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ABSTRACT

College and university mission statements commonly declare contributions for the public good and the development of engaged and responsible citizens as central to their institution’s work. Yet, a different narrative is often revealed when rhetoric meets reality in the promotion and tenure policies for faculty. Since Ernest Boyer’s seminal work Scholarship Reconsidered (1990) called for an expansion of the way we think about and reward scholarship in academia, a preponderance of studies have considered the degree to which community engagement and public scholarship has been integrated into higher education faculty reward policies. Such research has helped chart the progress that has been made in this area over the past twenty-five years. Many past studies have focused on land-grant and public research universities, both of which have specific mandates informing their institutional missions. Fewer studies look specifically at private or faith-based institutions. This study specifically considers how Catholic higher education is addressing the challenge of recognizing and rewarding community-engagement in its faculty policies.

The overarching research question guiding this study asks: To what extent is institutional mission operational in faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies at Catholic colleges and universities designated with the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification? The study employs a qualitative, content analysis of the mission statements and recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies of 31 Catholic colleges and universities. The institutions in this target cohort are members of the Association of Catholic Colleges & Universities (ACCU) that received the nationally recognized Carnegie Community Engagement classification in 2015. These two affiliations suggest that each institution in the cohort has a distinct Catholic identity and demonstrates a high commitment to community engagement. I first explore how these 31 Catholic institutions articulate their mission, values, and identity. Next, I evaluate their recruitment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies. Through a comparison of the findings, I determine the extent to which these Catholic institutions align their faculty reward policies with their faith-based foundations and espoused missions through a commitment to community engaged teaching and scholarship. Further, through a cross-case analysis, I reveal policy exemplars from Catholic colleges and universities that can inform institutions interested in strengthening the alignment between their Catholic mission/identity and faculty roles and rewards.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Overview and Problem Statement

The policies of higher education organizations are designed to influence not only the campus-wide culture, but also faculty who are directly responsible for animating through their teaching and professional lives the goals expressed in institutional missions. Many American colleges and universities, secular and non-secular alike, express a commitment to developing civically-minded individuals (Colby & Ehrlich, 2000; Thompson, 2014). However, tenure and promotion policies that assess, validate, and reward faculty for their professional work as teachers and scholars, have not as a whole mirrored the growing recognition of the value of engaged knowledge and practice in higher education. This situation reveals a conspicuous disconnect between campus missions pronouncing a commitment to community engagement and faculty reward structures which do not clearly support this commitment (Ellison & Eatman, 2008).

Research demonstrates that institutional reward systems failing to prioritize public engagement in teaching practice or scholarship are associated with decreased participation in these activities (Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Fairweather, 2005; Holland, 1999). Institutions desiring to fully realize the promise of community engagement through their faculty as one way of fulfilling their civic or service missions should feel compelled to examine and revise the
primary mechanisms which most influence faculty behavior—in particular, recruitment and reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) policies. This leads one to ask: Where might higher education institutions find guidance in this effort?

One place to begin is by critically examining the institutional culture and policies of higher education institutions that have attained the Community Engagement (CE) classification conferred by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Carnegie Foundation defines community engagement as “a collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015b, para. “How is ‘Community-Engagement’ Defined?”). The Foundation invites post-secondary institutions to voluntarily self-assess and document their institution-wide commitments to community engagement through a comprehensive application process. The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) acts as Carnegie’s administrative partner to manage and administer the Community Engagement Classification process. In order to earn the classification, campuses must demonstrate a wide range of foundational commitments to community engagement in areas such as mission, identity, leadership, campus-community partnership development, human resources,
funding, programming, teaching, curriculum, and awards (Driscoll, 2008). Furthermore, applicants are expected to not only document policies which reward community-engaged approaches to faculty scholarly work, but also to describe their approach to training faculty who will be evaluating RPT portfolios containing such work. The Foundation regards the review process itself as a catalyst for improvement in the area of civic engagement in higher education regardless of whether or not the institution gains the classification.

Overall, institutional support for community engagement in higher education has flourished in the past 25 years, as evidenced by increased investments in programming, funding, staffing, and professional development opportunities as well as the number of campus centers nationwide dedicated to civic engagement, community partnerships, and service-learning (Boyte, 2015; Butin & Seider, 2012; O’Grady, 2000). Indeed, service-learning and civic engagement is now spoken of as a field in its own right with its own research agenda, and has been enriched with a host of peer-reviewed academic journals; regional, national, and international conferences; and numerous scholarly publications (Bowdon, Billig, & Holland, 2008; Clayton et al., 2013; Grobman & Rosenberg, 2015). Further, the 361 U.S. institutions currently classified with the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement designation attest to a robust commitment to engagement efforts in higher education. In many cases, the process of applying for the classification has led to notable changes in
institutional culture which have stimulated campus-wide community
engagement and collaboration (Noel & Earwicker, 2014; Zuiches, 2008).

Despite these significant gains and visible representations of support for
community engagement efforts across academia, research shows that a
commensurate level of support has not found its way into promotion, tenure,
and reward systems (O’Meara, Eatman, & Peterson, 2015). This situation results
in an environment with dual—and often conflicting—messages to faculty
(Diamond, 1999). Higher education mission and vision statements commonly
declare contributions for the public good and the development of engaged and
responsible citizens as central to their work; yet a different narrative is often
revealed when rhetoric meets reality. The pervasive academic culture warns
against community engagement work in favor of other faculty activities. Subtle
and not-so-subtle messages from peers, senior faculty, and administrators
question the validity and worth of community engagement activities as scholarly
endeavors (Fairweather, 1996; McDowell, 2001; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).
Moore and Ward (2010) note that “[p]romotion and tenure is still skewed
towards traditional research at most universities” with largely self-serving goals
gearred towards advancing the disciplines (p. 51). When the place of community
engagement as part of faculty professional work is not articulated and validated
in faculty reward policies, it makes such efforts risky business for faculty,
effectively countering the public message the institution sends about the value of
its outreach efforts, its responsibilities to the larger community, and its intentions to play a vital role in addressing the most pressing social issues of our time.

Narrowing the Focus: Catholic Institutions in the United States

The research to date on engaged scholarship in promotion, tenure, and reappointment policies has been predominately generated from and focused on land-grant or large research university contexts, often for good reasons (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Franz, 2011; Jaeger, Jameson, & Clayton, 2012; Peters, Jordan, Adamek, & Alter, 2005). Land-grant universities have an historical “mandate” to serve the public good (Thelin, 2014) and public research universities frequently proclaim their responsibility to uphold the civic mission of higher education (Moore & Ward, 2010; Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Religiously-affiliated colleges and universities, however, tend to speak about their commitment to community from a faith-based perspective, especially at Catholic institutions where their mission is typically grounded in the Christian tradition, the values of a founding congregation, and the teachings of the Catholic Church (Morey & Piderit, 2006; Sanders, 2010).

Given that “virtually all political and professional leaders are products of higher education” (Ehrlich, 2000, p. xxviii) and Catholic institutions are educating a large cohort of individuals with the expectation that they will ultimately assume positions of leadership in their local and global communities (Pope John Paul II, 1990), the impact of these institutions on their graduates has
significant implications for society at large. One-sixth of all the Catholic colleges and universities in the world are in the United States (Heft, 2012), and half of all students enrolled in faith-based higher education in the U.S. are at Catholic institutions (Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, 2015). According to the U.S. Department of Education, student enrollment in these institutions has considerably increased over the past ten years from nearly 600,000 to well over 900,000 students during the 2012–2013 academic year (Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, 2015).

Catholic colleges and universities contribute to diversity in the higher education landscape and have the ability to leverage their unique identity as a competitive advantage for attracting students and faculty (Briel, 2012). Within these institutions, the liberal arts curriculum is designed to challenge students with different ways of thinking through its faculty who bring varied perspectives and methodologies to bear on contemporary and historical issues (Hatch, 2005). Wolfe (1999) contends that Catholic institutions are more relevant today than ever by virtue of their pluralism. He notes an interesting paradox between the societal expectations for secular and non-secular institutions and the actual behavior of these institutions. Where one might expect faith-based institutions and their faculties to avoid tackling social issues because of the American principle of separation of Church and State, in reality, one finds such institutions deliberately highlighting their responsibility to impact the world around them,
thereby asserting their position and value in a secular society. Conversely, where one might expect non-sectarian universities (e.g. land-grant institutions) to be heavily involved with social issues because of their founding legacy, one often finds them opting for a sort of social “detachment” in the interest of objectivity and scientific professionalism (Wolfe, 1999). The extent to which this supposition is true may be debatable in light of indications that there are a number of secular research universities leading the way in exemplary university-community engagement, public scholarship, and revised faculty reward policies and processes (Ellison & Eatman, 2008; Evans, Grace, & Roen, 2005; New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015a). However, such examples are not abundant. The pervasive academic culture of faculty roles remains to be one focused on traditional and insular notions of scholarship and practice (Checkoway, 2001; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).

While Catholic colleges and universities may share with many of their secular counterparts a parallel commitment to community engagement, their distinct missions drawing from a faith-based foundation suggest a unique motivation guiding their approach to engagement. It is a motivation worth exploring in greater depth, calling for equal attention as is given to secular institutions. Catholic colleges and universities are shaped by many of the same internal and external forces experienced by most contemporary U.S. institutions of higher education and thus face many of the same challenges and criticisms.
These include competing for funding in a world of scarce resources and rising operating costs; attracting and retaining quality students and faculty; becoming mired in the pursuit of prestige; keeping pace with developments in technology and science; responding to market, employer, and parental expectations; and staying true to their value-laden missions. Such concerns define the context in which Catholic higher education operates and the realities with which it must contend.

In this study, the competing concerns listed above serve as a backdrop to my examination of how Catholic higher education institutions holding the Carnegie Community Engagement classification address the challenge of recognizing and rewarding community-engagement in their recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. Such policies affect faculty behavior and serve as a crucial measure of the depth of an institution’s commitment to service, social justice, and the common good. Further, my study seeks to reveal the extent to which Catholic institutions align their RPT policies with their espoused missions as a consideration for how faculty are motivated and incentivized to carry out the key tenets of their institution’s mission.

**Research Questions**

Since faculty reward policies provide some of the most important extrinsic incentives for faculty achievement and behavior, this study is guided by the following overarching research question: To what extent is the social justice or
civic engagement aspects of the institutional mission operational in faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies at Catholic colleges and universities designated with the Carnegie “Community Engagement” classification?

The following sub-questions provide a systematic method for exploring this topic:

1. How do institutions of Catholic higher education characterize their mission, values, and identity in the 21st century?

2. To what extent do faculty recruitment, tenure, and promotion policies of Carnegie CE classified Catholic colleges and universities reflect their distinct institutional mission and identity through a commitment to community engaged teaching, scholarship, and service?

3. What policy exemplars from Carnegie CE Classified Catholic colleges & universities might inform institutions that are interested in strengthening the alignment between institutional mission/Catholic identity and faculty roles and rewards?

**Research Methodology**

In this study, I employed a qualitative, content analysis of the mission statements and recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies of 31 Catholic colleges and universities. Content analysis has been defined as a
research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text through a systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The work is guided by an interpretivist research paradigm. Interpretive approaches are dependent upon naturalistic methods such as interviewing, observation, and analysis of existing texts. Generally, meaning emerges from this interpretive inquiry process. The methodology is more fully described in Chapter 3.

The institutions in this target cohort are members of the Association of Catholic Colleges & Universities (ACCU) who received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015. These two affiliations suggest that each institution in the cohort not only has a distinct Catholic identity, but also demonstrates a high commitment to community engagement, making for fitting units of analysis. To see the institutional characteristics pertaining to the full list of institutions used in this study, consult Tables 7 and 8 in Chapter 3.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is an ideal source of data for studying higher education’s commitment to community engagement as it is one of the few organizations collecting both quantitative and qualitative national data across all elements of institutional commitment through its community engagement classification process. The Foundation’s comprehensive application for the Carnegie CE classification uses a research-based framework addressing a wide range of institutional structures and
practices supporting community engagement. The application includes specific questions about both institutional mission as well as faculty roles and rewards, especially those related to promotion and tenure (See Appendix A). Applicant responses to the application questions served as the primary source of data for this study.

To answer my research questions, I first explored how Catholic institutions in the study articulated their mission, values, and identity in the Carnegie application. Next, I reviewed the recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policy data supplied by the applicants. A thorough review of the individual cases allowed me to build a bank of characteristics and attributes pertaining to the policies in order to describe where and how each institution’s policy supported community engagement. This examination enabled me to evaluate the extent to which faculty recruitment and RPT policies reflected the institution’s distinct institutional mission and identity through a commitment to community engaged teaching, scholarship, and service. I then conducted a cross-case analysis of the 31 Catholic colleges and universities to identify institutions with the most robust alignment between espoused mission and policies in support of community engagement. Through this analysis, I identified several policy exemplars that clearly support the community engagement work of faculty. These findings are intended to assist institutions in
strengthening the alignment between their Catholic mission and identity and policies outlining faculty roles and rewards.

**Definitions**

Many terms are associated with the field of community-engagement in higher education and each has its own nuance in meaning. *Service-learning* is one of the most widely used and recognized, carrying 140 variations in meaning alone (Eyler & Giles, 1999). In 1990, the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) established the following definition of service-learning: “A method under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs...is integrated into the students’ academic curriculum...[and] enhance[s] what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community” (Furco, 1996, p. 9). This definition was later amended to acknowledge the need for an equitable balance between the learning benefits accrued by the service providers (students and faculty) and the benefits experienced by the service recipients (community members or organizations).

As a teaching pedagogy, however, service-learning does not address the practices faculty employ in their research lives known as *scholarship*. As with service-learning, scholarship can carry a variety of meanings which will be explored later in this paper (Boyer, 1990). Moore & Ward (2010) adopt the following definitions to establish faculty activity focused on community
engagement. These are intended to align with the traditional tripartite responsibilities of faculty known as teaching, research, and service:

*Community Engagement:* “focuses on the teaching domain and involves a commitment to working with a community in ways that benefit the community and the faculty member’s teaching.”

*Engaged (or Public) Scholarship* “encompasses the research domain whereby faculty members incorporate a community orientation into their research agenda.”

*Public service and outreach* refers to “the service domain where faculty...lend their expertise to address community-based issues” (p. 14).

Public service activity may also be referred to as professional service (Elman & Smock, 1985). Table 1 summarizes both the traditional and engagement orientations of faculty professional activity separated into the three generally recognized faculty role categories.

**Table 1:** Summary of Traditional and Engagement Orientations to Teaching, Research, and Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Orientation</th>
<th>Engagement Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Classroom-based lectures, discussions, and learning activities between faculty and students</td>
<td>Service-Learning, Community-Based Research, Civic Engagement, Community-Engaged Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>Basic research published in peer-reviewed journals and books</td>
<td>Engaged (or Public) Scholarship involving public or community entities in the development of research questions or creative projects as well as the dissemination or use of the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table demonstrates how research is often construed as distinct and separate from teaching practice and outreach efforts, when in fact, many faculty perceive natural overlaps and integration amongst these categories of professional academic work (Colbeck, 1998; Franz, 2009; Moore & Ward, 2010; Rice, 1995). Such features are noted in the New England Resource Center for Higher Education’s (NERCHE, 2015c) definition of engaged scholarship which is understood as an act of social justice rooted in democratic ideals:

The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of the faculty role in which teaching, research, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member's expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution [my emphases].

In this dissertation, I use the term “community engagement” to encompass the broad range of approaches to engagement in use today, whether they are labeled service-learning, civic engagement, community-based learning,
public scholarship, or any of the similar expressions noted above. As with NERCHE’s definition of the scholarship of engagement, community engagement refers to professional activity in the realms of teaching, research, and service. This all-inclusive term is the one favored and used by the Carnegie Foundation for the classification designation cited earlier, and thus provides consistency for the purposes of this study. Other justifications exist for choosing community engagement over the myriad choices available. For example, “service” can connote a charitable, one-way, or apolitical orientation to community engagement. This carries with it a privileged and empowered stance of the “giver” doing for others who are viewed as less privileged or disempowered, as opposed to working with those who are closest to and most directly affected by social issues. A unilateral “giving” or “fixing” approach could be interpreted as running counter to the Catholic conception of solidarity. Civic engagement, on the other hand, connotes a more defined political orientation, where work with the community is seen as an obligation of citizenship. While serving the vulnerable and actively participating in political life are both essential to nurturing human compassion and promoting a healthy democracy, a defining feature of NERCHE’s (and thus Carnegie’s) definition of community engagement is the emphasis on reciprocity and the collaborative nature of campus-community relationships.
Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) refers to the systems of advancement, recognition, and rewards for faculty on higher education campuses. The features of faculty rewards systems are communicated through institutional documents such as faculty handbooks, promotion and tenure guidelines, merit pay rules, and collective bargaining agreements on unionized campuses. Reward systems are influenced by institutional mission statements, disciplinary expectations, and regional or national accreditation standards (Diamond, 1999).

RPT documents generally outline faculty roles and responsibilities, expectations for workload assignments, protocols for performance reviews, and the criteria and timelines for advancement. Because faculty scholarship garners significant attention in RPT processes and an absence of uniform or clear definitions is one of the principal challenges for engaged scholarship gaining understanding and legitimacy in academia (Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010), a fuller discussion of scholarship and its interpretations will appear later in this study.

Significance of Study

This study sets out to address a gap in the literature examining how Catholic colleges and universities might employ RPT policies as a lever for promoting community engagement in concert with its institutional values and mission. Very few studies directly link the character of Catholic colleges and
universities with faculty reward policies for community engagement, and none do so comprehensively. In 2006, Morey & Piderit observed that many Catholic institutions had drifted from their missions. In their oft-cited study positioning Catholic higher education as a culture in crisis, the authors only briefly addressed the disconnection between faculty incentives and advancing the Catholic mission. Although one of their many policy recommendations for revitalizing Catholic culture on campuses included developing service-learning programs, none of the recommendations took into consideration how reward policies and structures might be framed to encourage such engagement practices and link them to institutional mission. Engaged faculty at Catholic colleges and universities have expressed the need for addressing the policy component of institutional support (Sinatra & Maher, 2012). Clearly, there is room to build on recent studies to assess fidelity to Catholic identity through a more thorough review of key faculty policy documents at Catholic institutions of higher education (Gambescia & Paolucci, 2011).

Secondly, this study adds to the contemporary conversation on assessment in higher education and has particular implications for those responsible for documenting institutional effectiveness related to Catholic identity. It has been argued that assessment criteria should arise from an institution’s stated mission which is designed to capture “the complex ideal that affects many dimensions of students’ learning and development” (Estanek,
James, & Norton, 2006, p. 205). Assessment should go deeper than what can be easily counted such as Mass attendance, student participation in campus ministry and service activities, or faculty and staff who identify as Catholic. Rather, assessment should focus on practices and outcomes. Thus it is important, on one hand, to identify the significant themes of Catholic higher education mission statements, and on the other, to understand how policies impact educators’ accountability to institutional goals. What this present study reveals about Catholic higher education mission statements is useful for all those engaged in assessment initiatives at Catholic colleges and universities, whether the aim is evaluation of student outcomes, institutional effectiveness, or faculty accountability.

Thirdly, the RPT process represents the most comprehensive assessment experience for faculty, carrying the highest stakes and the greatest consequences for their positions, validation, and influence within higher education. My research has practical implications for the future of engaged scholarship and teaching in higher education, which encompasses a wide range of practitioners and institutional contexts. The results of this study are useful, first and foremost, to faculty and administrators at Catholic institutions where current policies may lack clear direction, definitions, and criteria for community engagement. In this study, I was also curious to discover whether progress has been made over the past ten years in clarifying ambiguity, strengthening policy language and
expectations, and preparing faculty for engaged portfolio evaluation through training initiatives. Deficiencies were found in these three areas during an examination of reward policies in the 2006 Carnegie CE Classification cohort of applicants (Saltmarsh et al., 2009).

Lastly, this research sought to uncover potential exemplars of policies demonstrating a strong alignment between institutional mission, identity, and faculty rewards for community engagement. The exemplars presented in this dissertation can serve as a practical reference for institutions seeking to achieve greater coherence. Although such findings might appeal primarily to policy makers at Catholic colleges and universities, the results could be applicable to faith-based and secular institutions alike. Furthermore, the identification of these exemplars is a vital precursor to further research. For example, once identified, more in-depth case studies could be pursued to understand the processes institutions employed to revise their policies or to study the effect such exemplary policies have on academic culture, faculty behaviors, community outcomes, and the cultivation of mission-in-action.

**Theoretical Framework**

Faculty on higher education campuses are recognized as the primary drivers of pedagogy, deliverers of disciplinary content, and producers of new knowledge. Further, they are in a position to influence the development of student character. If, as these roles suggest, faculty constitute the core of any
given educational institution and those institutions declare a commitment of
stewardship to their local or global community, then one might expect clear
connections to be made between faculty activity and institutional aims for
community engagement. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that there
is a wide range of factors influencing a faculty member’s professional activity at
any given moment and throughout the arc of his or her career. These influences
can and do impact a faculty member’s willingness to pursue community
engagement activities, whether it be for the benefit of one’s self, one’s students,
the institution, or the community at large. I take a brief look at each of these
influences and some of the underlying theories that accompany each. Together,
they establish a theoretical framework for my study.

Mission, Culture, and Values of Higher Education Institutions

When faculty join an academic organization such as a college or
university, they enter into a culture imbued with a particular set of values and
historical traditions which are often expressed through the institution’s
statements of mission or vision. At Catholic organizations, the institutional
values are frequently promoted as springing from the Catholic educational
tradition and a founding religious order, both of which serve as guiding forces to
determine the way an institution goes about its work. Additionally, in the
United States, the democratic purposes of higher education are promoted as a
vital and necessary institutional responsibility (Boyte, 2015). Thus the mission,
culture, and values of a given college or university are expected to inspire and
direct those within the institution (Morphew & Hartley, 2006).

**Culture and Expectations of Academic Disciplines and Departments**

Faculty operate within particular subcultures which carry a set of expectations related not only to the world of academia, but also to their disciplinary fields. This generally demands the acceptance of certain methodologies, epistemologies, or scholarly products as appropriate and legitimate to a given academic context. It also involves a system of incentives and disincentives for faculty behavior as well as expectations for allegiance to the field or one’s department (Checkoway, 2001).

**Recruitment and Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies**

Closely related to the above influences are institutional, college, or departmental expectations about faculty workload, roles, achievement, and advancement which find expression in recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. The policies governing faculty rewards have changed over time towards increased emphasis on competition, scholarly productivity, professionalization, and specialization in academic work (Youn & Price, 2009). As a motivational tool, faculty policies carry with them a range of behavioral assumptions (Schneider & Ingram, 1990) which have implications for the direction of faculty activity and can often have a more profound effect than any
of the other aforementioned influencers. The behavioral assumptions attached to various policy tools will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.

**Faculty Development, Resources, and Support**

A faculty member’s ability to pursue professional community engagement activity can depend on available internal and external resources such as funding, material, or human resource support. Additional factors include the availability and quality of faculty development for community engaged teaching, learning, and scholarship; the level of familiarity with and expertise for preparing RPT portfolios for departmental or institutional review; and an understanding of the criteria and processes for assessing such work (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Franz, 2011; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

**Personal Motivations and Biases of Faculty**

Another important consideration beyond the external supports which influence faculty activity are the faculty member’s own motivations and sense of purpose; personal identity, values, interests, and inspirations; beliefs about effective pedagogy; and other intrinsic stimuli (O’Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Similarly, an administrator’s or peer reviewer’s capacity to value and evaluate professional community engagement work may be enabled or constrained by many of the same factors cited above. Additionally, mentors and decision-makers involved in RPT processes hold both conscious and unconscious beliefs.
about various forms of scholarship. These beliefs influence their judgments about what gets rewarded (O’Meara, 2002).

External Pressures

Lastly, there are many external pressures broadly affecting higher education that, in turn, affect faculty. These include marketplace expectations; institutional rankings; the pursuit of prestige; an increasingly multicultural society; questions about accessibility and affordability, and even debates about the purpose, relevance, and value of formal education (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Delbanco, 2012; Ferrall, 2011; Rothman, Kelly-Woessner, & Woessner, 2011). Individual institutions are also influenced by the practices and values prevalent at other institutions of higher education, especially peer or aspirant institutions (Bloomgarden, 2008).

Community Engagement Definitions and Beliefs

Running through the six factors outlined above—factors which influence a faculty member’s desire and willingness to pursue community engagement—are the definitions, beliefs, and understandings about community engagement held by one’s peers and the decision-makers within academia. These views impact an individual’s perception of the compatibility and legitimacy of community engagement efforts within professional academic work. Definitions and beliefs can either be shaped by the six sources of influence cited above or can help to define those spheres of influence. To date, faculty participation in community
engagement activity has been predominately enabled or constrained by the traditions within higher education that have developed over time in each area of influence (i.e. institutional, academic, and departmental culture; response to market forces; RPT policies, etc.). However, over the past thirty years, professional activity by a dedicated and expanding core of engaged faculty scholars across the disciplines has enabled (or at least vigorously encouraged) a re-orientation towards a community engagement discourse on campuses nationwide (O’Meara, Eatman, & Peterson, 2015). The Carnegie Foundation’s definition of community engagement helps to guide this conversation.

The theoretical framework discussed above and illustrated below in figure 1 provides an overview of the many factors influencing faculty pursuit of community engagement as part of their professional activity. My study primarily investigates two of the six areas of influence: 1) the mission, culture, and identity of Catholic institutions and 2) recruitment and RPT policies for community engagement.
My theoretical framework informs my conceptual framework. In the prior section, I pinpointed two of six areas that influence faculty inclinations for pursuing community engagement work (i.e. mission and RPT policy). My study is designed to investigate the degree of alignment between these two areas of influence in a cohort of Catholic colleges and universities. Another way of
thinking about this relationship is to visualize it in terms of alignment between goals, inputs, and outcomes as one might find in a logic model. See figure 2.

