculty programming and grants, UR Downtown faculty fellowships, etc.)?*
    - Mentoring: *What mentors are available to help new scholars desiring to do community-engaged work navigate the challenges of tenure and promotion? Should we train mentors, create a peer mentoring structure, and/or identify off-campus resources?*
- Rewards:
    - Tenure and Promotion: *Does our community have clear guidelines for defining, evaluating, and rewarding community-engaged teaching and scholarship? How are department chairs and members of the tenure and promotion committee oriented to these guidelines in an ongoing and systematic way? What supports*

---

[2] Examples include Syracuse University, VCU, and UNC-Greensboro amongst others. Associations representing academic disciplines have also begun to have these conversations. For example, the American History Association has created a set of recommendations for tenure and promotion of publicly engaged historians. Moreover, organizations such as Imagining America and Campus Compact have gathered resources to support institutions seeking to integrate community-engaged teaching and scholarship into their tenure and promotion structures.

are offered to faculty undergoing the review process regarding incorporating evidence of community-engaged teaching and scholarship into their dossiers?
- o Awards: *Are community-engaged teaching and scholarship activities among the criteria for potential selection for campus-wide awards (as is the case for the distinguished educator award)? Does the campus elevate and recognize the contributions of community-engaged teachers and scholars, specifically? Are administrative leaders aware of and seizing opportunities to nominate community-engaged UR faculty for national awards?*
- o Professional Development: *Are seed grants available for community-engaged research? Are community-based and community-engaged teachers across the tenure and non-tenure stream supported with resources needed for their courses? Are community-engaged teachers given course development support (could include: learning cohorts, stipends, course release)? Are community-engaged teachers and scholars able to apply for funding to attend and present at conferences outside their disciplines?*

Conclusion

Susan Sturm's metaphor of an "architecture of inclusion" is powerful because it brings to the forefront both the importance of institutional structure in creating an inclusive environment and that a program of inclusive excellence will necessarily be multi-variate like a complex architectural work (Sturm 2006). We recognize that the discussion within this paper only addresses part of the university's architecture and moreover that not all female faculty or faculty of color do community-engaged research. What is suggested here is just one pillar in the larger structure. Community-engaged scholarship has traditionally been less valued within American higher education (Saltmarsh et al. 2009). This hierarchy of values disproportionally affects female faculty and faculty of color who are more likely to do community-engaged teaching and scholarship. For many, they entered into academia with a goal of creating social change through community-engaged work. Creating more support structures and value for community-engaged work within the University will allow these faculty the opportunity to reach their full potential.

This is an opportunity for the University to forge a more inclusive future by building from its strengths. The University has many support structures for scholars who focus on community engagement in place already. Moreover, there is a significant energy and interest in community-engaged scholarship and teaching across the university. Since the CCE started its Community-Based Learning Faculty Fellows program in 2008, 90 different faculty representing all five schools have participated. Within these schools, faculty have come from 19 of the 22 departments in Arts & Sciences and 5 of the 6 concentrations within the Robins School of Business. Just in the past academic year, 87 faculty offered 168 community-based learning courses across all five schools. The visibility of this kind of infrastructure, together with new initiatives suggested by the questions above, linked to junctures along the tenure pathway, should both help recruit more diverse faculty and contribute to an environment that retains

this talent. The continued support of community-engaged teaching and scholarship can be a key component for creating a "thriving and inclusive University community."

References Cited

Aguirre, Adalberto, Jr. 2000. *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace: Recruitment, Retention, and Academic Culture.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 27, Number 6.

Antonio, Anthony Lising. 2002. "Faculty of Color Reconsidered: Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship." *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(5):582-602.

Antonio, Anthony Lising, Helen S. Astin, and Christine M. Cress. 2000. "Community Service in Higher Education: A Look at the Nation's Faculty." *The Review of Higher Education* 23(4):373-397.

Baez, Benjamin. 2000. "Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe." *Higher Education* 39:363-391.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown-Glaude, Winnifred, ed. 2009. *Doing Diversity in Higher Education: Faculty Leaders Share Challenges and Strategies.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Diggs, Gregoray A., Dorothy F. Garrison-Wade, Diane Estrada, and Rene Galindo. 2009. "Smiling Faces and Colored Spaces: The Experiences of Faculty of Color Pursuing Tenure in the Academy." *Urban Review* 41:312-333.

Eatman, Timothy K., Gaelle Ivory, John Saltmarsh, Michael Middleton, Amanda Wittman, and Corey Dolgon. 2018. "Co-Constructing Knowledge Spheres in the Academy: Developing Frameworks and Tools for Advancing Publicly Engaged Scholarship." *Urban Education* 53(4):532-561.