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework Viewed as a Logic Model

My study operates on the premise that institutional goals which are derived from the mission should inform faculty recruitment and faculty reward policies if one desires an outcome whereby the institution’s community engagement goals are fulfilled and faculty are rewarded. The above figure depicts this connection and also notes several other inputs, outputs, and outcomes necessary for this process. Specifically, my study takes a close look at the connections between the priorities associated with the mission of Catholic higher education and the inputs known as faculty recruitment and faculty
rewards policy. Thus, my literature review and study are organized to uncover the goals and priorities of Catholic higher education at large and in my cohort; to explore faculty roles and responsibilities through a traditional and community engagement orientation; and to identify best practices for faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies that enable and reward forms of community engagement in fulfillment of institutional mission. The Carnegie community engagement classification standards supports this logic model as the standards are geared towards best practices in community engagement at institutions of higher education.

**Researcher Background and Statement of Subjectivity**

As a qualitative researcher using an interpretivist lens, I am mindful that it is important to disclose and examine my background and beliefs in light of my role as a researcher within this study. I was raised in a Catholic household, was educated in Catholic schools, and now work in a Catholic higher education setting. My role as Director of Community-Engaged Learning at a small liberal arts Catholic college guided by the ethos of its founding order, the Edmundites, not only informs this study, but is also an opportunity for being informed by it. My primary job is to support faculty in their efforts to incorporate community projects into their courses for the benefit of student learning and the constituencies with whom they work. A number of campuses nationwide, secular and non-secular alike, co-locate their volunteer programs with their
academic service-learning programs. Others separate these two programs. On my campus, our volunteer and outreach office is situated under Campus Ministry in Student Affairs, whereas my office was intentionally positioned under Academic Affairs. It was members of the faculty who championed the creation of a full-time support office for service-learning a decade ago. When I came aboard as its director, it was explained to me that the purpose of aligning community engagement with the academic side of the institution was to legitimize faculty work in this arena. Early on, I held an “institute” on our campus which engaged our senior administration, Faculty Council, Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee, Teaching Resource Committee, and faculty-at-large in conversations about the nature of engaged scholarship as well as the recognition of such work in reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. This work led to a modest and notable revision in our tenure policies that included the practice of service-learning as a viable approach to teaching. Still, I did not fully grasp the importance of faculty rewards for enabling community engagement. In those early days, I focused most of my energies on faculty training, partnership and project development, and ensuring that our partners, faculty, and students were recognized for their work through awards and public events. However, the longer I have done this work, the more I have come to realize the role that faculty rewards play in the choices faculty make. I have encountered first-hand many of the challenges faculty face in pursuing
community engagement. I have had numerous conversations with faculty who express an enthusiasm for and desire to pursue community engagement work, but who have also received messages from advisors, mentors, and their departments that such work is not rewarded or valued in the same way as other activities. I have noticed that community engagement work is at times treated as work that is “separate” from or peripheral to a faculty member’s primary responsibilities, rather than central to the mission of the college and an integral part of one’s teaching and scholarship. Given that my institution espouses values of social justice, service, and the dignity of the human person, I have become more and more curious about the connections between mission and policy—that is, what we aspire to do and what we actually do to enable the fulfillment of those aspirations. Is community engagement work an important, or even essential, expression of mission at Catholic colleges and universities? What are the current trends in Catholic higher education that could or should guide faculty policy on these campuses?

Since the time those questions began to rise, I have become aware of extensive RPT revision efforts that have occurred at other institutions resulting in more comprehensive guidelines that clearly define and embrace the place of community engagement across the three traditional areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, research, and service. How might faculty policies create a culture of enabling faculty to pursue community engagement work, rather than
discouraging it? An educational policy course introduced me to an essay looking at the tools policy makers employ to motivate and enable people to do things they otherwise might not do (Schneider & Ingram, 1990). This policy tools framework inspired me to pursue the mission-policy alignment question I had about Catholic institutions and faculty rewards policies.

In 2010, my own institution gained the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, a classification framework that plays a major role in my present study. I was the person primarily responsible for organizing the self-study, gathering documentation, writing the report, and submitting the application so I am familiar with its intentions and structure. The self-study process revealed not only my institution’s considerable strengths in its commitment to community engagement, but also some of our opportunities to do better. We will have the opportunity to reapply for the classification in 2020, and I am mindful of the areas in which we need to do more work. One area that we could give more attention to is how to make our commitment to community engagement both clear and supportive in faculty recruitment and RPT policies.

I believe that mission and vision statements have symbolic and practical importance in organizations. They set the compass for the organization and have the capacity to guide both decision-making and an organization’s activities at all levels. I believe that Catholic institutions have a special responsibility to respond to the social and environmental issues of our time and to cultivate just
relationships with their local and global communities. This means we should have a sense of what it is our communities need and want as well as what works for them in terms of their engagement with faculty and students. Finally, I do not believe that one needs to identify as Catholic in order to carry out the values expressed at Catholic colleges and universities. All of these beliefs in some way shape the way I look at my data.

Consequently, this study used a suite of interpretive practices to mitigate subjectivity and enhance validity and trustworthiness (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). I consulted existing literature, research studies, and theories to inform my study and guide my analysis. I used content and cross-case analysis to identify patterns, develop themes, and demonstrate the representative characteristics of the research sample. First, I begin with the literature review.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation examines the alignment between institutional mission and faculty reward policies, particularly in regard to community engagement in the context of Catholic higher education. To support this study, the literature review is designed to shed light on three areas of concern: 1) the culture and mission of Catholic higher education; 2) an understanding of faculty roles, forms of scholarship, and community-engagement; and 3) best practices for faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies that enable and reward forms of community engagement. This latter consideration includes a look at the behavioral assumptions associated with various policy tools available to policy-makers.

Catholic higher education in the United States began in 1789 with the founding of Georgetown University (Sanders, 2010). To understand the current culture and identity of Catholic higher education as well as how it defines its mission, I turned to two prominent scholarly journals: the Journal of Catholic Education (formerly Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice) and the Journal of Catholic Higher Education (JCHE). The Journal of Catholic Education is an open access, peer-reviewed journal supported by 19 Catholic colleges and universities and hosted by Loyola Marymount University. The journal promotes and disseminates scholarship about the purposes, practices, and issues in Catholic education at all levels (K-16). The Journal of Catholic Higher Education
meanwhile is sponsored by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU). It focuses exclusively on higher education and has a particular interest in publishing articles that address ways to strengthen the mission and identity of Catholic higher education.

I searched the article databases of these two journals for themes that touched upon Catholic mission and identity in higher education over the past five years. I also searched for articles that demonstrated an institution’s or individual faculty member’s commitment to community engaged teaching or scholarship in practice or policy, especially those who saw this practice or policy as a unique expression of the Catholic mission of the institution. In reading these articles, I came to understand the influence that Vatican proceedings and documents had on Catholic higher education, including the sometimes contentious debates and dialogues that ensued from them. It became clear that it would be impossible to talk about identity, culture, and mission within Catholic higher education without considering the Vatican proceedings and official documents designed to give direction for Catholic colleges and universities. This also held true for the dialogues and documents from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), which specifically address higher education in the United States. The journal articles prompted me to access the primary source documents by visiting the webpages of the Vatican and United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) where the full text of Vatican
documents and USCCB reports can be found. Lastly, I drew on Morey and Piderit’s (2006) research-based volume Catholic Higher Education: A Culture in Crisis which was frequently referenced in the above-mentioned literature both as an illustration of the contemporary state of affairs in Catholic higher education and as a guide for strengthening its identity and culture.

For the second and third strands of my literature review, there are abundant journals and books that treat the topic of community engagement and its intersection with faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. Kerry Ann O’Meara is one of the foremost scholars on this latter topic, having devoted over 15 productive years to date on raising awareness of the critical role reward policies, institutional culture, and individual motivations play in advancing community engagement in the professional lives of faculty. Her research and that of many others in the field of community engagement springs from Boyer’s (1990) seminal work, which sought to expand our notions of scholarship in the academy.

In my exploration for scholarly works on the above topics, I applied search terms in the ERIC database which often combined one or more of the following: scholarship, engagement, research, community, public, service-learning, community-based research, promotion, tenure, faculty, policies, rewards, higher education, mission. The journals which garnered the most applicable titles and material included the following: Michigan Journal of
Community Service Learning; Journal of Higher Education & Outreach; International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement; Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education; and Journal of Higher Education. In some cases, I went directly to these journal websites and used the same search terms or simply scrolled through recent issues scanning titles for applicable themes.

For the policy strand of my literature review, I primarily drew upon works by Diamond (1999); Ellison & Eatman (2008); Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff (1997); and Schneider & Ingram (1990). These sources contributed to the evaluation frameworks I employed in my study. I expand on each source in Chapter 3 of my dissertation.

The literature review begins with a discussion of what it means to be a Catholic College or University in the 21st century, thus Part I reviews the history, culture and mission of Catholic higher education. In Part II, I consider the connection between faculty roles, forms of scholarship, and community engagement. In Part III, I consider how recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies can support community engagement in the professional lives of faculty. I also include a review of best practices that support and enable faculty community engagement within RPT policies.
Part I: What Does it Mean to be a Catholic College or University in the 21st Century?

In this section of my literature review, I explore the development of Catholic higher education and its relationship to the Catholic Church. I define some of the central features and terms associated with Catholic education, and then look at how Catholic colleges and universities in the United States have sought to establish their unique identities and contributions through the careful development of their mission statements. I then consider who bears the responsibility for advancing the mission on campus with a particular focus on the role of faculty. I round out this section demonstrating how community-engagement relates to Catholic educational mission by sharing some vignettes of faculty who have engaged in mission-driven teaching and scholarship that takes into consideration social concerns and the needs of the community. This review lays the groundwork for understanding the contemporary state of Catholic higher education as well as for analyzing and interpreting my data on mission and faculty rewards policies in light of the Catholic educational tradition.

Hallmarks of Catholic Education

To understand the modern landscape of Catholic higher education, it is important to consider its history and influences. Over the past century, a number of key events and documents originating from the Vatican and United
States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB)\(^1\) have significantly influenced the culture and mission of Catholic higher education as it exists today (see Table 2). I illustrate how the ideas and attitudes expressed within the official papers from various proceedings inform aspects of the Catholic educational tradition. I consider the guidance they provide, the questions they raise, and the tensions they have created at times. I also discuss the critical responses to these Church dialogues and pronouncements as offered by scholars within Catholic higher education. This historical evolution is important to my study because it tells the story of the influence of the Catholic Church on Catholic higher education and how the mission of Catholic higher education might be understood and interpreted through this influence.

Table 2: Timeline of Key Events and Documents with Implications for Catholic Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event or Document</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962-1965</td>
<td><em>Second Vatican Council</em> Gathering of the world’s bishops by the invitation of Pope John XXII to bring renewal to the Catholic Church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The USCCB is an assembly of all U.S. bishops. They jointly support the ministry of evangelization and pastoral functions on behalf of the Christian faithful of the United States. They collaborate with other Catholics to address contemporary issues that concern the Church and broader society, and provide direction, coordination, and education to carry on Catholic activities in the United States.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Land O’Lakes Statement: The Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University</td>
<td>Viewed as Catholic higher education’s “Declaration of Independence” from the Church, its signers sought unrestricted academic freedom. Brought more lay people into Catholic institutions, greater autonomy in institutional governance, and the freedom to pursue academic norms more in line with secular universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching in the U.S. Economy</td>
<td>Identified the persons and institutions with the greatest responsibilities to work for economic justice, including political bodies, citizens, owners, financial managers, and educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Ex corde Ecclesiae (&quot;From the Heart of the Church&quot;)</td>
<td>Generated renewed interest in and dialogue about Catholic higher education. Led many Catholic institutions to revise their mission statements and create mission offices. Also, established a mandatum for faculty of theology which became a source of controversy within the academy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The Application of Ex corde Ecclesiae for the United States</td>
<td>Document was a result of a 10-year dialogue and debate involving continued tension over issues of identity and autonomy in Catholic higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Final Report for the 10 Year Review of the Application of Ex corde Ecclesiae for the United States</td>
<td>Declares Catholic colleges and universities have made progress in clarifying their identity and cultivating greater mission-driven practices. Recognizing the increase in laypeople in Catholic institutions, it calls for continued dialogue about hiring practices and the formation of trustees, faculty, and staff regarding Catholic identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Instrumentum Laboris (&quot;Working Instrument&quot;): Educating Today and Tomorrow: A Renewing Passion for Catholic Education</td>
<td>The text references the essential points of Ex corde Ecclesiae. Assesses Catholic education, establishes its contemporary importance, and outlines the development of the mission of Catholic educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Response to “Educating Today and Tomorrow” from the Association of Catholic Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Identifies the unique contributions of U.S. Catholic colleges &amp; universities to the faith through its emphasis on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and the values of Catholic Social Teaching. Emphasizes the role of mission officers on campus to preserve and advance Catholic identity in the face of rising numbers of lay presidents, trustees, and faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2014, the Vatican released a document entitled “Educating Today and Tomorrow: A Renewing Passion.” This *Instrumentum laboris* or “working instrument” of the Church declares that a hallmark of Catholic education is a “balanced focus on cognitive, affective, social, professional, ethical and spiritual aspects” of a person’s development (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2014). Morey and Piderit (2006) describe a nested approach to understanding the relationship between three core dimensions of the Catholic educational tradition: intellectual, moral, and social justice. Each is “related to one another by inclusion” (p. 25):

The Catholic intellectual tradition refers to all contributions made to the intellectual development of the Western world stemming from Catholic theology and philosophy. The Catholic moral tradition is one component, albeit a very significant one, of the Catholic intellectual tradition. One very large sector within the moral tradition is Catholic social teaching. Thus, Catholic social teaching is contained within the Catholic moral tradition, which in turn is embedded in the Catholic intellectual tradition” (p. 125).
See figure 3 below. The following sections discuss each of these three dimensions of the Catholic Tradition in turn.

**Components of the Catholic Tradition**

- Theology
- Philosophy
- Traditional/modern liberal arts derived from classical Greek and Roman culture
- Extended liberal arts

Morey & Piderit (2006)

**Figure 3: Components of the Catholic Educational Tradition**

**The Catholic Intellectual Tradition**

In the initial efforts of formal Christian education during the Middle Ages in Europe, the traditional liberal arts drew from theological and philosophical thought. The first tier of studies (the trivium) consisted of grammar, rhetoric, and logic. This prepared students for the second tier of studies, known as the quadrivium, consisting of astronomy, geometry, arithmetic, and music. Over the
centuries, the educational tradition continued to be shaped by theology and philosophy as it transformed into the modern liberal arts (i.e., ethics, literature, history, mathematics, music, astronomy, grammar, rhetoric, Greek, and Latin) and then gradually extended into what is referred to as the “emerging disciplines” from the mid-19th century onwards. These emerging disciplines included the natural and life sciences, social sciences, psychology, computer science, and the professional areas of medicine, law, business, and education. Thus, the study of theology and philosophy as well as their influence on other academic disciplines are at the core of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition (Morey & Piderit, 2006).

The Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT), however, does not refer to a universal set of texts to be read or prescribed courses to be taken; rather, it consists of habits of mind to be developed. Because Catholicism is engaged in truth-seeking, every academic discipline is viewed as having a place within its intellectual tradition, and integration of learning is its trademark (Hellwig, 2000). Integration refers not only to connecting past and present knowledge, exploring various ways of knowing, and linking learning to life, but also to nurturing dialogue between and amongst disciplines. Philosophy shows students how to ask fundamental questions about any discipline by drawing upon the methods used by past philosophers. They develop habits of mind that can rigorously assess the value, validity, utilitarianism, and ethical content of claims and
actions. In this light, faith and reason are complementary pursuits, rather than being in conflict with one another: “[T]hey exist in a creative tension that enlivens both. Reason challenges faith to explain itself and faith challenges reason to go beyond itself. This is why philosophy has always held a prominent place in the Catholic intellectual tradition” (Ingham, n.d.).

What gets included in the definition of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT) varies in academia. Some choose to include the study of theology along with philosophy, the traditional liberal arts, and the extended liberal arts as the four primary components of CIT, while others exclude theology (Morey & Piderit, 2006). In this dissertation, the definition and understanding of CIT contains theology; however, it will not be the most prominent dimension applied in my study. It is discussed here because the role of theology and religiosity has often emerged as the most controversial topic when considering where and how the Catholic tradition should be made visible at Catholic institutions.

**Catholic theology.** In the mid-nineteenth century, Cardinal John Henry Newman proposed the inclusion of theology as a necessary part of a university education. An Anglican raised in the Church of England, Newman converted to Roman Catholicism mid-life and was soon after charged with establishing a Catholic University, the first of its kind, in Dublin, Ireland. To offer a rationale for this effort, Newman wrote a series of essays and lectures which were later compiled in a volume titled *The Idea of a University* where he argued that the
purpose of a university was to teach universal knowledge. Universal knowledge by his reckoning included the study of theology, specifically Roman Catholic theology. Thus, he reasoned, a university that omits theology is not fully a university. At the same time, Newman made clear that a Catholic University was not the Catholic Church and did not have the same aims. The purpose of a Catholic education was not to convert its students to the Catholic faith or save souls, but rather to develop critical habits of mind, intellectual breadth, and a moral sensitivity that he argued, could best be achieved through the study of the Roman Catholic doctrine of God and a liberal approach to knowledge. Ultimately, Newman’s essays reveal certain limitations in the interpretation of “universal knowledge” than the term might suggest to us today; however, it is generally acknowledged that Newman’s ideas about the aims of a university have had profound and long-lasting effects on institutions of higher learning worldwide, both secular and non-secular alike (Newman, 1996).

Catholic theology concerns the study and interpretation of the major doctrines of the Catholic Church, the inquiry into the nature of faith, and the exploration of how human beings should behave in light of the mission of the Church (Morey & Piderit, 2006). Vatican documents offer specific guidance about the treatment of theology in the realms of scholarship and teaching. *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, an apostolic constitution meaning “from the heart of the Church” and published by Pope John Paul II in 1990, developed a vision for the identity
and mission of Catholic higher education and set out general norms for Catholic institutions to follow. One of the governing norms established that “professors of theological disciplines are expected to seek or accept a *mandatum* from the local bishop indicating that, in their teaching and research, they act in full communion with the Catholic Church. As academics they present the teachings of the Church with integrity and refrain from presenting as Catholic teaching anything contrary to the magisterium” (Leibrecht, 2001, p. 148). The magisterium refers to the Church’s authority to determine the authentic teaching and truths of the Catholic religion (Morey & Piderit, 2006), while the *mandatum* is part of international Church Law, specifically Canon 812 from the Code of Canon Law which governs the Church’s day-to-day work (Leibrecht, 2001). Thus the *mandatum* is an acknowledgment by church authority that a Catholic professor is adhering to Church teachings (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2016).

Shortly after the release of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* in 1990, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) was charged with producing its own document on how the principles and guidelines of *Ex corde* should specifically be applied in the United States. During the decade-long process in which the bishops developed the document that eventually came to be known as “The Application of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* for the United States,” the *mandatum* became one of the greatest sources of contention between representatives of U.S. Catholic
higher education and the U.S. bishops writing the application document. Administrators and faculty alike resisted the prescriptive nature of the mandatum. They worried about the erosion of academic freedom, the encroachment on institutional autonomy, and the potential loss of government funding which might ensue from the mandate (House, 2010). Additional concerns about Ex corde centered around the compatibility of an institution’s adherence to both civil and Church law; the impact of the guidelines on non-Catholic faculty, administrators, and trustees employed by Catholic campuses; and the local bishop’s role not only in the granting of a mandatum, but also in influencing the general affairs of the university. Ultimately, the 2001 U.S. Application document produced by the USCCB sought to address matters related to institutional autonomy and the rights of theologians as independent scholars. Revised language resulting from the 10-year dialogue established that Catholic professors teach in their own name and not on behalf of the Bishop. Further, the Application document expressed that Bishops are not expected to be directly involved in the internal affairs of a Catholic institution. Instead, the document counseled for cultivating a cooperative relationship grounded in dialogue (Leibrecht, 2001). Authoritative members of the Church, however, believe that an institution cannot be authentically Catholic unless it is accountable to the Church, thus the debate about identity and autonomy remains an active one (O’Brien, 1998).
Ultimately, many Catholic institutions in the U.S. and their theology departments continue to resist the enforcement of the *mandatum* since it is still viewed by many as counter to the conditions necessary for a legitimate academic enterprise (O’Brien, 1998). It should be noted that no such mandate is expected of those teaching in disciplines outside of theology, and the *mandatum* does not apply to administrators, trustees, pastoral ministers, or staff. *Ex corde*, however, does advise that the faculty of Catholic colleges and universities consist of a majority of Catholics. Additionally, it calls on all members of these institutions, regardless of faith affiliation, to respect Catholic identity and doctrine. This former point has proved to be another source of contention while the latter point acknowledges the increasing role of lay people in Catholic higher education as the population of religious has declined in recent decades. In the present day, over 60% of Catholic university presidents are laypeople (Galligan-Stierle, 2014b) and Catholic colleges and universities generally express that they do not require faculty to be Catholic, practicing or otherwise. These institutions remain free to follow their own processes in the hiring and retention of faculty. Indeed, non-Catholics or those of no faith at all make important contributions to Catholic schools and can productively help to fulfill the mission and values of their institutions (Hatch, 2005; Pope John Paul II, 1990).

Another relevant consideration regarding the influence of Catholic theology in the curriculum is the expectation for student enrollment in theology
Although most students are required to take one or more courses in religious studies at Catholic colleges and universities, relatively few students adopt it as their major. In practice, 60% of undergraduates today are in pre-professional degree programs. If the goal is to bring theological perspectives to bear on other disciplines as was the tradition in the earliest universities, faculty are now encouraged to explore how Catholic principles might be infused into non-theology programs (Heft, 2012). Ex corde clearly supports the joining of “academic and professional development [of students] with formation in moral and religious principles and the social teachings of the Church” (Article 4 § 5). It does not mandate courses in Catholic doctrine, but rather states that such courses should be available to all students and recommends that ethical formation be embedded in each professional area’s program of study.

In sum, as one of many legitimate branches of knowledge, theology is deserving of its own place in the academic curriculum. Additionally, it can inform other disciplines in the same way that other disciplines can inform theology in the search for meaning (Stravinskas, 2009). This present research study intends to focus on institutional practices affecting faculty members across the disciplines, not on any particular departmental curriculum, nor on Catholic theology exclusively. Furthermore, Catholic theology is not the expertise of this researcher. For these reasons, this study will deal more directly with the second
and third realms of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition consisting of the moral
tradition and Catholic social teaching respectively.

**Catholic moral tradition.** The Catholic moral tradition springs from
understandings of natural law first developed in the classical era and
incorporated into Christian thought. Natural law emphasized “the cultivation of
virtue, as well as the avoidance of vice and sin. Christians are called to be people
of character whose relationship with God, self, others, and the world are freely
chosen and life-giving and who take responsibility for their actions and choices”
(Morey & Piderit, 2006, p. 139). In this view, outward practice is just as
important as internal dispositions. Virtuous behavior is achieved through faith,
hope, charity, humility, gratitude, mercy, forgiveness, justice, truthfulness,
temperance, and fortitude.

Various approaches to the interpretation of natural law have developed
over time stretching back to the philosophers of the first century B.C. A
contemporary version, called the “new classical natural law,” speaks of a
common good and fundamental values that apply to all human beings. These
values, arrived at through reason, are immutable. Acting contrary to a universal
value is considered wrong or immoral. Such values consist of friendship, life,
beauty, knowledge, religion, and common sense (Morey & Piderit, 2006). The
values expressed in Catholic moral teaching inform educational missions and the
development of student character — two fundamental concerns for faculty and
other professionals in Catholic higher education. Thus an understanding of the Catholic moral tradition is significant to this present study.

**Catholic social teaching.** Catholic Social Teaching (CST) consists of seven contemporary themes drawn from the universal values represented in the Catholic moral tradition. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2015) characterizes the Church's social teaching as “a rich treasure of wisdom about building a just society and living lives of holiness amidst the challenges of modern society. Modern Catholic social teaching has been articulated through a tradition of papal, conciliar, and episcopal documents.” Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical *Rerum novarum,* “On Capital and Labor,” (1891) is regarded as the beginning of modern CST. Written in the midst of the Industrial Revolution, it addressed the emerging concerns of worker safety, fair wages, humane treatment, and the right of workers to organize for better working conditions (Sullivan & Post, 2011). These sentiments are represented in the CST theme titled “The Dignity of Work and the Rights of Workers.” Three other themes are frequently cited as well-suited to the higher education context because of their origins in the fundamental values of the Catholic moral tradition. The *principle of solidarity* eschews individualism in favor of interdependence and committing oneself to the common good. Seeing oneself in others and as part of a larger community is viewed as the best way to preserve human dignity. The *preferential option for the poor* recognizes that those with the least resources face the largest
obstacles in pursuing the fundamental values, thus special attention should be paid to improving the situation of the disadvantaged through both short and long-term solutions (Morey & Piderit, 2006). The principle of subsidiarity acknowledges the rights of individuals to participate in the decisions that directly impact their lives. This principle “calls for problems to be addressed at the most local level possible” so that those most familiar with and affected by the issues facing their community are afforded the opportunity for solving them (Sullivan & Post, 2011, p. 115). A summary of the seven major themes of Catholic Social Teaching are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Seven Themes of Catholic Social Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life and Dignity of the Human Person</td>
<td>Belief in the value of human life as more important than things; the “measure of every institution is whether it threatens or enhances the life and dignity of the human person.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Call to Family, Community, and Participation</td>
<td>Society should be organized (through laws and policies) to allow individuals to grow in community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rights and Responsibilities (Subsidiarity)</td>
<td>People have the right and obligation to participate in society and seek well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Option for the Poor and Vulnerable</td>
<td>The needs of the poor and vulnerable come first. People and institutions should work to narrow the gap between rich and poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Dignity of Work and the Rights of Workers</td>
<td>Work allows people to participate in society, not merely to only make a living. The “economy must serve people, not the other way around,” thus workers’ rights must be respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Solidarity</td>
<td>Belief in the pursuit of peace and justice for everyone in the human family regardless of national, racial, ethnic, economic, or ideological differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Care for God’s Creation</td>
<td>We are called to be stewards of the earth, to protect both people and planet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The realm of the Catholic educational tradition most applicable to this study is that of Catholic Social Teaching. It specifically focuses on how beliefs and faith get carried out in the world. CST provides guidance for institutional mission and culture; student formation; and faculty approaches to teaching, research, and service. The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) asserts that CST provides an intellectual framework for students to engage in contemporary social issues and simultaneously meet both academic and community needs. As such, CST can be applied across disciplines so that students begin to see how their professional aspirations are tied to rights and responsibilities in pursuit of a common good. When coupled with community engagement, CST provides students the opportunity to experience solidarity with their community as well as to understand cooperation and participation in the public sphere as important elements of moral activity. Sullivan and Post (2011) observe that “such learning affords an opportunity to root student scholarship in the history, context, theory, and practice of both discipleship and citizenship [emphasis added]” (p. 114). They view these twin pedagogies as entirely compatible with one another within the context of a justice-oriented Catholic education and a democratic society.

*Ex corde Ecclesiae* clearly establishes a justice orientation in scholarly activities in a section aptly titled “The Mission of Service of a Catholic University”:
A Catholic University, as any University, is immersed in human society; as an extension of its service to the Church, and always within its proper competence, it is called on to become an even more effective instrument of cultural progress for individuals as well as for society. Included among its research activities, therefore, will be a study of serious contemporary problems in areas such as the dignity of human life, the promotion of justice for all, the quality of personal and family life, the protection of nature, the search for peace and political stability, a more just sharing in the world’s resources, and a new economic and political order that will better serve the human community at a national and international level. University research will seek to discover the roots and causes of the serious problems of our time, paying special attention to their ethical and religious dimensions...The Christian spirit of service to others for the promotion of social justice is of particular importance for each Catholic University, to be shared by its teachers and developed by its students. (John Paul II, 1990)

In keeping with this justice orientation, the ACCU (n.d.) encourages faculty in the modern Catholic university to shape curricula to emphasize principles of CST by working on sustainability issues, teaching solidarity with marginalized populations, combating discrimination, or protecting human rights, for example. Promoting cross-disciplinary collaboration on any of these
topics elevates their importance within the institution. In particular, the ACCU is concerned with how the themes of CST are reflected in the research agenda of the institution and of faculty. From this perspective, it becomes important to ask: Where and when do community groups and organizations inform research projects? Do questions guiding research endeavors employ principles of solidarity/subsidiarity, concern for the common good, and a regard for a preferential option for the poor? (Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, n.d).

**Establishing a Distinct Catholic Identity**

The discussion above raises challenging, yet essential questions about the modern Catholic university. Does the embrace of a Catholic identity jeopardize its reputation as an institution capable of the pursuit of truth and scientific inquiry, thus creating an “inferiority complex” when compared to its secular counterparts (House, 2010)? If an institution attempts to follow the principles of both a modern university and a Catholic education, will its Catholic identity be threatened, diminished, or even present a conflict in identity in which members are working at cross-purposes? What is the appropriate balance between secular and religious aims? Recent literature addresses a number of these questions.

Currie (2011) describes two stances that a Catholic institution might adopt: one extreme is to withdraw from the world around it in order to protect
against secularizing forces and stay “pure” while the other extreme is to become so immersed in the secular world that it merely blends in with little to no distinctive features (p. 353). In this latter scenario, a school might face criticism for effectively becoming Catholic in name only, rather than in substance.

Another issue Catholic higher education contends with is whether to focus on doctrine or on personal commitment (O’Brien, 1998). In Morey & Piderit’s (2006) exploration of the connections between mission and culture on Catholic campuses, they raise the concern of a pervasive Catholic culture giving way to Catholic subcultures on campus. This is especially prone to happen where there are many competing cultures on campus coupled with a paucity of campus-wide initiatives focused on Catholic understanding aimed at touching all students.

Administrators of Catholic higher education believe that the “Catholic approach to education and the search for truth is open and broad, not narrowed and constrained” (Morey & Piderit, p. 4). It is free to explore. Stravinskas (2009) reminds critics that the whole endeavor of a university education system was first conceived and developed by the Catholic Church in medieval times, so secular institutions ultimately locate their roots in an ecclesial tradition, not the other way around.

*Ex corde* states that “by its Catholic character, a University is made more capable of conducting an impartial search for truth, a search that is neither subordinated to nor conditioned by particular interests of any kind” which one
might assume refers to political, economic, or individualistic interests. In the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, truth is not mere opinion, ideology, personal preference, subjectivity, or sentimentality; it is objective, driven by reason, and embraces the consideration of multiple perspectives (Stravinskas, 2009). In this spirit, the dedicated search for truth in any discipline or profession is in itself a sacred act (Heft, 2012; Kelley, 2010). And just as faith and reason go hand in hand, the pursuit of truth and of justice are equally compatible endeavors in a Catholic academic context. Bergman (2011) remarks that Cardinal Newman recognized the social mission of higher education and advocated for it as a means of liberation for the poor and oppressed when he laid out his rationale for university education and founded the Catholic University of Ireland in the nineteenth century. This sentiment vigorously continues today in many discussions about the mission of Catholic higher education.

In addition to the above considerations, contemporary Catholic higher education cannot afford to ignore the milieu in which it exists. Many agree that it must find balance (Currie, 2011), perhaps achieving what one mission administrator at a Catholic institution calls the “virtuous middle” where individuals regardless of faith come with an appreciation for the espoused values of the institution, and a willingness to learn about Catholic faith alongside other traditions and theories (Morey & Piderit, 2006). Such an education is grounded in the liberal arts and dedicated to the development of the whole person.
Seeking the truth means being open to a plurality of ideas (Murphy, 1991), thus diversity serves as a trademark of Catholic higher education because of the various modes employed to infuse the Catholic Intellectual Tradition through the student educational experience, the array of students served in its institutions, and the breadth of content studied (Morey & Piderit, 2006). This is what makes Catholic institutions unique and therefore, what many believe is the route to success in the future. It certainly gives context to the balance referred to in the Vatican’s *Instrumentum laboris* as cited in the opening paragraph of this section on what it means to be a Catholic college or university. How, then, is Catholic culture and identity best represented in the mission of the institution?

**Shifts in the Identity, Culture, and Mission of Catholic Colleges and Universities**

Murphy (1991) describes three major shifts that have influenced the mission of Catholic higher education since the Second Vatican Council in the 1960’s. The first shift, characterized by a growing acceptance of a variety of lifestyles and individual values, fundamentally altered the environment in which higher education operates. Society moved from a generally agreed upon value system (a moral consensus) to a more pluralistic worldview (where there is little to no moral consensus). Similarly, the second shift refers to a change in internal campus climates. Staff and faculty who had largely been accepting of Catholicism’s influence on all aspects of academic and student affairs became
more focused on principles of academic freedom, diverse perspectives, and individual choice. This pervasive sense of personal determination in our present-day socio-cultural context means that “an integral connection no longer exists between pursuing a spiritual quest (or being a religious person) and affiliation with or participation in an historic religious institution” (Killen, 2015, p. 80). The third shift broadened the purposes of Catholic higher education, from preparing students for leadership within primarily Catholic communities to educating for leadership in all realms of society. Since Vatican II expanded the mission of the Church from evangelism and sacramental rituals to justice-oriented responses to contemporary human needs, educational institutions recognized the need for lay leadership in the social, political, and economic sectors (Murphy, 1991). These three shifts have challenged Catholic institutions to respond to the needs and characters of a wider range of students, and to reshape or clarify their educational missions.

Catholic colleges’ and universities’ current mission, vision, and values statements—which influence and are influenced by their identity and culture—owe much of their development to the papal document *Ex corde Ecclesiae* published in 1990. As discussed previously, the promulgation of Pope John Paul II’s encyclical, meaning “from the heart of the Church,” prompted many Catholic institutions of higher education to revisit their Christian inspiration and undertake initiatives to reestablish their distinct Catholic identity (Hagstrom,
An important component of this activity involved revising and making public their mission statements in light of the broader principles established in *Ex corde* as well as their institution’s particular founding traditions (Pope John Paul II, 1990). These updated statements of institutional identity, goals, and values made their way to the official websites of Catholic colleges and universities and offer a collective impression of Catholic identity. Markers of Catholicity in higher education include visible evidence of the following: Catholic heritage and symbols; mission-driven hiring practices; and an academic experience that addresses principles of the Catholic teaching, spirituality, and service in alignment with *Ex corde* (Gambescia and Paolucci, 2011). Morey & Piderit (2006) assert, however, that “there is no single way for a Catholic college or university to understand and actualize its Catholic mission” (p. 21). The interpretation and implementation of an institution’s mission flows from its cultural heritage. In the case of Catholic institutions, culture springs from the particular charism of each school’s sponsoring congregation or founder as well as the broader Catholic culture in higher education.

For Morey & Piderit, the concept of “culture” has greater utilitarian and expressive value than the ambiguous concept of “identity,” thus their national study of 33 Catholic colleges and universities centered on revealing the cultural characteristics of Catholic higher education as conveyed by senior administrators. They applied two criteria, distinguishability and inheritability,
to gauge an institution’s commitment to the Catholic formation of students.

Whereas distinguishability refers to the characteristics that set Catholic institutional culture apart from secular campus cultures, inheritability refers to how a culture is adopted or adapted over time, either for or by its faculty, staff, and students. They sought examples of Catholic culture in the realms of academics, residence life, student affairs, religious activities, and faculty/administrator influence. In their analysis, social justice was embedded in the academic realm. Since many secular institutions engage in social justice activities, in order for an activity to be seen as advancing the Catholic tradition, a Catholic link must be clear. For example, a course that introduces students to social justice or service projects should make explicit connections between Catholic faith and action by referencing principles of Catholic social teaching, examining pertinent texts, studying key figures who were inspired by their Catholic faith to sustain social movements, and so forth; otherwise, they argue, the exposure to social justice concepts is not distinguishable from what is offered at public or nonsectarian colleges and universities. Ultimately, organizational culture and behaviors are fed by the values, assumptions, beliefs, and norms of the people who constitute the organization. The values most important to the institution are often expressed in a mission statement which is meant to provide inspiration and direction for all those involved in the institution: “Rewards and punishments emerge from beliefs and values, but they also provide a window on
what an organization truly believes and values. The interplay of these components brings culture into view and shapes how an organization lives out its mission” (Morey & Piderit, p. 25).

Not all Catholic institutions are exactly alike, thus their missions will and should vary. The advantage of differentiated missions, not only amongst Catholic institutions but also amongst secular schools, is the opportunity to counterbalance the isomorphism that can result from the pursuit of prestige and marketplace forces described earlier. Isomorphism refers to the homogeneous effect of trying to become more like one’s competitors, not necessarily because one wishes to be more effective or distinct, but because one wants to be viewed in the same prestigious light in order to achieve other gains (Bloomgarden, 2008).

When mission statements are not differentiated between institutions or institutional types, they may be seen as merely serving a normative or legitimizing purpose rather than a utilitarian (operational) purpose that drives strategic planning and decision-making on a campus (Morphew and Hartley, 2006).

For Catholic schools, the pursuit of prestige may carry the risk of losing its Catholic character depending on how it proceeds with the effort. One example provided by Murphy (1991) references a study that examined Marquette University’s quest to become more academically professional. Many within the Catholic institution interpreted Marquette’s new direction as leading to greater
secularism, and a turning away from Catholicism. This has not been an uncommon criticism of many Catholic institutions of higher education, beginning in the mid-twentieth century and continuing to the present. Shortly after the Second Vatican Council sent out its call for modernization and renewal of the Catholic Church, a group of 26 presidents and administrators (mostly priests) of major Catholic colleges and universities issued the *Land O’Lakes Statement: The Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University* (1967). The statement, viewed by many as a “Declaration of independence from the church,” called for Catholic higher education’s autonomy, established the rights of the Catholic University to pursue academic excellence by following the norms of secular universities, and asserted that it held an important role in providing counsel to the Church rather than the other way around (House, 2010). Modernization to this group meant assuming authority over the governance, financial, and administrative functions of their institutions without the constraints of Vatican authorities or local religious sponsors (O’Brien, 1998). It insisted on complete academic freedom, and effectively determined that identity as a university was to come first, Catholicism second. This reflected a reversal of the state of affairs in Catholic higher education prior to Vatican II.

The Land O’Lakes statement specifically asserted a preference for Catholic institutions to align more closely with the way secular institutions operate regarding faculty and university activity, using language such as being “in
common with other universities,” having “the same functions as all other true universities,” and offering “the same services to society.” Although the drive for academic freedom and institutional autonomy allowed Catholic institutions to become more financially stable, grow student enrollment, and achieve academic respectability in the broader higher education arena, critics of the statement note that it downplayed what makes Catholic colleges distinctly Catholic (House, 2010; O’Brien, 1998).

Over 20 years after the Land O’Lakes gathering, *Ex corde Ecclesiae* was published. Its author, Pope John Paul II, incorporated a number of the sentiments expressed in the Land O’Lakes document, but maintained a more balanced approach. That is, neither the university nor Catholicism was subordinated to the other. The constitution spoke of “proper” autonomy and declared that “besides teaching, research, and services common to all Universities, a Catholic University by *institutional commitment*, brings to its task the inspiration and light of the *Christian message*.” More specifically, the document states that “being both a University and Catholic, it must be both a community of scholars representing various branches of human knowledge, and an academic institution in which Catholicism is vitally present and operative.” Pope John Paul II, like Cardinal John Henry Newman’s *The Idea of a University*, stressed the compatibility of faith and reason in academic study and the search
for truth. This point was reiterated by Pope Benedict XVI (2008) in his address to Catholic educators in the United States less than a decade ago.

Interestingly, today one does not hear scholars or administrators at Catholic colleges and universities referring to the Land O’Lakes document as frequently as one hears *Ex corde* referenced in discussions about how to best carry out Catholic identity and mission. Still, the messages contained in the two documents represent the lack of consensus Catholic colleges and universities experience when considering the intentions and interpretations of its mission and identity, especially as related to faculty expectations.

Overall, secularization is a topic of great concern for those involved in Catholic education, especially as they recall how well-regarded institutions with religious origins (e.g. Harvard, Wellesley, Stanford, etc.) have gradually shed those affiliations over time and concurrently enhanced their reputations for academic excellence. This history and tension between autonomy, academic professionalism, and retention of Catholic identity begs the question, how Catholic should a Catholic institution be? The answer to this has implications not only for the shaping of institutional mission statements, but also for the extent to which those mission statements influence and drive campus culture, responsibilities, and activity in all areas of the college or university.

**Responsibility for Maintaining and Strengthening Catholic Identity**
The previous section might lead one to ask, whose job is it to advance the Catholic mission and where should it be made visible on Catholic campuses? *Ex corde Ecclesiae* is unequivocal on the subject: “While the responsibility for maintaining and strengthening Catholic identity is primarily seen as the duty of university authorities, it is to be “shared in varying degrees by all members of the university community...especially teachers and administrators” (Pope John Paul II, 1990, Article 4§1).

Recognizing that virtually every individual on a Catholic campus can and should have a role to play in generating and sustaining its Catholic character, the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (n.d) developed a series of brochures entitled “Strengthening Catholic Identity” which provides guidance and suggestions for everyone from presidents and chief academic officers to faculty members to student affairs, admissions, and operations professionals. Here, I focus on the roles and responsibilities of three particular groups influencing and carrying out the work of Catholic colleges and universities: the religious founders, the senior leadership, and faculty.

**Charisms, sponsoring congregations, and religious orders.** Historically, authority at Catholic institutions originated from the sponsoring congregation or religious order that established each school. Each group possessed its own distinguishing charism, and these unique variations still find expression on campuses today. Charisms are defined as gifts from God which inspire the
character, culture, and ministerial activities of a religious congregation. An example of one such charism is the Sisters of Mercy whose ministry is focused on service to the poor, sick, and uneducated. Their distinct ministry is actualized by providing health care, education, and pastoral care to the most vulnerable in society (Sanders, 2010). Likewise, the Edmundites practice a ministry based on service, hospitality, social justice, education, spiritual development, and pastoral ministry (Cronogue, 2009). The Jesuit tradition is committed to a “faith that does justice” which emphasizes solidarity with the oppressed (Currie, 2011). These three orders, along with the Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans, are part of the over forty distinct sponsoring congregations of Catholic colleges and universities. Each possesses a unique set of defining characteristics and ministerial emphases (Govert, 2010; Kelley, 2010; Hagstrom, 2010). Where there are congregations sponsoring multiple educational institutions in disparate locations (such as the Benedictines, Jesuits, or Sisters of Mercy), members within those congregations have banded together or formed associations to discern how they might collectively strengthen their charisms in higher education and define their particular style (Association of Benedictine Colleges and Universities, 2010; Carney, 2010; Currie, 2010).

Despite this intentional variety, each charism carries something vital in common with the others: the ability to offer stability and renewal to its respective institutions (Sanders, 2010). These dual postures might at first seem to
be at odds with one another; however, they are both thought necessary to the maintenance of an authentic institutional identity as well as the ability to respond in a nimble fashion to the concerns and realities of the day. On one hand, charisms provide stability when used as reference points to maintain fidelity to its organizational ministries. Mission statements derived from the charism help direct institutional activities in a way that transmits and preserves the ethos of the educational community. Renewal, on the other hand, enables a congregation to respond to emerging needs in society or to discontinue a ministry that it no longer has the resources to support. There seems to be a consensus that the individual charism should not overshadow Catholicism, nor should it be an either/or proposition. Rather, each can enrich and deepen the moral and intellectual traditions of the other (Currie, 2011; Heft, 2012; Sanders, 2010).

Recent decades have witnessed the steady decline of religious vocations which has directly affected the number of nuns, brothers, and priests leading and teaching in higher education. Catholic institutions are at a critical moment in time as lay leaders are becoming increasingly important in the preservation and renewal of Catholic identity, in general, and of charisms, in particular. Such changes call for revisiting and revitalizing the mission of Catholic institutions as well as ensuring that representatives from all spheres of influence are committed to supporting Catholic culture on campus (Hagstrom, 2013; Hellwig, 2000).
Responsibility for making Catholic identity “vitally present and operative”—to use the language of *Ex corde*—cannot reside solely in campus ministry offices or theology departments (Heft, 2012). This is not unlike the call for more distributive leadership in service-learning and civic engagement efforts on campuses (Sandmann & Plater, 2013). Rather than relegating the responsibility to one area, it must be pervasive.

**Presidents and boards of trustees.** Morey and Piderit (2006) contend that presidents and boards of trustees are the campus leadership personnel most responsible for making Catholic culture and identity a priority. Since *Ex corde*, there has been a significant rise in mission officers on Catholic campuses. Nearly 80% of U.S. institutions holding membership in the Association for Catholic Colleges and Universities now have a mission officer dedicated to advancing the Catholic mission of their schools. Mission officers serve to orient current groups and new members to the institution’s mission and Catholic heritage, particularly boards of trustees which are frequently populated with a high number of laypersons (Galligan-Stierle, 2014b). So widespread is the use of mission officers that the ACCU has published two volumes specifically designed to inform their work (Galligan-Stierle, 2014a; Galligan-Stierle, 2015).

**The faculty role in contributing to institutional mission and Catholic social teaching.** Faculty are well positioned to directly influence the way students experience the institution’s mission and to develop the habits of mind
sought in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. Indeed, as the intellectual leaders of the campus, “it is the faculty who ultimately express and define a university’s deepest convictions” (Briel, 2012, p. 172). *Instrumentum Laboris* expresses the obligation for teachers to create environments conducive to active engagement with the values of the institution by fostering caring relationships between professors and students as well as concern for local community needs:

>Schools would not be a complete learning environment if, what pupils learnt, did not also become an occasion to serve the local community... It would be advisable for teachers to provide their students with opportunities to realize the social impact of what they are studying, thus favoring the discovery of the link between school and life, as well as the development of a sense of responsibility and active citizenship...

>Education is endowed with an ethical dimension: knowing how to do things and what we want to do, daring to change society and the world, and serving the community. (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2014)

The ACCU echoes this pronouncement, urging that classroom concepts be put into practice through such pedagogies as service-learning so that institutional culture is infused with the principles of Catholic Social Teaching (ACCU, n.d.). Recent research has demonstrated service-learning’s connection to spiritual development in the following ways: positive growth in engaging in a spiritual quest, developing an ethic of caring, and fostering an ecumenical
worldview (Astin, Astin & Lindholm, 2011). If themes such as Catholic social teaching and pedagogies such as service-learning are considered desirable, if not integral, to a Catholic post-secondary education, one might expect that faculty would not only be highly encouraged to infuse them into their teaching practice, but also would be subsequently acknowledged and rewarded for such efforts.

Since this study seeks to explore alignment between Catholic mission and faculty rewards, it is instructive to first consider what it looks like when faculty practice is aligned with the mission at Catholic institutions.

**Faculty applications of community engagement.** There are a variety of ways in which Catholic social teaching and community engagement can be applied across the disciplines. McMahon (2014) made the case for the inclusion of service learning in the core curriculum and, more specifically, presents models for integrating it into theology coursework as a way for students to test the “truth claims” of the Catholic tradition. Sullivan & Post (2011) demonstrated how the CST principles of solidarity, subsidiarity, and a preferential option for the poor were addressed in courses on leadership, community organizing, political processes, and social movements found in their sociology and interdisciplinary studies departments. The courses used an integrated approach in which community engagement projects were informed by theoretical knowledge from history, behavioral psychology, political science, and sociology.

In addition, students became familiar with Vatican and U.S. Conference of
Catholic Bishops letters, statements, and documents as well as case studies and autobiographical works from lay leaders involved in justice movements. All of these sources provided an historical perspective of the Catholic response to issues such as immigration, worker’s rights, poverty, and conflict. Drawing upon the principles of CST, students were called to move beyond charitable or sympathetic responses to a more thorough examination of the conditions which lead to unjust circumstances. Through the intentional connection of various textual and experiential sources of knowledge, faculty sought to enable students’ intellectual, spiritual, and civic development. Feedback from students revealed that the class enhanced their capacity to be engaged citizens as well as their commitment to faith in action. For many, the experience led them to revise their career plans to include an orientation towards serving the marginalized and disenfranchised.

Similarly, Garcia-Contreras, Faletta, and Krustchinsky (2011) viewed their course-based community engagement efforts as being in direct alignment with the University of St. Thomas’s Catholic mission. Like Sullivan and Post, they emphasized that justice is not charity or altruism. Applying a justice orientation to service requires working in solidarity with others, not merely doing things for them. In this way, cooperation serves as a counterbalance to destructive forms of competition and conflict. The impulse to cooperate and to recognize the rights of others is embodied in the principle of solidarity. Further, if a free and just
community life is the aim of civil society, everyone within the community has a responsibility to contribute to the advancement and preservation of that civil society using the principle of subsidiarity. Community members have the right to collaborate and work together to get their needs met and to enhance their well-being.

The authors, as scholarly practitioners, highlight two concrete examples of community-based projects which serve the aims of solidarity and subsidiarity. Students in a Math Methods course for undergraduates planned and delivered a family math night at a local low-income elementary school working in collaboration with teachers, parents, staff, and school administrators. In a second scenario, faculty established international partnerships for a microfinance program designed to assist the working poor in gaining economic independence in various locations around the world. This program was integrated into courses on international development and social entrepreneurship. In the latter case, students learned that humanitarian aims supporting social entrepreneurship can work in concert with business and economic objectives. Two papal encyclicals gave meaning to this program. Pope Benedict XVI’s *Caritas in Veritate* ("In Charity and Truth") endorsed micro-lending programs as an ethical approach to human development while Pope Paul VI’s *Populorum Progressio* ("On the Development of Peoples") emphasized the need for development to be people-centered. The preferential option for the poor was
actualized by enabling loan recipients to both contribute to and benefit from the economy. Through these two methods of fostering human dignity and solidarity (education and microfinance), St. Thomas University professors sought to transform, not only their students’ lives, but also those communities with whom they worked.

St. John’s University in Queens, New York unites both the Catholic tradition and its Vincentian charism in their mission to “be known worldwide for addressing poverty and social justice” (Sinatra and Maher, 2012, p. 66). In an effort to revitalize this mission, a Center for Social Action was established for “all levels of the university community from incoming freshmen to the board of trustees [to become] involved in Vincentian outreach to serve the poor, needy, and disenfranchised” (82). Its main aim has been to integrate scholarly work with the needs of community organizations through mentoring practices, community-driven research activity, and community service. At its core is an academic service-learning program in which faculty across the disciplines not only teach service-learning courses, but also supervise community-based student research projects and conduct their own research informed by community needs. In a faculty survey about outcomes of the program, faculty reported that their use of service-learning provided a tangible and meaningful way to engage in the University’s Catholic mission, and it in turn, encouraged students to do so; however, faculty also reported that their involvement was not adequately
recognized or rewarded in reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes. Although faculty members doing this work are acknowledged through certificates of achievement, stipends, or training, it is clear that in order to sustain robust faculty participation the University must address greater alignment between their mission-driven community efforts and the rewards that count most to faculty.

In quite a different application of service-learning on a Catholic campus, Guiry (2012), a marketing professor concerned about the lack of mission-focused professional development available at his institution, independently pursued a service activity as a means to deepen his understanding of the University’s mission and Catholic social teaching. He was interested in how CST might apply to the business school so he could integrate it more intentionally into the curriculum. The University’s mission is to educate students to become “concerned and enlightened citizens” through a curriculum that emphasizes social justice and community service, and a call to meet the spiritual and material needs of people (p. 234-35).