Ellison, Julie, and Timothy K. Eatman. 2008. *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University.*

Farrell, Elizabeth E. 2002. "Engineering a Warmer Welcome for Female Students." *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Fryberg, Stephanie, and Ernesto Javier Martinez. 2014. "Constructed Strugglers: The Impact of Diversity Narratives on Junior Faculty of Color." In *The Truly Diverse Faculty: New Dialogues in American Higher Education*, edited by Stephanie A. Fryberg and Ernesto Javier Martinez, pp. 3-24. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Garrison-Wade, Gregory A. Diggs, Diane Estrada, and Rene Galindo. 2011. "Lift Every Voice and Sing: Faculty of Color Face the Challenges of the Tenure Track." *Urban Review* 44:90-112.

Gregory, Sheila T. 2001. "Black Faculty Women in the Academy: History, Status, and Future." *The Journal of Negro Education* 70(3):124-138.

Harkavy, Ira, Nancy Cantor, and Myra Burnett. 2015. *Realizing STEM Equity and Diversity through Higher Education-Community Engagement.*

Ibarra, Robert A. 2001. *Beyond Affirmative Action: Reframing the Context of Higher Education*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Jayakumar, Uma M., Tyrone C. Howard, Walter R. Allen, and June C. Han. 2009. "Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80(5):538-563.

Johnson, Jennifer M., Ginny Boss, Chrystal George Mwangi, and Gina Ann Garcia. 2018. "Resisting, Rejecting, and Redefining Normative Pathways to the Professoriate: Faculty of Color in Higher Education." *The Urban Review*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-018-0459-8.

Knowles, MF, and BW Harleston. 1997. *Achieving Diversity in the Professoriate: Challenges and Opportunities.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Mayo Jr., J.B. and Vichet Chhuon. 2014. "Pathways to the Tenure Track: Reflections from Faculty of Color on Their Recruitment to a Research University." *International Journal of Educational Reform* 23(3):223-239.

Morris, Aldon D. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2016. "Legitimacy, Agency, and Inequality: Organizational Practices for Full Participation of Community-Engaged Faculty." In *Publicly Engaged Scholars: Next-Generation Engagement and the Future of Higher Education*, edited by Margaret A. Post, Elaine Ward, Nicholas V. Longo, and John Saltmarsh, pp. 96-110. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Parsons, Eileen R.C., Domonique L. Bulls, Tonjua B. Freeman, Malcolm B. Butler, and Mary M. Atwater. 2018. "General Experiences + Race + Racism = Work Lives of Black Faculty in Postsecondary Science Education." *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 13:371-394.

Rhoten, Diana, and Stephanie Pfirman. 2006. "Women in Interdisciplinary Science: Exploring Preferences and Consequences." *Research Policy* 36:56-75.

Saltmarsh, J., D.E. Giles Jr., K. O'Meara, L. Sandmann, E. Ward, and S.M. Buglione. 2009. "Community Engagement and Institutional Culture in Higher Education." In *Creating our Identities in Service-Learning and Community-Engagement*, edited by B.E. Moely, pp. 3-29. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Settles, Isis H., NiCole T. Buchanan, and Kristie Dotson. 2018. "Scrutinized but not Recognized: (In)visibility and Hypervisibility Experiences of Faculty of Color." *Journal of Vocational Behavior.*

Stanley, Christine A. 2006. "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 43(4):701-736.

Sturm, Susan. 2006. "The Architecture of Inclusion: Advancing Workplace Equity in Higher Education." *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 29(2):247-334.

Sturm, Susan, Tim Eatman, John Saltmarsh, and Adam Bush. 2011. *Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Community Engagement in Higher Education.*

Thompson, Chastity Q. 2008. "Recruitment, Retention, and Mentoring Faculty of Color: The Chronicle Continues." *New Directions for Higher Education* 2008(143):47-54.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, Juan Carlos González, and J. Luke Wood. 2008. "Faculty of Color in Academe: What 20 Years of Literature Tells Us." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(3):139-168.

Urrieta, Jr., Luis and Lina R. Méndez Benavídez. 2007. "Community Commitment and Activist Scholarship: *Chicana/o* Professors and the Practice of Consciousness." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 6(3):222-236.

Vogelgesang, Lori J., Nida Denson, and Uma M. Jayakumar. 2010. "What Determines Faculty-Engaged Scholarship?" *The Review of Higher Education* 33(4):437-472.

Warren, Mark R., José Calderón, Luke Aubry Kupscznk, Gregory Squires, and Celinia Su. 2018. "Is Collaborative, Community-Engaged Scholarship more Rigorous than Traditional Scholarship? On Advocacy, Bias, and Social Science Research." *Urban Education* 53(4):445-472.