Guiry related how engaging in an international service-learning experience with a nonprofit organization focused on women’s development helped him to cultivate a better understanding of his Catholic University’s mission and the principles of CST. He recalls that when he first joined the university community, he knew little about Catholic history, philosophy, and
theology, or how those perspectives might inform his teaching and research as a faculty member in the business school. Guiry’s admission is consistent with research findings indicating that across Catholic higher education, there is a general lack of faculty development opportunities focused on orienting the professoriate to the Catholic Intellectual Tradition (Morey & Piderit, 2006). In the international service activity, Guiry used his knowledge as a marketing professor to conduct educational workshops in Tanzania for women who owned small businesses or hoped to start one. The aim was to improve distribution and sales techniques to help the businesses thrive. Through interactions with the women participants, he developed an awareness of local, non-Western market conditions that directly impacted the women’s business approach. The development of this understanding through dialogue with the women demonstrated an important component of solidarity. Guiry found that he internalized the principles of CST by analyzing the nonprofit’s core operating principles for alignment with the seven principles of CST. For example, by acknowledging women as “cultural shapers” of their communities, they are deserving of education that will help them contribute more fully to the life of that community. Providing education, in turn, enhances the life and dignity of the human person. Since the organization Guiry worked with insisted on social empowerment, local ownership, and long-term sustainability in its practices, he was able to experience how these practices related to CST’s commitment to
secure essential rights and responsibilities of individuals. Upon return from his service immersion experiences, Guiry incorporated mission understanding and CST principles into his marketing courses by implementing assignments asking students to evaluate case studies and the ethical nature of marketing practices using CST principles. The message within his example is a call for more active ways for faculty to be engaged with the mission of the University. Additionally, he recommended that part of hiring for mission might include looking for candidates with service-learning experience.

The above examples of community engagement demonstrate the infusion of CST across disciplines and faculty responsibilities, challenging the notion of “mission-free zones” in the curriculum or co-curriculum (Prusak, 2015). Still, Killen (2015) declares that “No core can bear the weight of being the sole repository and primary communicator of mission and Catholic identity at our institutions.” He reiterates the message of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* in asserting that it is everyone’s responsibility in all realms and ranks of the institution to contribute to the worldview, vision, practice, and culture that distinguishes a Catholic education. This is all to say that despite the challenges faced internally (within the Catholic educational community) and outside the academy (external, secular forces), in order to strengthen mission and identity, the task must be pervasive in all efforts, not just relegated to one office or left to individual choice. At the same time, one does not have to be Catholic or of any faith at all to positively
contribute to the Catholic vision and values (Briel, 2012). Likewise, students do not need to have a Catholic background to understand or work within the framework of CST (Sullivan & Post, 2011).

I now turn to a discussion of the faculty reward systems which influence a faculty’s commitment to institutional mission and the forms of community engagement described above. To do so requires an explanation of faculty roles and motivations, the meaning of scholarship in higher education, and the content and aims of RPT policies.

**Part II: What is the Connection Between Faculty Roles, Forms of Scholarship, and Community Engagement?**

In one of the very few pieces of recent literature on Catholic mission and identity which addressed a connection to faculty reward structures, Briel (2012) asserted that a part of any overarching strategy to enhance Catholic culture must include hiring for mission and training faculty about the Catholic Intellectual Tradition as well as the institution’s guiding charism. Institutions should also be clear about how faculty contributions to the mission and culture will be evaluated for promotion and tenure. If the mission of the institution should shape “distinctive curricula and research” as Heft (2012) contends, then where and how is this expectation ensured? Catholic universities need to establish a clear position in helping to set a research agenda that encourages faculty to select and conduct research that resonates with the Catholic intellectual tradition. One
example is joining with colleagues at other Catholic institutions on major research projects aimed at addressing world hunger, conflict resolution, development issues and so forth (Hellwig, 2000). Institutional policy on faculty scholarship and rewards as well as the connection to community engagement in its many manifestations are the topics I discuss in this next section.

One of the principal challenges for community engagement gaining broader acceptance in academia is the absence of uniform or clear definitions (Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010). Thus a number of academics have devoted their energies to providing clarity about what fits under the modern day umbrella of scholarship as it applies to the higher education landscape and, more particularly, what is meant by various forms of engaged scholarship such as public scholarship, professional service, or community-based research (Diamond, 1999; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; O’Meara, 2000; O’Meara & Rice, 2005). Most of these approaches stem from Ernest Boyer’s (1990) expanded conception of scholarship outlined in Scholarship Reconsidered. Boyer argued that higher education institutions had an obligation to broaden the scope of scholarship beyond its narrow paradigm of basic research in order to align with the long-held belief that a university exists to provide a public good, not just private benefits (Boyer, 1996). He even went so far as to say that “society itself has a great stake in how scholarship is defined” because it has implications for the extent to which higher education involves itself in addressing the most critical
challenges threatening society’s well-being (1990, p. 77). Boyer proposed four major forms of scholarship that constitute faculty productivity: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The latter form of scholarship, teaching, he later revised to be called knowledge-sharing. Each form of scholarship along with its focus of inquiry and function are summarized in Table 4. All require that faculty remain current in their fields, and all have the capacity to be peer-reviewed and rigorously assessed whether the focus is on process or product.

Table 4: Summary of Boyer’s Definitions of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Scholarship</th>
<th>Asks</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Discovery</td>
<td><em>What is to be known? What is yet to be found?</em></td>
<td>Scholarly work consists of basic investigative research aimed at expanding human knowledge and enhancing the intellectual environment of a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Integration</td>
<td><em>What do the findings mean?</em></td>
<td>Scholarly work acknowledges the value of interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and integrative approaches where connections are made across disciplines and varied contexts. Concerns itself with where fields converge. Patterns and relationships are constructed or derived from various ways of knowing. Facts from one area of research are weighed against or applied to facts from other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scholarship of Application | *How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems in ways that are helpful to individuals and institutions?*  
*How might social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?* | Scholarly work makes knowledge useful in the world and serves the larger community. Service as scholarship is not merely “doing good.” “To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity” (p. 22). The intellectual process is a two-way street that “both applies and contributes to human knowledge” (p. 23). |
| Scholarship of Teaching or Scholarship of | *How can knowledge be communicated to the world and passed from one generation to the next?* | Teaching is the most active way of transmitting knowledge. It prevents other forms of scholarship from being divorced from the world. Good teaching requires that teachers be well-informed and immersed in the knowledge of their field. The work of the teacher-scholar has value when it is understood by others. This extends |
Historically, teaching and passing down what was already known was the principal duty of faculty (DeBlanco, 2012). It was at the heart of the first formal institutions of higher learning. Newman, in establishing his Catholic university in 19th century Ireland, embraced a faculty member’s primary responsibility for disseminating established knowledge—what Boyer would have labeled the scholarship of teaching. Since Newman was interested in the overlap between faith and reason, one might also argue that he espoused the scholarship of integration to some degree, even if it was quite a narrow conception of integration. For example, his idea of a liberal education was based almost exclusively on classical and Eurocentric texts presented in the English language. He largely eschewed the emerging subjects and research models of his day and effectively ignored the intellectual offerings from non-European cultures. He was mostly concerned with making an argument for the place of Catholic theology in the university setting as discussed earlier in this paper. Boyer, on the other hand, held a much more expansive notion of integration. In his view, integration seeks connections not only across disciplines, but also across the traditional faculty roles of teaching, research, and service (Franz, 2009). I should note here, too, that *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* adopted a favorable stance towards the scholarship of integration, stating that integration of knowledge is essential to
the search for truth and that various disciplines must be brought into dialogue with each other in order to achieve an advanced synthesis of knowledge and understanding (Pope John Paul II, 1990).

As faculty began to take on roles of self-governance and administration (to include peer review as part of RPT processes), service to the institution became a part of the faculty workload in addition to teaching. The expectation for research, knowledge-generation, and publication came later in American educational history. With the rise of funded research in the 20th century, the scholarship of discovery gained a prominent place in faculty responsibilities and tenure at U.S. institutions. Over time it has become the most important factor in gaining promotion and tenure, frequently given the most weight in faculty evaluations regardless of institutional type or the particular mission of the college or university (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Christensen & Eyler, 2011).

Meanwhile, the scholarship of integration and of application have been relegated to marginalized positions. Boyer points out, though, that at an earlier stage of U.S. history, the higher education system was highly valued for its practical contributions to the nation in areas such as agriculture, technology, and industry. Tangible support for applied knowledge was supplied through the Land Grant acts and a host of subsequent federal programs (Boyer, 1996). Boyer conjectures that higher education’s influence has diminished in recent decades.
precisely because it has become less useful: “Being an intellectual has come to
mean being in the university and holding a faculty appointment, preferably a
tenured one, of writing in a certain style understood only by one’s peers, of
conforming to an academic rewards system that encourages disengagement and
even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to nonacademics or
popularized….meanwhile the overall work of the academy does not seem
particularly relevant to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and
moral problems” (Boyer, 1996, p. 13-14).

The concern about the over-emphasis on research is that it has come at the
expense of teaching and other scholarly activities: “[T]he requirements of tenure
and promotion continue to focus heavily on research and on articles published in
refereed journals” (Boyer, 1990, p. 28). Boyer contends that the dominant model
of favoring research and publication productivity does not align with the unique
missions of many colleges and universities. Some forms of scholarship should
receive greater attention than others depending on the institution type and
mission. Research universities are best positioned to emphasize the scholarship
of discovery and application, liberal arts colleges the scholarship of teaching and
integration, community colleges the scholarship of teaching, and so on (Braxton,
Luckey, & Helland, 2002). For example, the mission of Madonna University, a
Catholic university in Michigan, has a particular emphasis on teaching and
service, thus the scholarships of application, integration, and teaching reinforce
this mission most directly (Bozyk, 2005).

Boyer’s overarching argument was not necessarily to push for a greater
industry-wide balance in faculty workload between the various forms of
scholarship; rather, he was more concerned with each form of scholarship
achieving equal legitimacy and recognition so institutions can better align their
reward systems with their missions and faculty can choose where to devote their
energies at various points in their academic careers. A broader embrace of
scholarship would help institutions acknowledge the full range of professional
work in which faculty should and do engage.

In recent years, there are indicators of shifts in thinking towards faculty
work focusing on serving the larger society, but this shift has not been
accompanied by a release on pressure to do research. That is, faculty are
expected to do more of everything else, but not less research (Schnaubelt &
Statham, 2007). When scholarship is defined narrowly (i.e. basic, peer-reviewed
research published in a narrow range of acceptable venues), it creates a climate of
anxiety, and provides little incentive for faculty to think and act creatively, to
consider the ways their work could impact the greater good, to work
collaboratively, or to promote integration across the three areas of responsibility.
It also can be unfair or impose additional challenges for those in disciplines with
a limited number of professional journals in which to publish. At the same time,
the system that promotes the drive for publications has led to a proliferation of new journals across a range of disciplinary areas. Publications that are read by very few and primarily within a small circle of disciplinary colleagues may be seen as having little value to society at large, something Christensen & Eyring (2011) referred to as scholarship of “dubious worth.” When publication becomes the primary goal of faculty activity, it can lead to individuals devoting ever-increasing energy to merely looking good or even creating work that is self-referential (in order to increase one’s “impact factor,” a measure of other academics citing one’s work) as opposed to making the work applicable to the world.

In terms of teaching responsibilities, faculty motivations for using the form of engaged scholarship known as service-learning might include one or more of the following interests: addressing the mission of the institution; meeting the needs of a community partner; teaching students civic, multicultural, or disciplinary skills; or expressing one’s personal identity which includes a commitment to a social cause or spiritual/religious foundation (O’Meara & Niehaus, 2009). When faculty perceive an institutional commitment to community engagement, this perception has a greater positive effect on faculty using their scholarship to address local community needs over any other factor, including disciplinary culture, institution type, and individual faculty characteristics (such as race, gender, academic rank, political orientation, etc.).
Institutional selectivity (i.e. working for a prestige-oriented institution), on the other hand, was found to decrease the likelihood of faculty using their scholarship to address community needs (Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010).

Faculty disinterest in attending to the civic mission of higher education is largely due to three factors according to Checkoway (2001). Firstly, academic culture does not encourage a public role or engagement with the community, and faculty training rarely includes civic content. Faculty are “conditioned to believe that the civic competencies of students and the problems of society are not central to their roles in the university” (p. 135). Secondly, faculty members view their primary commitment as being to their respective disciplines, departments, and professional fields, not necessarily to their institutions. As a result, senior faculty mentors warn junior members against straying from an entrenched allegiance to their disciplines and departments which discourages interdisciplinary work and the scholarship of integration. Thirdly, traditional forms of scholarship (i.e. positivist) are favored in university settings while public work is generally not rewarded in the pay, promotion, and tenure structures.

Saltmarsh & Hartley (2001) claim that institutions of higher education are not giving a high enough priority to their civic missions and many policies do not align with the rhetoric inhabiting their mission statements. This condition
trickles down to the college student experience where a void is felt regarding the connections between and amongst disciplinary study, public processes, social responsibility, and the development of a personal sense of agency. In addition, many institutions increasingly feel market pressures to cater to those focused on the extrinsic, utilitarian value of higher education at the expense of intrinsic purposes such as citizenship, character development, and contributions to a common good (Labaree, 1997). As students pursue coveted credentials and the upward social mobility which post-secondary education brings with it, less attention is paid to civic virtue and civic participation. Through their policies and actions, society and institutions, in turn, confirm to students the message that higher education is more about personal gain and social positioning than about protecting and preserving the democracy upon which such individual freedoms rest. Many observers and scholars of higher education have called for restoring public trust and the value of public service in higher education, and many point to RPT policies (faculty rewards) as critical to this effort (Fairweather, 1996; O’Meara, 2015; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).

This section of the literature review considered how the evolution of higher education and academic culture have shaped faculty roles and responsibilities as well as beliefs about the place of community engagement in the academy. Next, I turn my attention to policy design strategies and revision
processes for the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure polices that support community engagement.

**Part III: How Can Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies Support Community Engagement?**

This section considers how reappointment, promotion, and tenure guidelines might best support community engagement and public scholarship. If the goals of a college or university are to be reached, the faculty reward system must support these initiatives. RPT guidelines, then, should place emphasis on articulating the relationship between the promotion and tenure system and the mission of the institution (Zahorski, 2005). Further, RPT guidelines should demonstrate the range of activities that qualify as scholarly work, establish the criteria that will be used to evaluate scholarship, and identify the range of documentation that is acceptable for evaluation (Diamond, 1999). An additional characteristic of an effective promotion and tenure system is that it acknowledges differences amongst the disciplines as well as amongst individuals. Though institution-wide policies are important to communicating broad faculty expectations, it is recommended that language should be most specific at the departmental level because this is where faculty look for particular guidance.

RPT guidelines should recognize that faculty will focus on different areas of scholarship at different stages in their careers. Rather than narrowly defining
scholarship, the emphasis should be placed on identifying common desirable characteristics of scholarly work. These include innovation, originality, significance, impact, and demonstration of a high level of discipline-related expertise as well as the ability of the faculty work to be documented, replicated, and peer reviewed (Diamond, 1999).

Regarding processes for revising RPT policies, it is recommended that a definitional phase (deciding what constitutes scholarship) precede policy and implementation phases, and that this initial philosophical discussion be grounded in a common language using, for example, Boyer’s framework to orient the discussion. An intentionally sequential approach in policy development allows for an objective consideration of each phase so that questions about implementation do not interfere with judgments about the value of various forms of scholarship (Zahorski, 2005).

Faculty at St. Norbert’s College, for example, cited the benefits of a deliberative process in revising their RPT guidelines to include a broadened understanding of scholarship. The resulting perception of more fair and inclusive guidelines led to an increase in interdisciplinary scholarship, collaborative scholarship, research on teaching, and an expanded view of knowledge-sharing (Zahorski, 2005).

While Boyer’s efforts to establish priorities of the professoriate have helped to expand notions of scholarship in higher education, his publications
have prompted important questions about how to identify and evaluate such work. These issues have since been taken up by scholars who recognize that in order for professional faculty work to be assigned value, one must have standards by which to judge the work and a clear understanding of who is qualified to evaluate it. RPT policies which include clarification about how to identify, document, and evaluate engaged scholarship is necessary to enable such work and allow for it to be adequately rewarded.

**Identifying Engaged Scholarship**

The earlier discussion on Boyer’s model revealed that scholarship is not synonymous with research alone. Basic, investigative research pursued for the sake of advancing one’s field is but one form of scholarship. There are necessary overlaps among and between the various forms of scholarship laid out in his framework. Those examining the phenomenon of engaged scholarship since Boyer’s seminal work in 1990 have sought to concretely illustrate the more capacious view he proposed. Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2010), for example, delineated 14 types of publicly engaged scholarship based on tenured faculty member’s own practice and descriptions of the work they do as engaged scholars. They grouped faculty activities into four categories: publicly engaged research and creative activities; publicly engaged instruction; publicly engaged service; and publicly engaged commercialized activities. Their useful typology of scholarship resists restrictive, discipline-specific terminology in favor of a
more universal language allowing scholars to readily recognize the distinct forms of engaged scholarship they themselves employ across the range of disciplines.

Publicly engaged scholarship is primarily distinguished from other forms of scholarship in the following ways. Professional activities are designed to directly involve and benefit a community constituency external to the institution with the expectation that the activity be rooted in a scholarly foundation and make use of a faculty member’s disciplinary expertise. For example, publicly engaged research (also referred to as community-based research) relies on community input and collaboration in one or more phases of research processes (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). These tasks may include shaping research questions or design; collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; or communicating the results. Publicly engaged research activities might be unfunded or financially supported by nonprofit, foundation, government, industry, or business entities. Regardless of the funding source, the goal of publicly engaged scholarship is to address a problem of public concern or challenge experienced by business, industry, service fields, or trade associations (Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer, 2010).

In the realm of publicly engaged teaching, the focus is on the exchange of knowledge to and from audiences external to the academic institution. The context may be credit-bearing or non-credit bearing. Course-based service-
learning which is designed to involve students in community efforts are captured in this category as are faculty-led workshops and conference presentations to non-academic audiences that capitalize on the faculty member’s particular scholarly expertise. Faculty supervision of internships, practica, and student work placements for the purposes of student career preparation or experiential learning are not considered to be part of publicly engaged instruction.

Other activities that do not meet the definition of engaged scholarship are characterized as volunteer or community service pursued independently of one’s scholarly role, consulting for private purposes rather than on behalf of the institution, and contributions to committees or professional associations which are designed solely to serve one’s institution or academic field. Likewise, basic research projects pursued primarily to benefit an academic field or to yield results shared only with research audiences do not constitute publicly engaged research. These latter activities are all worthy in their own right and have long been rewarded in a variety of ways, either through compensation and recognition within academia, or through established promotion and tenure guidelines related to faculty productivity and commitment to the institution or individual fields. The typology of public scholarship described above explicitly emphasizes the public nature of community engaged scholarship while at the same time endeavoring to be as inclusive and comprehensive as possible. The
typology offers clear language and definitions for scholars and evaluators alike which can, in turn, be used as a reference in the review processes.

Evaluating Engaged Scholarship

Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff (1997) present a set of criteria that can be applied to any form of a scholarly project across disciplines and across Boyer’s four domains. The criteria emphasizes that intellectual projects must demonstrate clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. In this way, evaluation takes into consideration not only the way a scholar works but also the value of what he or she produces. Having clear goals prompts scholars to articulate the purpose of the work, the questions to be addressed, and realistic, achievable objectives. Adequate preparation means the faculty member possesses the appropriate scholarly background (disciplinary specialization) for the project and garners the necessary resources to complete the project. Appropriate methods provides justification for why the chosen technique is correct for the context and how it will be effectively applied. Significant results means demonstrating how goals were achieved, the disciplinary field was enhanced, and/or the work prompted further exploration. Effective presentation refers to the selection of an appropriate forum to disseminate results as well as the organization and style suitable to the intended audience. Lastly, reflective critique involves evaluation
of the project by self and others, taking into account the kinds of evidence used and the lessons learned to inform future projects.

**Peer Review**

Peer review is a critical component of evaluation in promotion and tenure processes. Expanding the definition of scholarship in the ways discussed above requires a commensurate expansion in the boundaries of peer review. Evaluation is based on established expectations for methodological rigor, accountability, demonstration of expertise, and significance of a scholarly activity. Community-engaged scholarship carries with it additional considerations such as evaluating the process of engagement, defining the benefits accrued by the community, and addressing ethical concerns for the community members involved or impacted (Gelmon, Jordan, & Seifer, 2013).

Peer review has traditionally been conducted by those within the academy identified as objective, experienced members of one’s discipline. Reviewers may even be anonymous to increase perceived objectivity. However, since community-engaged scholarship typically relies on partners outside the academy in which relationships are expected to be collaborative and resources, power, and recognition are meant to be shared, one must address the place of non-academic individuals in the peer review process. The impact of scholarly activity takes on new meaning when it moves beyond contributions solely within the discipline (most often measured by subsequent citations by other scholars and the level of
prestige or circulation of the academic journals in which one publishes) to influence on the community at large. A review completed exclusively by one’s academic peers or superiors reinforces the notion that a scholar is only accountable to one’s discipline rather than the public. In community engaged scholarship, one is also accountable to one’s partners and community constituents. Peer reviewers from the community might include program officers from grant organizations, government personnel, or leaders in the nonprofit or business world. Employing such applied expertise to document the impact of a faculty member’s work emphasizes the need and appreciation for a broader scope of impact. In order to ensure a common point of reference for evaluation, peer reviewers from the community should undergo training or provided guidance in peer review processes and standards.

**Policy Tools and Behavioral Assumptions**

Since this dissertation is concerned with the formulation of faculty reward policies and how those policies can support institutional goals for community engagement, here I review various policy tools that can be used to influence those who are the intended targets of a given policy. Each tool operates on an underlying behavioral assumption about how people will respond. In this way, I establish a framework for evaluating the potential of the policy language in this study to enable or constrain faculty behavior towards including community engagement as part of their professional practice.
Schneider and Ingram (1990) delineated five types of policy tools: symbolic/hortatory, incentives, authority, capacity-building, and learning. Symbolic or hortatory policy tools operate through slogans and statements to “associate the preferred activities with positively valued symbols” and to encourage desired behavior (p. 520). Such tools assume that the targets of the policy will be positively influenced by an organization’s cultural values and priorities. Individuals are prompted to take action predicated on a sense of alignment between their personal beliefs and larger institutional goals. In the context of faculty reward policies in higher education, institutional mission and values statements serve as symbolic and hortatory motivators with the intent of inspiring the professional activities of the faculty.

For example, Portland State University (PSU), a secular institution, makes use of the symbolic/hortatory policy tool in their RPT policy document by taking its cue from the school’s motto, “Let knowledge serve the city” (Portland State University, 2014). These words are prominently visible on a public sky bridge embedded in the center of the urban campus in Portland. The policy states: “PSU highly values quality community outreach as part of faculty roles and responsibilities. The setting of Portland State University affords faculty many opportunities to make their expertise useful to the community outside the University.”
The sentiment representing the underlying values at work here is extended in PSU’s vision statement: “PSU values its identity as an engaged university that promotes a reciprocal relationship between the community and the University in which knowledge serves the city and the city contributes to the knowledge of the University. We value our partnerships with other institutions, professional groups, the business community, and community organizations, and the talents and expertise these partnerships bring to the University. We embrace our role as a responsible citizen of the city, the state, the region, and the global community and foster actions, programs, and scholarship that will lead to a sustainable future” (Portland State University, 2014; my emphasis). The pervasive language of community outreach throughout PSU’s policy makes it clear that it is not only an expected and accepted form of scholarship, but also a responsible form of scholarship.

In the context of Catholic higher education, one might expect to find Catholic values and a founding charism represented within institutional mission and vision statements. These are the most prominent places where an institution’s principles and values are publicly displayed (Boylan, 2015). When incorporated into recruitment policies and faculty handbooks for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, such principles may be seen as inspiring and guiding the professional work of faculty.
A second policy tool, incentives, is an unmistakable feature of any college’s or university’s guidelines for faculty promotion and tenure. Policymakers using incentive tools believe that the targets of the policy will be positively motivated by tangible rewards such as money and status. Because RPT documents include the criteria and standards for faculty to gain promotion, tenure, and merit pay, the potential extrinsic rewards for following the policy are highly attractive. Those potential rewards include a secure position at the university as well as pay raises and greater rank, prestige, and recognition. An alternate form of incentive is punishment. That is, people are incentivized to act in a socially acceptable way in order avoid a punishment such as the withholding of a reward or the application of a fine. Meyer and Evans (2003) contend that faculty are generally more productive and produce higher-quality, meaningful work when rewards are based on the promise of what they might contribute to society through their scholarly efforts, rather than on a fear of failure to meet a certain level of output. In this way, RPT policies could be interpreted as a form of reward or punishment depending on how faculty are encouraged to approach their work. What motivates one person may not motivate the next, thus some policy strategies might have the effect of advantaging some and disadvantaging others.

Next, RPT policy documents generally carry the weight of authority behind them. This third policy tool assumes that people are motivated by those
in leadership and are inherently prone to obey authority and respond to hierarchy. RPT policies exercise the authority of administrators and the faculty members who design and approve them by effectively “granting permission” and providing encouragement for faculty to pursue specific activities. Clear support of a policy by people in influential positions (department chairs, academic deans/provosts, RPT committees, college presidents, etc.) tends to motivate faculty towards policy-preferred behaviors. In this scenario, the presence or absence of specific language supporting community engagement as a legitimate and preferred form of scholarship would have a concurrent positive or negative impact on the activities faculty choose to pursue.

A fourth tool, capacity-building, refers to the intent to train people so that they have the skills and abilities necessary to meet the desired behavior established in a policy. In the context of higher education and faculty rewards, capacity-building would include not only support for faculty training in the practice of community engagement and public scholarship, but also evidence of professional development for faculty and administrators who review and make decisions about a candidate’s RPT dossier.

A fifth policy tool, learning, encourages dialogue between the developers of policies and its targets. Learning tools help people evaluate and select the policy tools that they think will be most effective to achieve certain ends. Since faculty are often the ones who develop, challenge, amend, and approve faculty
policies in concert with higher education administrators, they can play a role in evaluating which tools lead to desired behaviors and be a force in changing or revising those tools. Here, one would examine the processes, people, and resources used to develop policy as well as to revise it as new interests and priorities come into play. Is active conversation amongst stakeholders and policy targets a deliberate part of the policy strategy? How? One might look for evidence of an institution following Zahorski’s (2005) recommendations for revising RPT policies which was explored earlier. Do faculty dialogues about the value of various forms of scholarship lead to a clarification of definitions about what is included as scholarship? What resources are used to inform such discussions? Boyer’s framework? Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff’s criteria? Ellis & Eatman’s standards? Do discussions about values and definitions precede decisions about implementation so that the logistics of implementation do not distract or detract from establishing consensus around priorities?

**Best Practices for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy Design**

Policy design for CE should not only take into account the behavioral assumptions of its intended targets (faculty), but also a special understanding of community engagement, forms of scholarship, and RPT structures and protocols. Ellison and Eatman (2008) effectively summarize the principles discussed above. They urge RPT policy-makers to expand “what counts” by embracing a continuum of scholarship and ensuring that policies make clear the answer to the
following questions: Do faculty roles embrace a range of scholarly approaches and many professional pathways, running from traditional field-centered scholarship to reciprocal scholarship and public engagement? Does the policy acknowledge work that builds on collaborations with community and is interpreted so that a broader public can understand it? Does the policy recognize the particular and unique features of community-based work and support the blending of pedagogy, research, creative activity, and publication to achieve that work?

Next, Ellison and Eatman compel policy-makers to demonstrate how RPT policies are informed by the context and culture of the campus. For an institution with a Catholic identity, this would mean determining what the connection is between the college/university’s mission, Catholic identity, and faculty roles as public scholars and community engagement professionals.

Another best practice in policy design is establishing how the institution defines community engagement. Does the RPT policy define the meaning of public scholarship or faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? What are the features and characteristics of these definitions that will guide faculty?

Lastly, Ellison and Eatman recommend that CE supportive RPT policies identify documentation methods, the criteria used to evaluate scholarship, and
acceptable peer and external reviewers to include “any and all relevant publics and audiences for the achievements of the candidate” (p. 14).

Summary of Literature Review and Application to Study

This dissertation examines the alignment between institutional mission and faculty reward policies for community engagement in the context of Catholic higher education. The literature review provides the background for three areas of concern: 1) the culture and mission of Catholic higher education; 2) an understanding of faculty roles, community-engagement, and forms of scholarship; and 3) best practices for faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies that enable and reward forms of community engagement. In the next three chapters, I draw upon the definitions, models, and concepts discussed in the literature review to examine and evaluate the recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies at Catholic institutions holding the Carnegie “Community Engagement” Classification.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This study focused on how 31 Catholic higher education institutions designated with the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification recognize and reward community engagement in their recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. The Classification is conferred by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which invites post-secondary institutions to voluntarily self-assess their institution-wide commitment to community engagement through a comprehensive application and documentation process. My study sought to discover the extent to which the 31 Catholic institutions align their faculty policies with their espoused missions—missions that are informed by their faith-based foundations and reflect a commitment to community engagement. The three main questions explored in this study included the following: 1) How do institutions of Catholic higher education characterize their mission, values, and identity in the 21st century? 2) To what extent do faculty recruitment, tenure, and promotion policies of Carnegie CE classified Catholic colleges and universities reflect their distinct institutional mission and identity through a commitment to community engaged teaching, scholarship, and service? 3) What policy exemplars from Carnegie CE Classified Catholic colleges & universities might inform institutions that are interested in strengthening the alignment between institutional mission/Catholic identity and faculty roles and rewards?
Content analysis is defined in the literature as a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text through a systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns. Krippendorff (2004) defined content analysis as a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context. Other researchers describe content analysis as a tool that can be used to determine the presence of certain words, concepts, and phrases within text allowing the researcher to make valid interpretations of text (Berelson, 1952; Weber, 1990). Generally, content analysis is a method that involves several steps including explaining the process and rationale for selecting this methodology, defining the units of content to be examined and coded, preparing the content for coding and developing coding categories, and analyzing and/or interpreting the results (Krippendorff, 2004).

In this chapter, I begin by offering the rationale for choosing a content analysis methodology to address my research questions. I then identify my research sample and the institutions targeted in the study. This is followed by a description of the data sources and instruments used for the data analysis. Finally, I round out the chapter with a review of the delimitations and limitations of my study as well as matters of trustworthiness and credibility of the study.

**Rationale for Research Methodology and Design**

At least one intention of my study was to identify enabling or constraining language for community engagement in faculty reward policies. Content
analysis offers a systematic method of examining a key system of communication (i.e. RPT policies) embedded in the academic culture of institutions of higher education. Content analysis as an empirically grounded method which is exploratory in nature and capable of producing valid predictions and inferences. (Krippendorf, 2004). It requires a systematic reading of texts allowing the researcher to gather evidence about the message or intended communication as contained in the text. The epistemology that underpins content analysis values human discourse, knowledge, and behavioral motivations. Content analysts examine texts “in order to understand what they mean to people, what they enable or prevent, and what the information conveyed by them does” (Krippendorff, 2004, xviii).

O’Meara (2013) laid out important directions for new research on faculty motivations for service-learning and community engagement, and in doing so, offered guidance for a further methodology which my study used. She called for a closer look at the structural and cultural conditions that increase faculty members’ motivation and sense of agency related to community engagement work. The RPT policies and institutional commitments examined in this study are examples of structural and cultural conditions that can affect faculty behavior. O’Meara talked about discourse analysis and contended that “[d]iscourse analysis sheds a critical spotlight on how what is said and written about service learning and community engagement represents a particular social
context, identity, beliefs, and values and actively produces and legitimates a
given reality” (p. 233). It is, therefore, fitting that discourse analysis be employed
to address the connections between Catholic identity, values, and faculty reward
policies. When using discourse analysis the researcher can look at the wording
used and explore elements of interpretation.

In research endeavors, the goal is often to discover and present a “stable
reality” as a compelling representation of truth. In content and discourse
analysis, since language and its meanings represent social constructions, it may
be open to many truths: “[P]eople studying discourse see language as
performative and functional: language is never treated as a neutral, transparent,
means of communication” (Rapley, 2007, p. 2). Words, definitions, and usage in
a particular social context both represent the social context and shape it. Likewise,
the methods for employing discourse analysis can vary. The selection and
application of any set of particular tools depends on the goals and needs of the
study (Gee, 2011). In this dissertation, for the evaluation of mission and policy
statements, it made sense to employ the constant comparative method for coding
text and creating categories of meaning.

The constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965) refers to a particular
process of coding, organizing, and analyzing data. The researcher begins by
placing a coded unit (or incident) in a given category and comparing each
successive coded unit with previous units placed in that category. As one
progresses with this unit-to-unit comparison coding, the focus shifts to comparing each unit with the emerging theoretical properties of the whole category. These properties are based on the unit-to-unit comparisons previously made. The analyst next makes comparisons amongst the theoretical properties of the assembled categories. Along the way, the researcher may modify coding schemes based on category properties and re-organize data into new or revised categories. The researcher writes memos summarizing and documenting information about each category in order to develop themes and theories about them. This codified, systematic procedure is designed to raise the credibility of the resulting theory. For example, in my examination of mission statements, I began by looking for units of text that corresponded with the themes of Catholic identity discussed in my literature review. These were categorized as a priori codes. When I encountered units of text that did not fit into those pre-established categories, I established new codes. As I reviewed each successive mission statement, I determined whether units of text might be assigned to one or more of the emerging codes. As more text was assigned to an emerging code, I began to develop a category description which identified the common attributes within that category. Along the way, I documented the newly emergent themes as well as the process by which I arrived at those themes.

In order for an argument or theory about discourse to be convincing, a number of strategies assist in legitimizing researcher claims. These include
detailing the pragmatic and theoretical issues that inform the process; using direct quotes from the source material; comparing findings to previous work available on the subject; and comparing ideas and findings to each other in an iterative process (Rapley, 2007). The essence of qualitative comparative analysis is to explore commonalities and variances between cases using a deductive approach (Vogt, Vogt, Gardner, & Haeffele, 2014). I primarily used a deductive approach in my study because this method is characterized by using theories and ideas to guide data collection and analysis, rather than constructing generalizations and theories from the data. Thus, I first established thematic categories and individual codes based on the literature that informed this study. I then evaluated the cases, searching for evidence of the attributes or conditions defined by the established themes and codes. If new categories or themes emerged, I added these to my codebook. A coding scheme allows qualitative researchers to make decisions about content and sort text based on pre-determined attributes or emerging ones (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

I analyzed the mission and vision statements of the 31 cases in this study for attention to themes such as guiding charism and the Catholic intellectual tradition, moral tradition, and social teaching. This analysis formed an understanding of how contemporary Catholic institutions of higher education articulate their mission, values, identity, and commitment to community engagement. I compared these findings to several prior studies on Catholic
mission statements (Estanek, James, & Norton, 2006; Gambescia & Paolucci, 2011; Young, 2001) as recommend by Rapley (2007). Similarly, I was able to compare language contained in the RPT policies to the literature on community engagement, a technique to determine if there was a common understanding of terms pertinent to this study such as service-learning, public (or engaged) scholarship, and so forth.

Next, I used Schneider and Ingram’s (1990) behavioral assumptions of policy tools to evaluate each policy’s ability to enable or constrain community engagement practices of faculty within Catholic colleges and universities. I sought evidence for and coded text that demonstrated use of the five policy tools described in the literature review: symbolic/hortatory, incentives, authority, capacity-building, and learning.

In addition to the policy tools above that served as one portion of the coding scheme for my content analysis, I applied Ellison & Eatman’s (2008) considerations for designing tenure and promotion policies for community engagement and public scholarship. This allowed me to determine whether and/or how these elements were exemplified in the policies and practices under examination. Specifically, I sorted the policy language into the following categories which served as a second set of a priori codes: defines the meaning of public scholarship; policy connects to campus context/mission, clarifies faculty
roles and supports a continuum of scholarship. Many of these attributes mirror
the information sought in the Carnegie application questions.

In sum, three sets of predetermined codes—Catholic mission and values,
policy tools, and supportive tenure and promotion policy language for public
scholarship—formed my codebook of themes. In my analysis of the text, I
searched for the presence, absence, and frequency of keywords from the
literature review on Catholic mission, themes, and values as well as on tenure
and promotion policy design. In other instances, I coded text by applying
theoretical concepts such as the behavioral assumptions of policy tools. These
deductive approaches to content analysis are known as summative (coding by
keywords) and directed (coding by theory), respectively. A third, conventional,
approach relies on inductive methods where codes and themes arise from the
data itself to represent emerging patterns not determined by the literature or
theory (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This third approach was applied, for instance,
when determining attributes of recruitment practices and policies. Table 5
presents a summary of only the pre-determined categorical variables used in this
study which were used as a starting point for analysis. Taken together, this
coding scheme helped me to assess not only the extent to which the recruitment
and RPT policies in question were designed to enable or constrain faculty use of
community engagement as a valid and valued form of scholarship, but also the
extent to which Catholic principles are associated with these efforts. I refer back
to the content analysis strategies discussed above as I present my findings later in this paper.

Table 5: Summary of Categorical Variables (*a priori* codes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission: Themes and Values</th>
<th>Schneider and Ingram’s Policy Tools</th>
<th>Ellison &amp; Eatman’s considerations for tenure and promotion policy design supporting community engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority for community engagement</td>
<td>Symbolic/hortatory</td>
<td>Defines the meaning of public scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charism</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Makes a connection between the college/university’s mission and public scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Intellectual Tradition</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Faculty roles include CE and support a continuum of scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Moral Tradition</td>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Teaching (7 Themes)</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the initial content analysis of individual cases described above, the next phase involved building cross-case displays comparing the cases to each other. Some cross-case displays allowed me to explore, describe, and evaluate the text from the Carnegie applications while others helped me to compare and visually rank order the cases by the presence of certain attributes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For example, if a case revealed few to no attributes of Ellison & Eatman’s best practices in policy language, then the case ranked low in this category. If the case exhibited a given number of attributes for institutional understanding and support of community engagement as part of a faculty member’s professional responsibilities, then the case ranked high. Similarly, if
no references to Catholic values or the mission of the institution were incorporated into faculty reward policies, then the case would receive a low rank for documented alignment between mission and policy for faculty expectations; whereas, a case that demonstrated clear attention to these themes received a higher rank. Ultimately, the presence or absence of the policy tools and language that supports CE determined whether the institutions in the study used enabling or constraining language, and thus how they ranked in terms of their alignment with professed missions of community engagement.

Prior research demonstrates that RPT policies explicitly defining, supporting, and rewarding community engagement practices are not widespread, even among the most engaged campuses. I hypothesized this might be the case for many of the 31 institutions in my study; however, I also hoped to encounter one or more policy documents that stood as outliers to the others in their clear commitment to community engagement through faculty roles and rewards. Thus, in the final phase of my study, I conducted an atypical case study analysis to identify the salient features of a policy deemed exemplary. Atypical case study analysis acknowledges information from a data set that is not typical (Vogt, Vogt, Gardner, & Haefele, 2014).

Overall, the use of content analysis, data displays, cross-case analysis, and atypical case study analysis enabled me to not only demonstrate the representative characteristics of mission and policies in the research sample, but
also to reveal the extent to which these two components were aligned or misaligned at those institutions, thereby bringing balance to the full study.

**Research Sample and Target Institutions**

To address my research questions, this study examined the mission statements and recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies of 31 Catholic colleges and universities as reported on the Carnegie application. All of the institutions (cases) in this target cohort are members of the Association of Catholic Colleges & Universities (ACCU) who received the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification in 2015 (see Tables 6 and 7). These two affiliations suggest that each institution in the cohort has both a distinct Catholic identity and demonstrates a high commitment to community engagement, making for fitting units of analysis. The advantage of using an intermediate number of cases (between 10-40) is that it helped to maximize the ability for robust comparison across cases (Vogt, Vogt, Gardner, & Haeffelle, 2014).

Estanek, James, and Norton (2006) argued that considerations of mission belong in any serious institutional assessment process and that the “fundamental principles and values of Catholic identity are operationalized and realized by each individual Catholic college and university” (p. 205). An analysis of the mission, vision and identity statements of the target cohort in this study,
therefore, formed the foundational concepts necessary to make connections between their institutional values and reward policies.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is an ideal source of data for studying institutional commitment to community engagement as it is one of the few organizations collecting both quantitative and qualitative national data across all elements of institutional commitment through its community engagement classification process. The application for the Carnegie designation employed a carefully designed framework with specific questions focused on institutional mission as well as faculty roles and rewards, especially those related to promotion and tenure; therefore, the completed application documents contained the appropriate text to explore the attributes and variables described earlier and most pertinent to this study.

Data gathered from Carnegie CE applications have been used in research studies in the past (Noel & Earwicker, 2014; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Researchers examined the Carnegie applications and policy documents from the first cohort of 76 institutions to receive the classification in 2006 (Saltmarsh et al., 2009). For that iteration of the application, there was only one question asking for evidence of faculty reward policies related to community engagement and it was an optional, not required question. Only 33 institutions affirmatively responded to the question on faculty reward policies addressing community engagement. Of the 33 institutions, only sixteen reported that they had either
recently revised their promotion and tenure guidelines related to CE or were in the process of doing so. Thus the sample size and documentation available for the study was quite small. Since 2006, there have been three additional opportunities for institutions to apply for the CE classification. These took place in 2008, 2010, and 2015. In those applications, faculty role and reward policy questions were no longer optional, signaling a shift in the importance for institutions to address promotion and tenure policies as a marker of institutional commitment to community engagement. (See Appendix A demonstrating how the wording of the questions has changed over time in the 2008, 2010, 2015 Carnegie application templates.)

Each application year has garnered an increase in applicants as well as the number of institutions awarded the classification, thus the pool of data has greatly increased. No research specifically examining the reward policies of these three newest cohorts has been conducted since the 2009 study. My study builds on that initial research, allowing for some comparisons to be made between the two studies along with some insights into a few developments that have occurred over the past decade. Table 6 presents statistics on institutions currently holding the Carnegie CE classification, with a particular focus on ACCU-member institutions.
Table 6: Portrait of Carnegie Classified Campuses

### 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Campuses Nationwide that currently hold the Carnegie “Community Engagement” Classification (classified in either 2010 or 2015)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. institutions that are members of the Association of Catholic Colleges &amp; Universities (ACCU)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU-member institutions that applied for and received CE Classification in 2010 or 2015 (This figure represents all Catholic institutions currently holding the CE classification.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of CE Classifications held by Catholic Institutions out of all institutions that currently hold the classification</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Catholic institutions with ACCU membership holding the CE classification (45/197)</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-Catholic institutions holding the CE classification out of all higher education institutions nationwide (316/3994)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of campuses receiving first-time classification or re-classification in 2015. Represents the cases for this study.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic institutions that applied for and received 1st time or re-classification in 2015.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of CE Classifications held by Catholic Institutions in the 2015 cohort</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Catholic Institutions represented in the 2015 cohort out of all U.S. ACCU-member Catholic Institutions (31/197)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Institutions that were classified in 2010 did not need to re-classify in 2015, so their classification status remains current. Institutions that were classified in 2006 or 2008 were required to submit an application in 2015 to be re-classified. Not all campuses re-applied in 2015 and of those who did re-apply, not all received re-classification. 5 campuses did not receive re-classification. 26 campuses (Catholic and non-Catholic) did not seek re-classification. 7 Catholic Institutions previously classified in 2006 or 2008 were not re-classified in 2015, either because they did not re-apply or did not submit successful applications.

Sources: Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. (2015); New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015a

31 ACCU member schools received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015. All of these institutions are 4-year, private, and not-for-profit. As noted in table 6, thirteen institutions sought classification for the first
time, and eighteen had been previously classified and sought to renew their classification. Table 7 provides a list of the institutions used in this study along with some of their key institutional characteristics such as regional location, CE-classification status, basic Carnegie class, size, and sponsoring charism. All institutions in this study provided consent for their applications to be used for research. Some indicated a preference to remain anonymous while others gave permission for the institution name to be revealed. For consistency’s sake, a pseudonym was assigned for all of the institutions in this study. This is reflected in Table 7.
### Table 7: Institutional Information for Catholic Colleges and Universities Used in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Pseudonym</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CE Elective Classification Status</th>
<th>Basic Carnegie Class</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Founding Charism or Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Franciscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigid University</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement College</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Vincentian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent University</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. David University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Spiritan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard College</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Diocesan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena University</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo College</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lando University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Franciscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Sisters of St. Agnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Vincentian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Natalia University</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Julia</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Sisters of Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hilarius University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marie Rose College</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>LaSallian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pius University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester College</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Franciscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cecilia University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphina College</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Congregation of Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Demetria University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1st time</td>
<td>RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Marianist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Teresa</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Diocesan and Society of the Sacred Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Edmund</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Founded by Archbishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine University</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Augustinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenceslas University</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
<td>Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Jesuit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution of characteristics in the sample population detailed in Table 7 resembles the distribution of characteristics represented in Catholic higher education nationwide in terms of geography, size, basic Carnegie classification, and sponsoring religious congregation. The cohort represents campuses from seventeen states (4 national regions) serving student populations from as small as 2,277 up to 25,072. Regarding basic Carnegie classification distribution, three institutions are baccalaureate, sixteen are master’s, five are research, and seven are doctoral/research.

Table 8: Distribution of Institutional Features for Cases in Study Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution size by population of degree-seeking students (defined by Carnegie)</th>
<th># of Institutions</th>
<th>% of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very small = less than 1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small = 1,000–2,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium = 3,000–9,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large = 10,000+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Carnegie Classification</th>
<th># of Institutions</th>
<th>% of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L: Master’s Colleges &amp; Universities (larger program)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M: Master’s Colleges &amp; Universities (medium program)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Regions (U.S.)</th>
<th># of Institutions</th>
<th>% of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 22 varieties of sponsoring religious congregations of higher education institutions in the United States. These categories have been established by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. Table 9 demonstrates the distribution of sponsoring congregations represented in the sample population of my study. The distribution of congregations in the study cohort was fairly evenly matched to the distribution found in the entire collection of U.S. based ACCU schools (ACCU, n.d.b), save for one sponsoring congregation, the Jesuits. Although Jesuit schools are somewhat over-represented in this study, my intention was not to evaluate faculty policy or community engagement practices based solely on the differences between sponsoring traditions. Rather, the study’s purpose was to evaluate all U.S. colleges and universities that 1) were recipients of the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and 2) identify as a Catholic institution.
Table 9: Distribution of Sponsoring Congregations represented in Catholic Carnegie CE Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring Congregations of U.S. Catholic Colleges &amp; Universities</th>
<th># in 2015 Carnegie CE cohort</th>
<th>% in 2015 Carnegie CE cohort</th>
<th># in ACCU member schools</th>
<th>% in ACCU member schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustinian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation of Divine Providence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasalian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Sisters of Notre Dame</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Charity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Saint Joseph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of the Precious Blood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursuline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentian Fathers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsoring Congregations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources and Collection

The goal of this study was to address the research questions by employing a qualitative content analysis approach to responses on the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification applications. Applications contained information about 1) institutional mission, vision, and identity statements of Catholic colleges and universities; 2) recruitment policies and practices; and 3) faculty promotion...
and tenure guidelines. Applicants were often directed to provide material
directly quoted from existing mission statements, strategic plans, and policy
documents. In reality, responses to questions on the application often included a
mixture of narratives, anecdotes, and quoted material. The Carnegie CE
application process and documentation framework was designed to be
approached as a campus-wide self-study of community engagement. Although
one individual was designated as the contact submitting the application, this
person would have had to contact many other individuals, departments, and
documents to address all of the areas of the application. The applications show
that individuals from a variety of roles headed the project and wrote or
assembled the responses. These ranged from deans to provosts to directors of
community engagement centers. There was also one faculty member and an
assistant to the President. Most hailed from an academic office, but a few were
from student affairs.

My primary data source (the 2015 Carnegie applications of 31 Catholic
institutions) can be characterized as follows. The Carnegie application asked 37
questions developed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education
(NERCHE). Questions ranged from themes on identity and culture of the
institution to documentation of curricular and co-curricular engagement,
outreach, and partnerships. I focused only on the questions and responses that
were relevant to institutional mission and values as well as recruitment,
reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies or practices. The Carnegie application also asked about professional development available for faculty and administrators who review candidate’s RPT dossiers.

Appendix A displays the questions from the Carnegie application which were most pertinent to this study. In most cases, there was a 500 word limit for responses to each question. Applicants were invited to provide links to relevant webpages or institutional documents for concrete evidence of their engagement. These survey data are a mixture of researcher-driven and existing data (Rapley, 2007). That is, the narrative responses written by the applicants would be considered researcher-driven. These narratives would not exist without the Carnegie application process, making the text akin to survey data prompted by a researcher. The stakes in this context, however, were higher than a standard survey since there were consequences for the types of data provided and incentives to respond in a certain way. Respondents were motivated by the possibility of obtaining the nationally-recognized CE classification status. Other forms of data provided on the application could be considered existing or naturally occurring data in that applicants provided quotations from already existing documents. For example, many pulled mission, vision, and identity statements from their college or university websites. This information is in the public domain. Similarly, excerpts from their policy documents were already in existence. They were not created for the purposes of the Carnegie application.
Data occurring without the presence or actions of a researcher are considered to be naturally occurring data (Rapley, 2007).

A consent form granting permission for the information to be used for research purposes was embedded in the application and submitted to NERCHE by each institution at the time of application. All institutions in this study provided consent for their applications to be used for research. Since some preferred anonymity, a pseudonym was assigned for all of the institutions in this study.

Independent of the Carnegie applications, I conducted an internet search of Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines for each institution and discovered varying levels of accessibility. Some were in the public domain (on college websites or in pdf format searchable by Google). They were most often found in faculty handbooks or documents specific to reappointment, promotion, and tenure guidelines. Some were inaccessible to the public and were contained only in an institution’s intranet or internal publications. Since all of the institutions in my study are private institutions, it is no surprise that some documentation would not be readily accessible to the public. I did not set out to do a review of each of the 31 institutions’ individual RPT documents since the Carnegie application responses were expected to provide the content most applicable to my study. For example, in the Carnegie applications, respondents were asked to cite direct language from or provide links to their faculty
handbook or similar policy document. One such question asked for the institution-wide definition of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods. Respondents were further asked to describe and identify the policy document where this explanation appears and provide the definition. I generally assumed that if an institution had the information requested by Carnegie, then it would have been provided to enhance the chances of receiving the CE designation. The absence of information might have indicated one of two situations: either the institution did not have evidence to support the sought after information or the applicant was unaware of its existence. Either way, the absence of certain information in a given area might indicate an institution’s weak support for CE in that area because it was not addressed or not widely known. See Appendix A and B for the wording of application questions most pertinent to this study.

My expectation was that a review of the Carnegie applications would reveal which institutions were incorporating into their faculty policies the language, clarity, definitions, criteria, processes, and incentives necessary to enable and reward community-engaged teaching and scholarship. Further, I looked for indications of how recruitment, tenure, and promotion policies reflect their Catholic institutional mission and identity through a commitment to community engagement. Through this analysis, I identified institutions demonstrating promising alignment between mission and recruitment and RPT
policies. I then conducted a more in-depth round of analysis on the full RPT document of one of these institutions. RPT documents, when used in this study, fall into the existing data category (Rapley, 2007).

Instrumentation and Data Analysis

I used QSR International’s NVivo 10 qualitative data analysis software for Windows to store and manage data from the Carnegie applications. Once the pdf documents of all 31 applications were imported into the program, NVivo allowed me to extract and organize excerpts from the relevant responses on the applications. I then was able to run queries, identify patterns, assign codes to specific pieces of text, establish themes, investigate connections between codes and themes, and create framework matrices to compare cases by themes and sub-themes. I also wrote and stored memos in NVivo to track my procedures and to record emerging theoretical ideas interpreting the data (Silver and Lewins, 2014). All of these features supported the proposed methodology of this study, especially the use of the constant comparative method. Further, NVivo enabled me to build and export models and visualizations for the findings and recommendations section of this dissertation (Bazeley and Jackson, 2013). Lastly, NVivo ensured a record of my work and processes to enhance the transparency and reliability of the study.

Delimitations of Study
In this study, I was interested in examining the RPT policies of Catholic institutions to learn how they may or may not be supporting community engagement. Further, I hoped to find one or more faculty reward policy that could serve as an exemplar for how to support and incentivize community engagement as professional faculty work. To start, I turned to the list of institutions that had received the Carnegie Community Engagement classification because it is generally thought that those institutions have demonstrated a robust institutional commitment to community engagement. I discovered that there are currently 45 Catholic institutions holding the Carnegie CE classification. I chose to focus only on the 31 who received the designation in 2015 for three reasons. Firstly, the size of the cohort met the bar for the number of cases (10-40) desired for an intermediate case analysis. This number would ensure a healthy comparison across cases in which multiple variables are taken into account (Vogt, Vogt, Gardner, & Haeffelle, 2014). Secondly, the sample cohort represents differentiation in demographic characteristics such as size, institutional type, and geography. Representation by charism approximates the spread existing in the national cohort of Catholic institutions. These aspects of differentiation were represented earlier in Tables 7, 8, and 9. Thirdly, the 2010 Carnegie application did not ask the same questions about RPT policies as those asked in the 2015 application, nor were the applicants bound to the same documentation framework. This situation would have made it difficult to do
comparisons across cases. Even within the 2015 cohort, there were slight variations in the presence or framing of certain application questions based on whether the institution was seeking first-time classification or re-classification. I note these variations in my findings section where applicable.

I did not initially include recruitment policies and practices as part of my investigation; however, when I discovered that questions pertaining to recruitment were on the Carnegie application, I decided to expand the scope of my investigation. The recruiting stage is the first place where faculty members receive a signal about whether community engagement is an institutional priority. Such messages have symbolic and practical implications, thus the inclusion of recruitment considerations fit well with my intention to investigate alignment between institutional mission and faculty policies.

I was initially inclined to examine not only the data found in the Carnegie application, but also the mission and vision statements from each institution’s website as well as the full RPT documents of each institution. The mission and vision statements would have been easily accessible as they were in the public domain. Likewise, many RPT documents were readily available via internet and website searches; however, not all were publicly accessible. Ultimately, I determined that I had more than enough data to work with via the applications. Additionally, prior studies have been done on the thematic elements of Catholic mission statements and identity in higher education. I would be able to compare
my data to these studies for validity so it was not necessary to overburden my study with additional data.

The primary aim for including an examination of mission statements for my target cohort was to establish the particular ways in which the institutions in my study characterize their identity and goals. This was important so that I could make a determination about alignment of those goals with faculty policy. A similar rationale applied to my decision to not look at each individual RPT document. Since institutions were directed to supply excerpts from the relevant policy documents, the Carnegie applications served as an adequate pool of data to conduct both individual and cross-case comparisons. Past studies on faculty reward policies using Carnegie applicants as units of analysis did not have the benefit of the more extensive documentation framework available in the 2015 version (Saltmarsh et al., 2009). The analysis derived from the information supplied in the more robust 2015 applications allowed me to determine whether a particular policy was worth exploring further as an exemplar.

**Limitations of Study**

It is possible that Catholic schools who did not apply for the Carnegie CE classification do, in fact, have exemplary RPT language related to public scholarship which would be of use to policy discussions about community engagement. Information from these institutions were not captured in this study because non-CE classified schools were not included as units of analysis. By
focusing on CE-classified schools only, this study was able to address the mission-policy alignment question since those institutions that were successful in achieving the designation are generally thought to exhibit institutional commitment to community engagement across many strategic areas including mission, vision, and faculty rewards policy. Institutions that applied and were not granted the classification or chose not to apply were likely weak across many areas of institutional support and campus-wide commitment to CE.

Another consideration is that reappointment, promotion and tenure criteria may be defined at the departmental, college, or institutional level. Previous studies examining faculty reward policies cite the decision or ability to only look at one level of policy as a limitation to their studies (O’Meara, 2002; Saltmarsh et. al, 2009). Similar concerns exist in my study as the most robust data was available at the institutional level. I did not intentionally set out to specifically look at policy language at the departmental level. However, since the 2015 Carnegie CE application asks about both institutional and college, school, or departmental level policies, I was able to incorporate some of these insights into my analysis as well as draw some broad conclusions from the findings.

A third limitation to my study is that the findings primarily relate to the influence of policy on tenure-line faculty. Full-time instructors and adjunct faculty may not be directly impacted by policies geared towards tenure-seeking faculty. However, since policy serves as an indicator of the sort of faculty
activity that is valued by an institution, all faculty regardless of rank and status
will likely feel the effects of the messages that are sent by policy, even if they are
indirect. This is important to consider given that part-time faculty make up a
significant percentage of the teaching faculty and thus are in a position to
contribute to fulfillment of the mission of the college or university.

Quality of the Research

Validity, reliability, and objectivity are criteria typically used to evaluate
the quality of research, most often defined in a positivist research approach.
Since qualitative content analysis is an interpretive method, I engaged in what
Lincoln and Guba (1985) originally proposed as criteria for evaluating qualitative
interpretive research: credibility, transferability, and confirmability. The
considerations lend support to the trustworthiness of the study. The findings of
this study may be generalizable only to CE-classified institutions; however, since
the point of the study is to demonstrate how the most engaged and committed
campuses are addressing RPT issues, the findings do make an important
contribution to current literature and policy discussions.

In terms of credibility, I engaged in persistent observation of the data, and
designed a data collection and analysis process that is transparent and offers
clear coding procedures systematically applied (See Appendix B for my Master
Coding List). It is also intended that the data sets, presentations, and
descriptions are detailed enough so that although not necessarily “generalizable”
other researchers may be able to judge whether or not such findings from this study are transferable to their own settings. And finally, in terms of confirmability, I presented the data in a system of tables and charts—supported with detailed narrative descriptions and research literature—that the results may be confirmed by others who read and/or review this study.

Since this study was limited to document analysis, it excludes contextual or hidden factors such as the messages faculty receive about what is valued and rewarded through often unwritten mechanisms such as oral communications from one’s peers within a department or discipline; from department chairs, deans, and administrators; and the academic community at large. These factors can and do collectively influence a faculty member’s behavior (Checkoway, 2001; O’Meara, 2002). Additionally, the study does not reveal actual effects of policy language on faculty behavior, nor does it address how the policy language was arrived at, is interpreted, or is implemented by faculty. All of these factors regarding context and impact will be of interest to those seeking to institute policy changes to reward CE work and, therefore, present opportunities for further study.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In this study, I sought to uncover answers to the following research questions: 1) How do institutions of Catholic higher education characterize their mission, values, and identity in the 21st century? 2) To what extent do faculty recruitment, tenure, and promotion policies of Carnegie CE classified Catholic colleges and universities reflect their distinct institutional mission and identity through a commitment to community engaged teaching and scholarship? 3) What policy exemplars from Carnegie CE Classified Catholic colleges and universities might inform institutions that are interested in strengthening the alignment between institutional mission/Catholic identity and faculty roles and rewards?

To address my research questions I performed a content analysis of institutional responses to the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification Application in order to compare institutional mission statements to faculty policy statements and descriptions about those policies. A hallmark of qualitative research using an interpretivist paradigm is thematic exploration of the data under investigation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). I mined the data provided by 31 Catholic institutions seeking evidence of the ways in which mission statements, faculty recruitment protocols, and RPT policies encouraged or discouraged community engagement as a professional activity for faculty. Although the study yielded a variety of descriptive statistics about the
institutions as well as common features of RPT documents, the primary focus was to qualitatively examine the policy language itself in order to construct patterns and meaning about how Catholic institutions frame faculty roles to support community engagement and public scholarship. My investigation and analysis led to the development of five themes to be reviewed in this section.

First, I present a summary of the collective findings organized by the five major themes. Hsieh & Shannon (2005) recommend that findings from a content analysis be coupled with explanation of codes and presented with supporting evidence such as exemplars and descriptive evidence. Within each of the five themes, I include both coding explanations and direct quotations from the Carnegie applications and institutional documents to demonstrate how a unit of text was categorized, how it supports an understanding of the theme, or met evaluation criteria. At times, I report a rank order comparison of frequency of codes within a certain theme in order to summarize the data or to demonstrate the prevalence or absence of a phenomenon. The five themes are followed by a comparison of the 31 cases to determine the level of each institution’s overall alignment between mission and policies. Lastly, I review exemplary policy language that aligns institutional mission with recruitment and RPT policies supporting community engagement.

**Theme 1: The Mission of Catholic Higher Education in the 21st Century**
This section considers how Catholic institutions in the 21st century articulate their mission, values, and identity. The Carnegie application asks applicants how community engagement is specified as a priority in the institution’s mission, vision statement, or strategic plan, and requires excerpts from the relevant documents. The responses to these questions formed the pool of data where I examined mission priorities. Miles & Huberman (1994) recommended initiating coding processes by using key variables related to the context and conceptual framework of one’s study. Since my study concerns the mission of Catholic higher education, I referred to the markers and themes generally understood to be part of the Catholic educational tradition as outlined in my literature review. In addition, I needed to keep in mind that applicant responses were specifically intended to highlight how a commitment to community engagement was evident in their missions. I also realized that other priorities not falling under the established themes might be present and should be noted, thus I arrived at a coding scheme which is explained more fully below.

For a summary of the coding scheme and sources of information (i.e. Carnegie application questions) used in this study, see Appendices A and B.

Here I present a collective analysis of institutional priorities and character of the 31 institutions included in this study based on the Carnegie application responses. Twenty-six institutions (83.9%) made at least one or more references to their Catholicity when describing their institutional mission and vision. For
those not explicitly citing their Catholicity in the mission section of the Carnegie application, it should be noted that mention of their faith affiliation may have appeared elsewhere in their application or in other published materials (i.e. their institutional website). I did not include such external references for consideration here because my intent was to examine what features applicants chose to highlight in their mission statements, especially in light of a professed institutional commitment to community engagement efforts.

First, I ran a word tree query on the mission statements. This query revealed how the term Catholic was used within articulations of institutional mission. Catholicity is most commonly paired with the following concepts: beliefs, community, doctrine, faith, heritage, higher education, identity, institution, social justice, (intellectual) tradition, values, and vision.

I then assessed mission descriptions for the presence of language associated with five a priori sub-themes, many of which directly relate to Catholicity. A sixth category, “additional priorities,” identified emerging sub-themes beyond the five established themes. The a priori categories included 1) priority for community engagement; 2) influence of charism; 3) Catholic Intellectual Tradition (CIT); 4) Catholic Moral Tradition (CMT); and 5) Catholic Social Teaching (CST). The statements were assessed using the definitions and descriptions for each category as presented in the literature review earlier in this study. To summarize:
• The first theme, CE priority, is characterized by the use of language indicating that the institution explicitly understands and prioritizes community engagement in its mission, vision, or value statements, thus I searched for language referencing community engagement or ones of its variants (e.g. civic engagement, service-learning, public scholarship, etc.).

• Charism means that the unique gifts and focus of the sponsor or founding order is referenced as an inspiration for the institutional mission. It is an influential part of the institution's identity and culture.

• CIT indicates adherence to a range of concepts and practices contained in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. These include the liberal arts; theology and philosophy; Catholic doctrine; the development of certain habits of mind such as truth-seeking; the complementarity of faith and reason; and the integration of learning (e.g. not only connecting past and present knowledge, exploring various ways of knowing, and linking learning to life, but also nurturing dialogue between and amongst disciplines).

• The Catholic Moral Tradition (CMT) expresses an institution’s concern with the common good and fundamental values that apply to all human beings as well as the formation of student character and virtuous behavior.

• Catholic Social Teaching (CST) relates to how beliefs and faith get carried out in the world which would be indicated by references to social justice, service, action, community outreach, and compassion towards others, especially the
CST is also represented by explicit reference to any of the 7 themes of Catholic social teaching described earlier in this study. See figure 3 and table 3 in the literature review for a reminder of the nested relationship between CIT, CMT, CST and the 7 themes of Catholic Social Teaching. Lastly, the category, “additional themes,” includes priorities that do not fall under any of the above themes. Next, I explain the findings for each theme in turn.

Priority for Community Engagement

All 31 institutions affirmed that community engagement was a priority in their institution’s mission. Some respondents cited direct quotations from their mission or vision statements while others paraphrased or interpreted mission documents. Twenty-seven institutions (87%) included the word “community” at least once in their mission descriptions. This might have been expected given the nature of the application question which specifically asked about community engagement being part of the mission; however, it should be noted that an earlier study on Catholic higher education mission statements also found "community" to be a top theme amongst Catholic institutions in the United States (Young, 2001).

It should be further noted that the meaning and use of the concept of "community" was not always consistent or clear in the applicants’ descriptions. In some cases, “community” appears to refer only to the college community.
itself, while in other cases the term is inclusive of communities external to the college. Take for example, St. Natalia University’s description:

The core values, based on a set of Hallmarks, common to all [St. Natalia University] Learning Communities, also provide evidence of [St. Natalia University’s] commitment to community engagement. Seven...core values, enunciated in 12 statements are: Community 1. A commitment to build a diverse, collaborative, open and student-centered community that holds itself and its members accountable to learn, serve, work, and grow together in partnership. 2. A commitment to share the responsibility of governance and to create transparency and accountability in our decision-making. Diversity 3. A commitment to celebrate, embrace, value, and learn from the voices, perspectives, and experiences of all our community members....

The use of “learning communities" and "student-centered" in this example indicates an interpretation geared more towards the college community and its constituencies than the external or surrounding community. Similarly, Urban University states:

The University will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual and economic resources of the [Urban area] and its location...to enrich and strengthen its educational programs.

In this description, the identity of the “learning community” could be interpreted as ambiguous or geared primarily towards faculty and students. Certainly, the description indicates the University’s intention to make use of or take from the community. It does not necessarily indicate how the University
will contribute to the larger community, thus the use of “community” here does not appear to be externally-focused.

To counterbalance examples of a somewhat ambiguous use of “community,” six institutions (19%) specifically used the sort of language the Carnegie foundation employs to define community engagement. Recall that this definition emphasizes “partnership, collaboration, shared resources, and reciprocity.” For example:

[Brigid University] is committed to serving local and global communities through collaborative and mutually productive partnerships. The University accepts responsibility to engage with communities to pursue systemic, self-sustaining solutions to human, social, economic and environmental problems.

Felix University:

[Felix] has a further obligation to the wider community of which it is a part, to share with its neighbors its resources and its special expertise for the betterment of the community as a whole.

St. Cecilia University:

Faculty, staff and students listen carefully to the needs of the community and create reciprocal partnerships in which we share and contribute our resources while also learning and reflecting upon our experiences.

In these examples, it is more clearly understood that the institution’s conception of community is inclusive of stakeholders beyond the campus. It is important to acknowledge not only the prevalence of community engagement as a priority at Catholic colleges and universities, but also to be aware of its application and meaning since this can have implications for whether the
institution is responding to the Carnegie Foundation’s criteria for attending to the needs of a broader public.

References to Charism

Twenty-four out of the 31 institutions (77.4%) explicitly referenced their founding tradition or charism as an important inspiration for their mission and expression of their identity. The College of St. Julia’s core values, for example, are expressed as follows:

1. Community: Informed by the spirit of the **Sisters of Mercy**, we demonstrate our spirit of connectedness with one another through our expressions of **hospitality**, **courtesy**, **inclusive relationships**, **shared values** and **collaboration**. We extend this value of community by reaching out to neighbors and to members of the broader civic and ecclesial communities.

2. **Compassion**: Inspired by the example of **Catherine McAuley**, foundress of the **Sisters of Mercy**, we open our hearts to those among us in physical, psychological or spiritual need. We consciously reach out beyond our college boundaries to serve the needs of others with **compassion** and **mercy**.

3. **Justice**: Recognizing the dignity of all persons, we seek to address instances of injustice both within and outside our College community from a stance of informed advocacy. We hold ourselves accountable to each other and endeavor to practice responsible stewardship of the resources available to us.

At St. Marie Rose College:

A distinctive mark of a **Lasallian** school is its **awareness of the consequences of economic and social injustice** and its **commitment to the poor**. Its members learn to live "their responsibility to share their goods and their service with those who are in need, a responsibility based on the union of all men and women in the world today and on a clear understanding of the meaning of Christianity."
Through the content analysis of mission statements, it became clear that for many institutions in this study, there is a desire for a school’s charism to be closely tied to its priorities, commitments, and activities. Further examples of this association are evident in the analysis of other mission themes, especially Catholic Social Teaching, as will be seen later.

**Catholic Intellectual Tradition**

Twenty-eight institutions (90.3%) expressed a focus on one or more aspects of the Catholic Intellectual tradition in responding to the Carnegie application question on mission priorities. For the three institutions not referencing CIT in the application, a search of the mission on the colleges' websites indicated commitment to the intellectual tradition (i.e. liberal arts, education of the whole person, integration, truth seeking, etc.). Moreover, since the moral tradition and Catholic social teaching are embedded within CIT and all institutions in this study referenced at least one aspect of CIT, CMT, or CST as part of their mission statement, it could be argued that all of the institutions in this study view the Catholic Intellectual Tradition as vital to the work of the institution. Table 10 illustrates the distribution of prominent CIT sub-themes found in mission descriptions.
Table 10: Catholic Intellectual Tradition as a Mission Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIT Sub-themes</th>
<th># of institutions</th>
<th>% of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote a life of faith and an intellect informed by faith</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated learning experience in which the &quot;whole person&quot; is educated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education grounded in the liberal arts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for truth and meaning as an important part of the educational experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts from the mission descriptions support the above quantitative data:

Brigid University: “In the Catholic intellectual tradition, integration of study, reflection and action inform the intellectual life.”

Nicholas University: "NU seeks to develop the whole person, mind, body, heart and soul." The "Catholic faith provides perspective in the search for truth and meaning."

St. Demetria University: A "Catholic vision of the intellectual life...calls for integration of the human and the divine, reason and faith, and promotes true understanding through a person's head and heart."

St. Cecilia University: "Education in social responsibility is integral to holistic human development."

Catholic Moral Tradition.

Twenty-one (67.7%) institutions cited the moral development of their students or emphasize the ethical dimensions of their studies and actions as part of their mission. This was most often characterized by advancing the common good, being socially aware and morally responsible, and demonstrating ethical behavior and understanding. For example, St. Natalia University "challenges each member to consciously apply values and ethics in his or her personal, professional, and public life." Another university sums up its commitment as
follows: Margaret University is committed "to principles of 'service to the world' through a fully engaged institution of community outreach for advancing teaching, learning, leading, and serving as the ethical bedrock of 21st century Catholic higher education in the Franciscan tradition."

Catholic Social Teaching, Social Justice, and Service

Findings in this area revealed that 96.8% (30/31) of institutions in this study indicated a commitment to social justice and service as part of their mission. Some expressions are broader or more ambiguous than others but many are quite specific about the nature of their commitment. For a number of colleges and universities, this specificity derives directly from the institution's founding charism. Table 11 demonstrates the frequency of various key words and their variations drawn from CST and used in the mission statements examined in this study:

Table 11: Frequency of Catholic Social Teaching Themes in Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CST Terms and Concepts</th>
<th># of institutions using this word or phrase</th>
<th>% of institutions using this word or phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving the dignity of the human person</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering peace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving the poor and vulnerable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility/social change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement/responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two institutions used the word "charity" but only to stress that their intentions are to go "beyond charity" because charity is not sufficient. Only one institution directly used the phrase “Catholic social teaching” within their mission description. In a provision reminiscent of the purpose of Newman's first Catholic university, several institutions specified a priority for providing access to higher education to those with limited resources.

An example of a broad pronouncement of commitment to CST, social, justice, and service is found in the statement, “this university exists not for itself....but to render service.” Other broad phrases include "responding to the needs of others," educating "students for lives of leadership and service for the common good,” and "service of humanity.” It should be noted that the term “service” is commonly used by public and private institutions alike in their mission statements; however, there are important differences in the meanings. At public universities, “service” is emphasized as a way to develop civic duty; whereas, at private institutions “service” is viewed as a way to “transform the world” (Morphew & Harley, 2006, p. 466). I, too, detected this interpretation of service as a means to improve society or change conditions for the better within my analysis of mission statements at private, Catholic schools.

Among the more specific mission descriptions, one finds commitments to particular principles of Catholic Social Teaching which are often closely
associated with the institution’s founding charism. The below examples illustrate explicit references to solidarity with the marginalized, care and concern for the vulnerable, and a preferential option for the poor:

The University seeks to graduate students who are 'empowered to seek the liberation of humanity from injustice, poverty, ignorance and all that violates the dignity and freedom of the human person.' In the Spiritan tradition, “We go to people not primarily to accomplish a task but rather to be with them, live with them, walk beside them, listen to them, and share our faith with them. At the heart of our relationship is trust, respect and love...We are called to a practical solidarity with...those who are most poor, vulnerable, and excluded from society. (St. David University)

Jesuit education strives to seek the truth and to form each student into a whole person of solidarity who will take responsibility for the real world. Our students must have an educated awareness of society and culture, a sense of being interrelated and interconnected, and a commitment to act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed. (Lando University)

The DePaul community is above all characterized by ennobling the God-given dignity of each person. This religious personalism is manifested by the members of the DePaul community in a sensitivity to and care for the needs of each other and of those served, with a special concern for the deprived members of society. (Boniface University)

More mature commitments to CST often reference behaviors such as compassion and justice rather than charity. A handful of institutions specifically talked about the role of scholarship in the pursuit of justice and as a form of active service. Furthermore, they do not limit this activity to only students or faculty.

[Brigid University] expects all members of our community to accept social responsibility to foster peace and nonviolence, to strive for equality, to
recognize the sacredness of Earth, and to engage in meaningful efforts toward social change. The University promotes social justice through teaching, research and service.

The University as Marianist challenges all its members to become servant-leaders who connect scholarship and learning with leadership and service. (St. Demetria University).

As an Augustinian University: Encourage students, faculty and staff to engage in service experiences and research, both locally and globally, so they learn from others, provide public service to the community and help create a more sustainable world; Commit to the common good, and apply the knowledge and skills of our students and faculty to better the human condition; Encourage our students and faculty to pursue virtue by integrating love and knowledge, and by committing themselves to research and education for justice, with a special concern for the poor and compassion for the suffering; Respect a worldview that recognizes that all creation is sacred and that fosters responsible stewardship of the environment (Wenceslas University).

The University regards peace as inseparable from justice and advances education, scholarship and service to fashion a more humane world. (University of St. Teresa).

Other Priorities

Leadership development, diversity and inclusion, professional preparation, and global competence emerged as re-occurring themes within mission descriptions. Twenty-one (67.8%) institutions cited leadership development as a priority using such modifiers as ethical leaders, professional leaders, servant leaders, and transformative leaders. Twenty-one institutions (67.8%) cited diversity and inclusion as a priority, mostly related to its campus community. This included developing habits such as fostering a diverse and
inclusive or collaborative community of learners and respecting individual
differences (i.e. physical, intellectual, spiritual, cultural, background) and
perspectives (i.e. open and free inquiry). A number of institutions specified a
commitment to being welcoming of all faiths.

Nineteen institutions (61%) cited offering professional preparation as part
of their mission. Thirteen institutions (42%) explicitly expressed a commitment
to students embracing their roles and responsibilities as world citizens; the
creation of a more sustainable world; realizing our interconnectedness; or
developing global knowledge and partnership. It is possible that these
additional themes may be somewhat under-represented because applicants were
compelled to select language from their mission and vision statements that best
represented their commitment to community engagement rather than other
priorities. It can also be argued that many of these additional themes overlap
with commitments to service, social justice, and community engagement.
Despite the limited space provided for applicants to explain institutional
priorities on the Carnegie application, it was clear that the priorities identified
beyond community engagement were relatively pervasive across the cases and
aid in understanding the scope of Catholic identity and values in the 21st century.

Mission Summary

One way of strengthening a researcher’s claims using context analysis is
through comparing findings to previous work performed on the subject of
inquiry (Rapley, 2007). Overall, my findings about Catholic mission are consistent with prior content analyses on identity and priorities found in Catholic higher education mission statements. A previous study by Young (2001) revealed that service was “mentioned more often than any other value. Spirituality was second, followed by truth, community, human dignity, equality, tradition, justice, and freedom” (p. 70). A study on the presence of “Catholic markers” on websites of U.S. Catholic colleges and universities demonstrated that the majority of institutions (≈90%) were explicit about the connection to their founding charism and nearly half depicted student involvement in service as part of their college’s character (Gambescia & Paolucci, 2011). A third study which focused on developing student learning outcomes from mission statements revealed that each of the following themes were represented between 10-32% in a random sample of mission statements from 55 Catholic institutions: intellectual development, social justice/social responsibility, religious/spiritual development, service, leadership, moral development, education of the whole person, and responsible citizenship (Estanek, James, & Norton, 2006). The findings about the primary values and goals of the Catholic institutions from my own study concurred with previous studies and provided the identifiers needed to evaluate recruitment and RPT policies for alignment with Catholic mission.

Theme 2: Characteristics of Faculty Recruitment Policies for Community Engagement
This section presents findings about faculty recruitment policies of the Catholic colleges and universities examined in this study. Specifically, I attempted to assess the extent to which hiring protocols reflected a commitment to acquiring faculty with community engagement expertise. Assessing recruitment policies turned out to be a complex matter not only because institutions use variable approaches to attract and review candidates for faculty positions, but also because many institutions do not appear to have formal institution-wide recruitment policies addressing community engagement. Departments, schools, or colleges within the institution may use different techniques or have different priorities. Some use passive approaches and others active ones. Some consider a commitment to mission to be understood as a commitment to community engagement or vice versa. In short, the approaches to faculty recruitment can be inconsistent or ambiguous. Nevertheless, some common characteristics about recruitment policies emerged from the recruitment information provided by Carnegie applicants, and I describe these features in greater detail below.

The Carnegie application asked the identical question for both first-time and reclassifying institutions regarding recruitment: Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement? Twenty-four institutions responded “yes” and seven responded “no.” Six of the
institutions who answered "no" followed up with a "no, but" explanation which occasionally yielded evidence of a stronger commitment to CE in recruitment processes than some of the institutions that answered “yes.” Similarly, some institutions that responded "yes” might have been better characterized as "yes, but" or “no” because they qualified their affirmative responses by explaining that they did not have formal policy statements on recruiting faculty for their community engagement expertise. For example, the University of St. Edmund answered "yes"; however, they did not supply any evidence of formal policies or even proactive practices. Instead, they explained that candidates have shown interest in community engagement by asking search committees about the potential for community engagement at the institution. In such cases, prospective faculty members initiated the inquiry, not the hiring committees. Further, the University of St. Edmund did not clearly indicate whether or not this candidate-driven inquiry was viewed favorably by the hiring committee or the institution, though a positive response seemed to be implied. They did mention that new hires were supplied with a service-learning handbook; however, this practice only suggests that candidates were informed of institutional support for CE activities after being hired. Even though many institutions demonstrated passive approaches to recruitment as exemplified in the above vignette, most claimed that they did have recruitment policies and practices that supported CE.
Table 12: Summary of Carnegie Applicants’ Responses to Recruitment Policies and Practices Supporting CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of recruitment policies and practices supporting CE</th>
<th># of institutions</th>
<th>% of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yes”</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No, but”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents, save one, offered some amount of narrative explanation to the Carnegie question on recruitment. The Carnegie application did not require excerpts of or links to policy documents about recruiting as they did for questions related to mission or RPT policy. Thus, the question became what type of coding scheme might be most helpful in ascertaining whether the recruitment mechanisms described demonstrated a commitment to CE? As I applied the constant comparative method in reviewing the text across cases, I began to see several trends emerge in the responses which prompted me to formulate several evaluative questions for coding purposes: Did the applicant tend to share information only about policy, only about practice, or both? Did the policies or practices express explicit or implicit support for CE? Who was responsible for initiating an inquiry about CE throughout the recruitment process: the candidate or the institution? If the institution was initiating the inquiry, were efforts geared more towards informing candidates of the institution's commitment to CE or assessing the candidate’s commitment to CE? The iterative process of
evaluating each applicant response based on these questions yielded three sets of instructive binaries: 1) policy vs. practice; 2) explicit vs. implicit methods; and 3) informing vs. assessing. These sub-themes help to characterize the range and quality of recruitment activity focused on community engagement within the cohort under investigation.

**Policy vs. Practice**

Overall, few institutions in this study demonstrated having explicit (written) institution-wide policies designed to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement. More frequently, institutions offered one or two specific examples of where a commitment had been represented in a particular department or hiring situation. And in these cases, most responses tended to offer evidence for practice, rather than policy, with practice being somewhat subjective. That is, practice was more frequently influenced by departmental beliefs or values rather than an overarching departmental or institution-wide policy. Since practice and policy were often used interchangeably within responses, it proved difficult to discern in many cases whether the institution employed a specific written policy or handbook to guide search committees at any level (e.g. departmental, college, or campus-wide). In order to illustrate the ways in which institutional priorities were conveyed to prospective candidates and used in hiring processes, it became useful to establish additional themes. The next two sub-themes help ascertain
more directly whether the recruitment strategies actively promoted, discouraged, or were neutral about community engagement at a critical stage of a faculty member’s first encounter with the college or university.

**Explicit vs. Implicit Methods**

Explicit methods means that the institution provided evidence of written documentation or spoken directions from leadership/administration personnel which plainly expressed preference or expectation for faculty expertise and commitment to CE during recruitment processes. Commitment to CE may have been expressed by the use of the terms community engagement or one of its variants: community service, social justice activity, civic engagement, etc. Implicit methods means that such expressions are implied rather than clearly expressed or documented. An example of an implicit practice is found in the following example: “our mission, which is shared with applicants/available for viewing, indicates that we value service.” In such a case, it is assumed that the candidate will recognize the commitment to CE through a reading of the mission statement which may or may not be directly provided to the candidate and may or may not specifically define community engagement. Thus, a candidate’s exposure to the information might be left to chance. In this study, the recruitment "policies" offered up as examples for commitment to community engagement frequently cited a general expectation for applicants to contribute to the college's mission (which, as described above, was often presented as a proxy
for dedication to community engagement.) Since the priorities embedded in an institution’s mission or vision are often multi-fold as established earlier in this study and in the literature, this argument does not offer a strong or convincing indication of a direct commitment to CE in the recruitment process. Rather, such an approach is open to interpretation and to inconsistent application in hiring processes.

Explicit CE recruitment methods, when they existed, most frequently consisted of communicating information in position advertisements, recruitment materials, or verbally in on-campus visits with search committees. Twenty institutions (64.5%) indicated some form of explicit method for communicating their commitment to mission or CE during the search process, either directed at the faculty on the search committees or prospective candidates.

Helena and Felix Universities were among the few cases citing the use of a guide for faculty search committees, thus providing a framework for discussing and assessing mission or community engagement with prospective candidates. Both are Jesuit institutions and both presented mission and community engagement as intimately connected. Helena University has a policy of “mission-centered faculty hiring” while Felix University uses a "Hiring for mission" guide. Similarly, Marcus University uses a hiring-for-mission policy which was described in the following way:
In the case of faculty hiring, the Office of the Provost and the Office of Mission and Ministry hold **workshops for department chairs to assist with their efforts in hiring for mission and to provide resources.** The Office of Mission and Ministry provides extensive online resources for chairs and for faculty candidates. **The commitment to community engagement is lived out through the university’s mission and tradition of social justice.** For example, the resource document for candidates, Our Guiding Jesuit Philosophy: What it Means to Be at [Marcus] Today, states that ‘by fully embracing our identity as a Catholic, Jesuit university, [Marcus] takes a step beyond the teaching of ethics and addition of service programs to our already comprehensive curriculum. **We seek to create an indivisible link between what a student learns in the classroom and how that knowledge is shared with those most in need.’**

Ten institutions (32.2%) employ implicit methods to communicate commitment to CE. For example:

**Recruitment policies [supporting CE] are implicit in [Boniface University]’s mission, the realization of Vision 2018, [Boniface]’s previous strategic plan, and [Boniface]’s urban location. The practice of faculty recruitment invariably incorporates [Boniface]’s expectation that faculty are aware of and interested in supporting [Boniface]’s community engagement efforts as it relates to the Vincentian mission.”**

Here the implied expectation is one only of awareness and interest. It does not address an expectation that prospective faculty members actively engage in CE efforts. Where applicants did refer to active engagement, it was frequently an implied expectation also by virtue of it being "embedded" in the mission statement. Only a handful of institutions indicated that their position advertisements include the specific terminology of community engagement or one of its variants.
When communications about the mission or CE did occur in the recruitment process, it was more likely to inform candidates of the institution's mission or commitment to CE rather than to assess a candidate's interest and expertise in CE, or include it as a criteria for hiring. In a number of cases, it was characterized as an unexpected bonus if the candidate happened to have this interest or expertise, thus expressing favorable impressions towards candidates with CE interest or experience, but revealing an essentially passive approach to recruiting for community engagement. Innocent University sums up what appears to be a fairly common approach amongst a number of the institutions in this study: "there is no official institution-wide hiring policy that mandates preferential hiring for faculty with community engagement interests and expertise, however these qualifications would be considered positively in the evaluation of faculty candidates."

**Informing vs. Assessing**

In addition to explicit and implicit communication, informing and assessing became an important distinction for evaluating each institution’s commitment to CE in the recruiting process. Here, I define “informing” as any efforts directed towards notifying candidates of the institution's mission and/or commitment to community engagement. “Assessing,” on the other hand, refers to efforts to evaluate a candidate's understanding of the college's mission or
expertise and interest in community engagement. This might be gleaned from the candidate’s cover letter or through dialogue in the interview, for example.

Nineteen institutions (61.2%) indicated that candidates are informed of the institution's mission and/or commitment to CE during the recruitment process. Position announcements and advertisements were the most common venues used for this information, although candidates might also be directed to the appropriate page on the institution’s website (e.g. mission page or human resources page), a faculty handbook, or print materials sent to them. Additional methods included telling candidates about mission priorities during campus visits or interviews.

Thirteen institutions (41.9%) cited some form of assessment method focused on evaluating faculty candidates for their alignment with the institution’s mission or their interest and expertise in CE. Eleven (35.5%) emphasized evaluating the candidate for mission alignment, in general, while eight (25.8%) specifically evaluated for interest in and experience with CE. Again, in most cases it seemed to be implied that a commitment to CE was contained within the mission.

Evaluation most often took place through the interview process, though one institution required a written statement from the candidate about how s/he could contribute to the mission. The institution indicated that such statements
are shared with the department chair, academic dean, and vice president of Academic Affairs.

Ten institutions (32.3%) cited use of both informing and assessing methods to emphasize mission or CE in the recruiting process. Three institutions (9.7%) had policies and/or handbooks regarding mission-oriented hiring processes and practices which included specific questions to ask candidates. Rarely did institutions detail the types of community engagement that they expected or desired of faculty. Sometimes it was spoken of more broadly as "applied experience" or familiarity with "experiential" methods or simply as "service." In a few cases, it was implied or directly stated that faculty would learn more about avenues for CE after being hired.

Table 13: Summary of Recruitment Methods Pertaining to Mission and Community Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Method</th>
<th>% of Institutions Using Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use explicit methods for communicating a commitment to mission or CE during the search process</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use implicit methods for communicating a commitment to mission or CE during the search process</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform candidates of the institution's mission and/or commitment to CE during the recruitment process</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess candidates for alignment with the institution’s mission or their interest and expertise in CE</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use both informing and assessing methods to emphasize mission or CE in the recruiting process</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cited having written policies and/or handbooks regarding mission-oriented hiring processes and practices</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three sub-themes above helped to characterize the range and quality of recruitment activity focused on community engagement within the cohort under investigation. I also made note that many institutions responded to the Carnegie question about recruitment and hiring practices by sharing information about programs that were in place to inform and support faculty once they arrived on campus.

**Evidence of a Supportive Environment Post-hire**

In the absence of clear or pervasive recruitment practices and policies, a number of Carnegie applicants offered information about the content of new faculty orientation programs or evidence of CE work being carried out by new hires. Orientation material included a focus on understanding the college’s mission, community engagement practice as part of the institutional mission, presentations from mission or CE directors and staff, resources available to faculty to support CE work, or general encouragement to engage with the community in research, teaching, and service. Another way that Carnegie applicants chose to demonstrate their commitment was to provide evidence of faculty outcomes. For example, they listed programs which have expanded faculty CE work, identified the titles of specific CE projects completed by faculty, or cited faculty survey results indicating perceived alignment with their work and institutional mission.
As important as training, resources, and reported outcomes are in sending a positive message about community engagement and even enabling its practice by faculty, these methods are not a replacement for initial communications during the recruitment and hiring phase where there are opportunities not only for intentionally attracting candidates with CE interest and expertise, but also assessing prospective faculty for their level and quality of experience. In this study, it appears that candidates may become aware that the mission, broadly understood, is to be respected; however, there was not as much evidence suggesting that institutions directly and consistently promote a unified expectation for the type of faculty work Carnegie has in mind for community engagement within the various realms of faculty responsibility.

**Training for Search Committees**

A final consideration for determining an institution’s commitment at the recruitment stage is the level of training invested in the search committee itself to prepare participants for informing and evaluating prospective candidates for mission alignment and commitment to community engagement. St. Demetria University reported that it “conducts a Hiring for Mission Retreat each year. Mandatory for all chairs/directors who will be hiring faculty members, it reinforces topics of Catholic Social Teaching and mission and identity, within which principles of community building are important tenets.”

At the University of St. Teresa, all of its seven colleges and schools
incorporate curricular public service and/or intensive community-based clinical practices requiring each school to have recruitment policies to hire faculty with community-engaged expertise. Starting at the executive level, the president and provost have convened all of the deans to support faculty hiring and recognition. Additionally, the director for CSL [community service learning] and the Changemaker Hub have met with the deans to help inform the hiring and recruitment process.

The examples above were the only two offered in relation to formally preparing faculty search committees for a recruitment process designed to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement.

Recruitment Summary

No single institution demonstrated clearly consistent and proactive practices or policies for community engagement across all three key considerations of recruitment: 1) informing candidates of CE priority; 2) assessing for faculty understanding, interest, and expertise in CE; and 3) training for search committees. On one end of the spectrum, nine institutions did not offer any information at all about how they either inform or assess candidates for a commitment to CE. On the other end, only 9 out of 31 institutions (29%) appeared to demonstrate a relatively strong approach in explicit methods used to inform and assess faculty candidates for CE during the recruitment stage. Of these, two universities used language that only broadly focused on the
institutional mission. Thus, CE priority in these cases was not explicit, only implied via the mission. Four of the institutions that were stronger in this area cited common practices for evaluating faculty for mission alignment and commitment to CE. They make these considerations part of the standard criteria for hiring. St. Natalia University seemed to do the best job in directly using the language of CE. They cited the following language from their Human Resources web page connecting faculty responsibilities to the mission and community engagement:

[St. Natalia] University is a Catholic, not-for-profit, coeducational institution serving 2,000 traditional aged and adult students from diverse backgrounds. Established in 1851, by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, [St. Natalia] maintains a strong commitment to academic excellence, social justice and community engagement.

To place social justice and community engagement as an equal alongside academic excellence is to say that to work at [St. Natalia] is to be held to high standards in all three areas.

Their application goes on to explain that “In full-time faculty hiring, St. Natalia is very intentional about asking prospective faculty to address mission questions, and the discussion centers around the interviewee's interest and commitment to community engagement.”

At Helena University, informing and assessing are key components to the recruitment process. From the Carnegie application:

[Helena]’s search strategy and process requires that all applicants for faculty positions demonstrate an alignment with the university’s mission. The [Helena] University Policy of Mission-Centered Faculty
Hiring states, ‘Mission orientation will be considered as an important hiring preference criterion...’ The policy rationale also states that, ‘...hiring committees should seek candidates who can and want to support [Helena]’s mission and to support the development in our students of a dynamic faith and enlightened dedication to the ideals of justice, peace and service to others.’ The policy includes an implementation process that directs all hiring committees to ‘document its assessment of the candidates’ mission orientation for consideration at each step of the process’.... Interviewing guidelines further emphasize the importance of candidates’ commitment to community engagement. The policy, ‘Selected Mission-Related Interview Questions and their Rationale for Faculty Candidates,’ include inquiry into candidates’ mission-related values reflected in questions such as ‘What does service mean to you in view of the Mission Statement?’ The process favors faculty candidates with expertise in, and commitment to, community engagement.

Overall, most institutions in this study tended to take a relatively weak or neutral approach to recruitment efforts specifically focused on community engagement. While there were little to no indications of direct discouragement, there were also few indications of clear and pervasive promotion of community engagement to prospective faculty. Seeking candidates for mission alignment, on the other hand, was a relatively strong factor in recruitment efforts. In the Carnegie applications, school mission was often used as a proxy for community engagement.

**Theme 3: Policy Tools and Behavioral Assumptions to Evaluate Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies that Support Community Engagement**

This section returns to Schneider & Ingram’s (1990) five policy tools discussed earlier in the literature review, in order to evaluate the extent to which
the institutions in this study applied policy strategies that encourage and enable faculty community engagement as part of their professional work. O’Meara stated that “there have been more exploratory and descriptive studies than in-depth uses of theory to...conduct content analysis of written documents” (2013, p. 233). This was at least one purpose of applying Schneider & Ingram’s framework of policy tools based on theories of behavior in order to evaluate the efficacy of the RPT policies in my cases. Here, I present the findings for how the 31 institutions employed those five tools within their RPT policies. I first briefly recall the behavioral assumptions accompanying each policy tool and its role in motivating faculty within higher education. I then provide an analysis of how the tool may or may not have been applied in the RPT policy descriptions offered by the Carnegie applicants.

Symbolic

Those who use symbolic policy tools assume that individuals who are the targets of a given policy are inspired by or seek alignment between their personal values and the values embedded within the policy. This alignment motivates people to act in a way consistent with the policy. In my literature review, I proposed that institutional mission statements have the capacity to serve as symbolic motivators within the context of faculty reward policies in higher education. This positive association has been corroborated in other studies which have looked more generally at the purpose and use of mission statements
in educational organizations (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Thus, in my content analysis, I sought evidence of direct connections being made between an institution’s mission and faculty responsibilities (particularly in respect to community engagement) within its RPT documents. I have already established that all institutions were prompted in the Carnegie application to provide excerpts from their mission statements in order to demonstrate how their identity and culture fostered a foundational commitment to campus-wide community engagement. The Carnegie application additionally prompted respondents in a section on faculty roles and rewards to provide evidence of how community engagement is rewarded in the faculty handbook or similar documents. In these responses, 14 institutions (45%) referenced their mission in relation to faculty roles and rewards. Most applicants offered a general characterization or paraphrase indicating that their institutional mission influenced faculty rewards for CE, while only a handful presented material directly from their respective policy documents that specifically referenced the mission. Below, I highlight three examples of direct quotations offered from a faculty handbook or similar policy document. The bold text in each example indicates my emphasis to point out connections between mission, community engagement, and faculty roles:

St. Natalia University: Excerpt from Faculty Handbook
Membership in the academic profession carries with it individualized responsibilities for the advancement of knowledge, the intellectual growth of students, and the improvement of society. Faculty member's performances should reflect the commitment to the contents of the mission and educational visions and to the improvement of its intellectual and practical effectiveness.

St. Hilarius University: Excerpt from Faculty Manual

The University mission encompasses service to the community around it. Faculty members are therefore encouraged to participate in community projects and organizations, helping to carry out the programs of community service that are appropriate to the mission of the University and the professional identity of the faculty member.

St. Demetria University: Excerpt from Faculty Handbook on the university’s commitment to research

[I]n fulfillment of its mission to render public service, the university offers its physical and human resources to support the research needs of the public and private sectors of our society. It encourages the establishment of team-oriented, multidisciplinary research programs which are responsive to the complex problems facing contemporary society.

The above examples demonstrate the ways that nearly half of the cohort under examination makes explicit connections between faculty roles and responsibilities, institutional mission, and forms of community engagement. These findings do not mean that the other half of institutions do not reference their mission somewhere within their faculty handbooks. They may simply have overlooked the opportunity to include such information in the Carnegie application. The findings do suggest, however, that the connection between faculty responsibilities and mission may not be clearly delineated within the reappointment, promotion, and tenure statements themselves and bears a closer
examination. Many scholars are in agreement that declarations of institutional
mission and values are an essential feature to effective RPT policy design
(Diamond, 1999; Ellison & Eatman, 2008).

Incentives

Policies have the potential to incentivize or dis-incentivize the actions and
behaviors of those for whom the policy is intended. In the case of
reappointment, tenure, and promotion guidelines for faculty, policies can convey
a positive or negative view towards community engagement. On the one hand,
RPT policies have the capacity to encourage desired performance by awarding
promotion, tenure, merit pay, and other forms of recognition. On the other hand,
a lack of attention to community engagement in RPT policies or the withholding
of payoffs such as the ones cited above for community engaged faculty might
signal that such efforts are considered illegitimate or unfavorable activities in the
academy. The denial of promotion or tenure may also stigmatize those who
follow a CE path. In this way, RPT policies have the power to encourage or deter
faculty from pursuing CE work.

One of the strongest statements offered by an applicant for the linkage
between community engagement and tangible faculty rewards appears in the
following excerpt from the Preamble of Leo College’s faculty handbook:

[Leo] College expects all faculty members to attend to the needs of their
students, their departments, the College and the community at large. It
also expects that, in their work with students and colleagues, faculty will
encourage awareness of the rights and needs of others and will promote responsible action on behalf of justice. Providing opportunities for students to use their energy and talents in the interests of others is an important dimension of education in the Jesuit tradition. Therefore, service to the College and to the larger community will be considered in awarding tenure and promotion.

Other applicants offered numerous examples of successful outcomes as evidence of supportive promotion and tenure processes. Examples included faculty hiring decisions, tenure attainment, positive third-year reviews, promotions, internal awards for teaching or scholarly excellence, and other forms of recognition for faculty practicing CE. Applicants also cited the rise of service-learning courses being offered or increases in the number of scholarly articles written, conference presentations, or grant proposals related to community engaged approaches and methodologies.

Often, examples were presented in a tone meant to convey that in the absence of explicit policy language supporting CE, the existing language did not prohibit nor inhibit faculty from pursuing CE as legitimate professional work. This condition is demonstrated in the following applicant response:

Although the recognition of community engagement as a form of teaching is not specific in these statements, recent tenure and promotion decisions have demonstrated that teaching involving community outreach is valued and rewarded. (Innocent University)

Alexander University illustrates a more precise example of how RPT policies have incentivized faculty various forms of CE activity and scholarship:

Due to the 2008 addition of service-learning courses being recognized as a form of evidence for excellence in and devotion to teaching for the
tenure and promotion process, the number of service-learning courses being offered by faculty rose considerably, from four courses in the 2007-2008 academic year, to 40 courses the 2012-2013 academic year....Recently, a nursing faculty member was promoted to associate professor due in part to her community-engaged scholarship and commitment to service-learning. She has conducted extensive research and presented on her experience with service-learning as an effective form of pedagogy. [Another] faculty member was granted tenure shortly after having successfully defended her Doctoral Dissertation entitled: "The Evaluation of Service-Learning as an Innovative Strategy to Enhance BSN Students' Transcultural Self-Efficacy."

A third institution offered the following positive statistic:

**72% of promotion or tenure eligible faculty who incorporated community engaged practices in 2013 were granted tenure or received a promotion.** (University of St. Teresa)

A fourth example addresses the issue of legitimacy:

[S]cholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches is a legitimate basis for promotion and tenure. Since 2006, 261 faculty members have used their community-based research, publications, and conference presentations to buttress their portfolio for hiring, or for tenure and promotion review. Among these 261 faculty members, there were 734 articles and books published, 736 conference presentations, and 180 grants that addressed community engagement topics and themes. (Urban University)

St. Hilarius University cited direct language embedded in their RPT policies about the connection between status rewards and community engagement:

**Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor** presupposes among other factors ‘Evidence of such outstanding abilities in teaching, advising of students, and service to the University and the community as to merit general recognition throughout the University.’

How and where institutions reward faculty community engagement within RPT policies are critical considerations in the discussion about incentives
and legitimacy. The specific categories in which CE efforts get recognized—teaching, research, or service—is a topic addressed more extensively in the section on best practices in RPT policy design which directly follows this discussion of the five policy tools.

**Authority**

The authority policy tool rests on the assumption that people are inherently motivated to follow rules and expectations out of a sense of duty for obeying authority. As one of the most frequently used and effective policy tools in society (Schneider & Ingram, 1990), the influence of authority cannot be overlooked in higher education reward systems. As with incentive tools, the authority tool plays a significant role in faculty motivations because it legitimates what gets rewarded. All of the institutions in this study have a faculty handbook or set of guidelines formulating the policies of the institution in regards to RPT processes. Two institutions are governed by a collective bargaining agreement. Regardless of the governing structure, each institution’s RPT policies ultimately operate on the authority of the faculty body and academic administrators. RPT policies are most frequently written, approved, and amended by a faculty council or similar committee. The following excerpts from one Carnegie applicant recounts how the authority tool was applied in revising RPT policies to support faculty community engagement.
[Felix University’s] **Academic Council** passed a motion to revise the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure to include explicit language on community engagement in teaching, professional accomplishments and service. The process leading to these changes to the Guidelines included the engagement of institutional leadership, campus dialogue, and professional development on best practices in community-engaged scholarship.

[Felix’s] **Academic Council** voted in favor of a motion to form a subcommittee to consider the inclusion of language in the Faculty Handbook and/or Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion that recognizes the importance of community-engaged scholarship. The subcommittee surveyed the vast literature on community-engaged scholarship and best practices at comparable institutions. In light of the findings, the subcommittee recommended multiples changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion.

All of the recommended changes were approved by the **Academic Council** and the revised guidelines are currently in place. All department schools and colleges are bound by the institutional policy and we do not have separate polices at the school/department level.

In the case cited above, authority was granted to the Faculty Council to alter the guidelines which, in turn, affects all faculty members at the institution.

Beyond the authority of faculty handbooks, applicants also cited specific examples of campus leaders who provide public support and additional sources of authority for the practice of CE. These include the president, chief academic officers, department chairs, and in one case, a “Professional Review and Ethics Committee.” Because of the way RPT policies come into being and are used in RPT processes, every institution in this study essentially employs the authority policy tool as part of their strategy to encourage or discourage certain forms of faculty behavior and professional activity.
Capacity-Building

The capacity-building policy tool refers to training and support designed to achieve policy-preferred behaviors. All 31 institutions in this study offered myriad examples of professional development to increase faculty capacity for community engagement, from funding faculty to attend regional or national conferences on community-engagement to sponsoring campus workshop series, faculty certificate programs, brown bag lunch discussions, book circles, or invited speakers with a specialty in higher education civic engagement. For the purposes of my study, I looked more specifically for the presence of professional development directed at the faculty members and administrators who review RPT portfolios because such training is vital to community-engaged work being recognized, understood, assessed, and valued. In other words, does the institution have training in place on how to evaluate faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? The Carnegie Foundation only asked this question of those institutions applying for reclassification and I discuss the findings below.

Twelve of the 18 reclassifying institutions responded that they had faculty development for the evaluation of RPT portfolios. Of those, only 7 had training directed at RPT reviewers or potential reviewers (such as academic deans, department chairs, or senior faculty) and only 8 indicated that they explicitly
included content about how to evaluate scholarly work that used CE approaches and methods.

The situation for most institutions can be characterized as a "mixed bag" in terms of clarity around the process, delivery mechanisms, content, and audience for professional development geared toward understanding RPT portfolios that include CE. Some described training directed at any interested faculty regardless of rank or position (including, sometimes, faculty from other institutions), and many described training content focused on the practice of CE rather than on how to evaluate CE portfolios or scholarship. The following application responses from four institutions best illustrate the inconsistency in training approaches found across the cases:

- Faculty who are department chairs or deans and are involved in the preparation and review of candidates’ dossiers are included in a workshop-based training annually. This workshop includes discussion of the standards for review and promotion. [Target audience is clear; content is general--not specific to CE]

- Workshops related to the promotion and tenure process and evaluation in the context of the Boyer model are offered, but not required. [Optional training; target audience not clear; content clear--training focuses on evaluation using a particular model]

- While there is no professional development to faculty and administrators who review candidates' dossiers in the context of evaluating scholars work involving community engagement, there has been a retreat for Deans and Associate Deans to educate them on engaged pedagogy. [Target audience clear, though limited; content emphasizes understanding of CE, but not on evaluation]
• The faculty development program offers workshops to both applicants for promotion and tenure, as well as for chairs who participate in the review. However, chairs are not required to attend. [Target audience clear, though it misses critical positions and does not indicate whether training is optional or required; content not clear]

As can be seen, some institutions offer evaluative training, but not necessarily to those in positions of influence within the RPT process. The training might be broadly offered to any interested faculty or is not required at all. On the other hand, training about general evaluation protocols in the RPT process may be offered consistently to the right people (those on RPT committees), but the training may not explicitly address evaluation of CE. This latter situation is demonstrated in the first and third examples above.

Three institutions in this study indicated that they not only offered training addressing evaluation of CE scholarship, but also intentionally directed that training towards those involved in RPT decisions, especially those in senior faculty or leadership positions. These dual attributes are illustrated in the below examples, thus I would rate these institutions higher than others regarding the use of capacity-building tools as a strategy to encourage policy-preferred behaviors.

Clement College:

Members of the Promotion and Tenure Board in particular have received professional development on the value of community-engaged approaches. [The Provost] was hired for her experience with community partnerships and engagement. She has provided the primary orientation
and evaluative structure for faculty evaluations and reviews and is consistent in this messaging.

University of St. Edmund:
There are a variety of committees and councils in each of the colleges/schools that review and approve faculty dossiers. Each of the schools provides an orientation with specific references to the faculty handbook regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. During this time, the Chair of each reviewing committee discusses the details of each of the three main areas....Service-Learning is included for teaching and for scholarship areas of evaluation. There is an array of service type opportunities for each department so that faculty has [sic] a chance to develop ideas that include but are not limited to: workshops, videotapes, community councils, etc. This type of orientation is included in department reviews, college/school level reviews, and then the University council for promotion and tenure. For the University level review, the Provost reviews the evaluation process with the council members.

University of St. Teresa:
Since 2006 there have been on average eight workshops annually for senior faculty, department chairs, and deans to understand how to implement and evaluate community engaged practices...there is a scholarship of teaching and learning professional learning community that requires faculty to participate for a minimum of two years to understand the scholarship and pedagogy of community engaged practices...In 2013, the provost and the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, Business, Engineering, and Leadership and Education Sciences meet [sic] with the director of CSL and the Changemaker Hub to understand how to evaluate and deepen community engaged practices in each school. The provost and deans selected six faculty from each school to develop social innovation pedagogy across disciplines. To date the faculty champions have taken a leadership role in training other faculty and departments how to evaluate and create community engaged practices focused on social innovation.

Aside from these three exemplars, few institutions demonstrated that they had the sort of training needed to build capacity for evaluating CE or that such training would consistently reach those most responsible for evaluating
portfolios containing CE. In this way, the capacity-building tool did not appear to be used as robustly as it might by most institutions in this study.

**Learning**

The learning policy tool seeks to help people evaluate and select the policy tools that they think will be most effective to achieve certain ends. It takes into consideration the processes, people, and resources used to develop policy and attempts to involve many stakeholders (including the policy targets) when revising policy. The Carnegie application queried all institutions on this point: “If current policies do not specifically reward community engagement, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If yes, describe the current work in progress.” Responses to this question assisted in determining which “learning” tools, if any, were being employed at the time of the application and whether an active conversation amongst faculty and academic leadership was part of the institution’s policy strategy. At least eighteen institutions (58%) in this study indicated that they have work-in-progress to assess how they can strengthen their RPT policies in support of CE faculty work. This work-in-progress took the form of ongoing conversations or newly formed committees and included considerations of including more specific references to CE and defining terms within policy documents.
The above analysis of five policy tools provided a useful method for evaluating a policy’s capacity to enable community engagement by focusing on the motivational attributes they contain. Ellison & Eatman (2008) contend that policy design is a crucial factor as well. They call for clarity in defining what is meant by community engagement, clarity in how faculty roles and responsibilities relate to CE, and clarity in how the policy is informed by the context and culture of the broader community in which the institution exists. These are all hallmarks of RPT policies which enable faculty to pursue CE. In the next 3 themes, I explore and evaluate each of these policy design features for the 31 cases.

**Theme 4: Presence and Absence of Community Engagement Definitions in RPT Policy**

The literature review revealed many considerations for what should be included in RPT guidelines to fully value and reward community engagement work performed by faculty. For the purposes of this study, I focused on three major considerations for RPT policies that demonstrate support for CE approaches and methods: 1) the inclusion of institution-wide definitions of community engagement and faculty scholarly work that uses CE approaches and methods, 2) a description of faculty roles and responsibilities that incorporates a community engagement orientation and recognizes a continuum of scholarship, and 3) a recognition of the external community context with a view towards
collaboration and reciprocity. Within these considerations, I also searched for indications that the institutional mission was expected to guide faculty in their professional responsibilities. This, too, is a feature of best practice in RPT policy design. It should not be forgotten that it is important to analyze if and how RPT policies explain to faculty the methods for documenting community engagement work for presentation to RPT reviewers, identify who can serve as a peer reviewer, and establish the criteria used to evaluate scholarship. Carnegie applicants were not prompted to address these latter expectations, thus those considerations are beyond the scope of this study. The Carnegie application does, however, directly ask how each institution defines community engagement and the meaning of public scholarship. I present the findings to those questions next.

The Carnegie application asked all applicants to provide an institution-wide definition of community engagement. Such a definition might be applied to any number of activities and programs, either in the curricular or co-curricular realms of the institution. Institutions seeking re-classification were also prompted to respond to the following question specifically pertaining to faculty roles and rewards: “Is there an institution-wide definition of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? Please describe and identify the policy (or other) document(s) where this appears and provide the definition.”
Just about all institutions, both first-time classification and reclassification, offered a variety of the preferred words, phrases, and descriptions of CE used on their campuses. These were drawn from strategic plans, mission and vision statements, institutional websites, or Centers devoted to community-engagement. Few institutions, however, could provide a clear definition of community-engaged scholarship taken directly from their faculty handbook. Many offered either broad definitions from the RPT policy or indicated that the understanding of faculty scholarly work resided somewhere other than their faculty handbook. Table 14 offers a summary of how the re-classified institutions in this study responded to the question about defining faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods. The table includes an evaluation of the characteristics of the definition (i.e. the definition is inclusive of CE or is broad and ambiguous) as well as the location for the information (i.e. inside or outside the policy). It also identifies the institutions that do not have a definition for scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods.

Table 14: Summary of Reclassified Institutions’ Use of Definitions for Faculty Scholarly Work that Uses Community-Engaged Approaches and Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition for faculty scholarly work explicitly includes dimensions of CE</th>
<th>In Policy</th>
<th>Outside of Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Boniface University, Valentine University</td>
<td>(2) Alexander University, Felix University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of institutions referenced Boyer’s model as the definition they embraced for scholarship, inferring that CE was embedded in that model. Some institutions use Boyer’s language directly in the policy while others cited that Boyer’s model guided current tenure and promotion protocols, had been embedded in other institutional documents beyond the faculty handbook, or had guided revision processes leading to new tenure and promotion policies that support CE. Next, I present examples that demonstrate the various approaches re-classifying institutions used to define faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods.

**Clear Definitions of CE Residing in Policy**

Only two institutions identified a definition for faculty scholarly work that uses CE approaches and methods *and* appears within their institution’s RPT document. Boniface University’s faculty handbook includes the following definition of scholarship:

| Definition for faculty scholarly work is broad; may imply inclusion of CE, but is ambiguous | (2) Innocent University  
St. David University | (6) St. David University,  
Madeleine University,  
Nicholas University,  
University of St. Teresa,  
Urban University,  
University of St. Edmund |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No definition</td>
<td>(7) Clement College, Gregory University, Lando University, St. Marie Rose College, St. Pius University, Seraphina College, Wenceslas University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The application of knowledge in responsible ways to consequential problems of contemporary society and the larger community, so that one’s scholarly specialty informs and is informed by interactions with that community.

Valentine University’s rank and tenure policy states:

[A] productive scholarly and professional life, including basic and applied research and, where appropriate, professional practice, is an essential element of the educational and learning process. Similarly, [Valentine] believes that participation in and contributions to one’s department, college, University, profession, and community are the natural and desirable outgrowths of the scholarly life.”

Broad or Ambiguous Definitions of CE Residing in Policy

Two of the re-classifying institutions offered language directly from their policies that they thought defined community-engaged scholarship. Innocent University draws upon the Boyer model which is demonstrated through the references embedded in their RPT policy for full-time faculty, but they do not make a specific connection to having a responsibility to the community. They assert that this broad institutional statement on faculty scholarship is considered inclusive of community engagement activities as a form of scholarship:

All faculty members are expected to engage in a demanding program of professional development and scholarship:

(a) As a teacher-scholar strengthening and updating professional expertise for classroom instruction (Scholarship of Teaching).

(b) As a scholar strengthening and broadening the faculty member’s scholarly and academic credentials (Scholarship of Discovery).

(c) As a practitioner engaging in both theory and application (Scholarship of Application).
(d) As an integrated scholar placing specialties in a broader context (Scholarship of Integration)

St. David University believes that community-engaged scholarship is represented in the following Faculty Handbook declaration, however, these statements are quite broad and ambiguous regarding the meaning of “community”:

[A] basic goal of [St. David] University is to support a community dedicated to the discovery, enhancement, and communication of knowledge and to the free and diligent pursuit of truth, in order to provide society with men and women able and willing to act as wise, creative, and responsible leaders.’

It is not clear how “community” is being used in this latter example, but it seems more directed at the internal campus community than external communities. Both of the above examples only imply that CE is part of the definition of scholarship. The definition does not mention the development of relationships with or responsibility towards external constituencies.

Clear Definitions of CE Residing Outside of Policy

Alexander University presents a robust definition of service-learning as its understanding of faculty scholarly work that uses community engagement: “a pedagogy of community-informed scholarship, reflective thought, and civic responsibility that promotes intentional learning, provides experiential knowledge, and fulfills community-defined needs.” The University clearly
situates service-learning as an academic endeavor and includes reference to mission values within the definition:

The corresponding service-learning objectives include: 1) service-learning is embedded in credit-bearing courses and requires educational objectives that are fundamentally integrated with community-driven initiatives; 2) service-learning intentionally combines service with academics in activities that change both the recipient, the provider of the service, and the community at large; and 4) service-learning is accomplished through collaborative and structured opportunities that demonstrate the [Alexander] Franciscan mission of ‘knowledge joined with love.’

The definition and criteria cited above were developed by a Service-Learning Action Committee, which had representation from faculty in seven different disciplines across campus. The definition, however, is not located within the RPT documents. Rather, it appears on Alexander’s service-learning webpage. The applicant did note that, ”The Rank and Tenure Committee developed criteria that clearly mark the scholarship of community engagement and service-learning as a path toward faculty promotion and tenure.” These criteria apparently reside outside the faculty handbook.

Similarly, a working group at Felix University developed criteria for peer reviews for community-engaged scholarship within the health unit of the University. More broadly, the applicant notes that their recently revised RPT policies were informed by and reflect an extensive process that employed both Boyer’s model and Carnegie’s definition of scholarship. Blending these two together yielded an institutional understanding presented as follows:
The scholarship of engagement includes explicitly democratic dimensions of encouraging the participation of non-academics in ways that enhance and broaden engagement and deliberation about major social issues inside and outside the university. It seeks to facilitate a more active and engaged democracy by bringing affected publics into problem-solving work in ways that advance the public good with and not merely for the public.

The applicant further stated that, at Felix University, the scholarship of engagement is defined as “community engaged scholarship that involves the faculty member in a reciprocal partnership with the community, is interdisciplinary, and integrates faculty roles of teaching, research, and service.”

**Broad or Ambiguous Definitions of CE Residing Outside of Policy**

Quite a few of the re-classifying institutions offered a broad or ambiguous definition for community-engaged scholarship that resided outside their RPT policy documents. St. David University noted that a modified version of a broad definition including CE appears on their webpages. Madeleine University and University of St. Edmund both said that their institutions had adopted Boyer’s definition of scholarship, but did not supply any language directly from their RPT document to reflect this. The University of St. Teresa indicated that it used “enhanced components” within their core curriculum. Enhanced components were described as the equivalent of George Kuh’s “high impact practices” which includes among many other practices, service-learning.

Urban University’s definition of community engagement included faculty “participatory research and scholarship’ that makes the university relevant to
the surrounding world.” The applicant was not clear about where this definition resides. Furthermore, they cited a series of accrediting agencies’ criteria for faculty professional work which included CE. For example, the School of Management’s Master of Public Administration accreditation agency, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) “universal required competencies” include the ability “to lead and manage in public governance,” “to participate in and contribute to the policy process,” and “to articulate and apply a public service perspective.” Meanwhile, the American Bar Association indicates that law schools have “obligations to the public, including participation in pro bono activities.”

In sum, the six institutions in the “broad and outside of policy” category were unable to cite language directly from their RPT policies that provided a clear definition of faculty scholarly work using community engagement approaches and methods. Rather, they pointed to general definitions residing outside of institutional faculty policy documents and even outside of the institution itself, as in Urban University’s case.

Even though definitions for community-engaged scholarship were not spelled out in many RPT policies, the existence of definitions elsewhere may be useful when they are explicit. Certainly, many applicants implied that the design and interpretation of the policy were informed by such outside sources. These
definitions represent the cultural conditions and institutional understandings which inform RPT policies, thus they are important to note.

Theme 5: Faculty Roles and a Continuum of Scholarship in RPT Policy Design

Ellison & Eatman (2008) prompted designers of RPT policy to consider the following questions: Do faculty roles as expressed in RPT policies support a continuum of scholarship as discussed earlier in the literature review? What elements are represented within this continuum? Does the policy embrace a range of approaches and many professional pathways, running from traditional field-centered scholarship to reciprocal scholarship and public engagement? Does the policy acknowledge work that builds on collaborations with community and is interpreted so that a broader public can understand it? In this section, I review findings about the quality of representation of CE within institutional faculty reward policies. I look at where and how institutions categorized CE in the faculty roles of teaching, research, and service. Through a review of RPT policy language characteristics, I consider the strength and capacity of the language to send a clear message to faculty in support of CE as legitimate scholarly activity. I also include some findings about RPT policies at the college and departmental levels.

Twenty-two institutions (71%) in this study affirmed that they had institutional level RPT polices specifically rewarding faculty scholarly work using community-engaged approaches and methods. Nine (29%) indicated that
they did not have such institutional level reward policies in place; however, in these cases, each cited one or more other ways support for faculty community engagement was indicated at their institution:

- college or departmental level policies;
- examples of how CE work was rewarded in one of the three categories of teaching, research, or service even if the institutional-level policy didn’t explicitly indicate it;
- candidates who successfully gained promotion or tenure with a portfolio that included CE work;
- specific faculty CE projects taking place at the institution (implying that faculty were not inhibited to do this work);
- work in progress to enhance CE reward policies at the institutional level.

All Carnegie applicants were asked to indicate the areas of faculty responsibilities for which community-engagement was rewarded at their institution. Was it acknowledged and rewarded as a form of teaching and learning, as a form of scholarship, or as a form of service? A summary of responses indicated strong representation in all three areas of responsibility across institutions as shown in Table 15.
Table 15: Where Applicants Indicate Faculty are Rewarded for CE within RPT Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table includes the yes/no response as given from all institutions. These responses do not necessarily equate to the actual presence of institution-wide policies supporting CE. Some institutions may have had in mind their college or departmental policies or other indications of support when answering “yes” or “no.”

Overall, the prevalence of CE being rewarded in all three areas of faculty responsibility at first appeared to be a significant finding when compared to Saltmarsh et al.’s (2009) study of successful Carnegie CE classification applicants from 2006. The authors noted a tendency for institutions to include community engagement predominately as a faculty “service” activity with a few exceptions (8 institutions) taking a more integrated approach across the three traditional faculty roles. In my study, the majority of institutions (87%) under investigation claimed to reward community engagement across all three categories. See comparisons in tables 16 and 17.
Table 16: How Catholic Institutions Receiving the 2015 Carnegie CE Classification Say they Rewarded Community Engagement: Number of Applications Responding Affirmatively in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching/Learning Only</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
<th>Service Only</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning and Research</th>
<th>Research and Service</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning, Research, and Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This institution indicated that there were no institutional level RPT policies rewarding CE and also that CE was not rewarded in any of the 3 areas of faculty roles and responsibilities. Later in the application, this institution cited departmental faculty policies that rewarded CE, citing 3 departments that reward CE in 1 or more of the 3 categories.

Table 17: How applicants receiving the Carnegie CE Classification in 2006 Rewarded Community Engagement: Number of Applicants Mentioning Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching/Learning Only</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
<th>Service Only</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning and Research</th>
<th>Research and Service</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning, Research, and Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These institutions answered “yes” to having institutional promotion and tenure policies rewarding community engagement; however, they did not specify category or criteria for how it would be evaluated.

It should be noted that Saltmarsh et. al.’s study was based on the 2006 version of the Carnegie application in which all faculty rewards questions (including categorization of community engagement in RPT policies) were optional. In the 2015 application, responses to faculty rewards questions were required. A second difference is that the sample population from the 2009 study included both secular and non-secular institutions. The researchers did not attempt to draw any conclusions about RPT policies based on a secular/non-secular distinction beyond saying that an institutional culture which embraced...
its responsibility as a “steward of place” may have been linked to those who had revised their RPT policies to support CE. Despite these differences in the present and former studies, the findings from my study may indicate some critical movement in the past decade—at least amongst some of the most community engaged institutions in the nation with a Catholic identity—towards increased recognition of CE within the various responsibilities of faculty professional roles. Furthermore, the recognition of community-based work as having a place in multiple realms of faculty activity aligns with Ellison and Eatman’s (2008) best practices for tenure policy as well as Boyer’s (1990) conception of a capacious view of scholarship in the academy.

Since the above findings are based solely on each applicant’s simple “yes/no” response for placing CE into teaching, scholarship, and service categories, I performed a content analysis on the narrative responses justifying these placements. The application prompted respondents to cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document) to back up their claims. Many applicants did quote excerpts from faculty handbooks as requested. Others, however, offered a narrative interpretation of the policy or a mixture of paraphrases from the policy, quoted material from non-policy documents, or specific examples of faculty CE work that had been rewarded in one way or another by the institution irrespective of policy language.
Overall, I found that there was a general tendency for applicants to portray a favorable interpretation of their institution’s RPT policy’s level of support for CE, even if no text could be provided from their RPT documents that demonstrated a clear understanding of or commitment to CE as faculty scholarly work. For example, in lieu of specific language supporting CE or clear CE definitions within the policy, some responses cited the college's mission as making the case for the inclusion of CE in faculty roles, especially where faculty handbooks included a reference to mission in their preamble or introduction. Others reasoned that that broad descriptions of teaching, research, and service embraced community engaged work and thus no special language beyond this was required. Still others cited as evidence for CE support the training provided by the institution or ways that faculty are evaluated and rewarded beyond promotion and tenure (such as faculty awards given for CE). For example, one university said, “The institutionalization of an Office of Service-Learning organized under Academic Administration serves as a type of reward in that the Office is designed for faculty participating in curricular community engagement.”

The above observations called into question the extent to which the application responses could be relied upon to represent an objective view of the policy statements themselves. Even if quoted text from the policy was provided, it was not necessarily clear about how it supported CE scholarship. In order to
arrive at a meaningful analysis of the responses, I devised a coding scheme to evaluate the presence and quality of specific references to community engagement within the institution’s policy. The codes consisted of 3 levels of CE representation in the policy: inclusive, ambiguous, or absent. I coded units of text as “inclusive” if the applicant supplied quoted material from the policy and those excerpts directly named characteristics of CE, demonstrated an understanding of the features of CE, or used CE terminology in the respective faculty role category. Here, I drew upon Moore & Ward’s (2010) engagement-oriented definitions of teaching, research, and service presented earlier in this study (Table 1) to ask the following: Were forms of community engagement included under teaching responsibilities? Was engaged or public scholarship named under research responsibilities? Were public service or outreach activities contained under service responsibilities? In addition, I searched for evidence that integration across faculty responsibilities was expected, valued, or supported as proposed in Boyer’s model of scholarship. Specifically, was the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) named as a legitimate form of scholarship? Lastly, the Carnegie definition of community engagement prompted me to determine if reciprocity or community input played a role in the expectations for faculty work. If the forms of representation cited above were present in the policy document, then the policy language was coded as inclusive.
I coded units of text as “ambiguous” if excerpts from the policy were included or referenced in the response but only implied that the policy could be interpreted as inclusive of CE. Put another way, I coded text as ambiguous if the policy language neither explicitly promoted nor excluded CE methods and approaches.

Lastly, I coded units of text as “absent” if no quoted material from the RPT policy was supplied, no RPT document was referenced, or the provided RPT statements clearly did not support CE. In a few cases, where I wasn't sure how to code the segment of text provided in the application, I consulted the actual RPT document if it was publicly available to make a determination.

One might conclude that in cases where no direct policy language was provided in an applicant’s response, the institution’s policies do not adequately support CE practices or do so in an explicit fashion. Nevertheless, most institutions indicated that their RPT policies did support CE. Since at least one goal of mining the 31 applications was to reveal potential exemplars of mission-policy alignment, an initial round of content analysis using the above codes yielded useful indicators for narrowing the field. In keeping with the constant comparative method, I continuously re-evaluated the placement of a unit of text into one of the three categories as I proceeded. For example, if I initially coded a piece of text as "inclusive," but it did not seem so clearly inclusive after comparing it to the language of other cases, then I re-coded the text and placed it
in one of the other two categories (e.g. “ambiguous” or “absent”). Once I coded all applicant responses for each of the three faculty roles, I re-read the RPT language in each category to determine if there were common characteristics amongst them. I created memos grouping these characteristics together and noting their features. Below is a summary of the characteristics of faculty reward policies where CE support is inclusive, ambiguous, or absent. Within each category, I considered the findings in relation to the three areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, research, and service.

**Characteristics of CE-Inclusive RPT Policies**

Nine institutions (29%) appeared to have met the conditions for having inclusive, institution-wide language rewarding CE as a teaching/learning activity. Twelve institutions (38.7%) exhibited inclusion of CE in their rewards policy pertaining to the faculty scholar/researcher role. Twenty-six institutions (83.9%) included CE as part of the faculty service expectations. There are a variety of ways in which this support manifested itself; however, some common elements surfaced from the content analysis. Each element is discussed in turn below.

**Use of explicit CE terminology.** Support for CE in the teaching/learning category was largely characterized by specific use of the terminology "service-learning," “community-based learning,” or "community-engagement" as an
aspect of teaching excellence. Typically supportive and explicit policy
statements from faculty handbooks are represented in the following examples:

Evaluation of teaching excellence includes designing and/or teaching
service-learning courses. (Alexander University)

Teaching accomplishments include developing and teaching ‘new or
existing courses designed for community engagement.’ (Felix)

Several institutional policies went beyond simply acknowledging the design and
teaching of CE courses. These policies recognized that community work
instigated by faculty could be associated with the "transmission of knowledge,"
"sharing of professional growth," "leadership of intellectual ethical concerns,"
"facilitating faculty seminars," supervision of student "community-engaged
projects, research, or internships," and "innovations in teaching and integrative
approaches that bring together teaching, scholarship, and community
engagement."

Policies that articulated the expectations for evaluation of teaching using
CE further illustrated explicit support. One institution's policy identified
acceptable sources for evaluation of teaching that take into account the
community perspective. This institution's policy said that assessment of teaching
can include "community partner evaluations and community-based peer or
student evaluations." Additionally, this same policy allowed, as part of the
faculty portfolio, the inclusion of “[o]ther community outreach teaching not
counted as part of your teaching load.” A different institution’s policy stated
that “Properly conducted, faculty evaluation will enhance all academic programs because it encourages faculty members to work toward...performing service to the community-at-large.”

In the scholarship/research category, the explicit CE language defining acceptable scholarship was presented in the following ways.

Scholarship is

The application of knowledge in responsible ways to consequential problems of contemporary society, the larger community, so that one’s scholarly specialty informs and is informed by interactions with that community. (Boniface)

Similarly, St. Cecilia University’s faculty evaluation manual describes seven types of scholarship, one of which is “scholarship that leads to or results from action aimed at participating with the wider community.” Wenceslas University references the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) as a legitimate form of scholarship, while Alexander University lists, "scholarly work...in educational pedagogy, including service-learning” in their faculty RPT policies for scholarship.

At Felix University, community partners are suggested as potential peer reviewers of scholarship, thus emphasizing the importance of community input and mutual benefit which are both key features of the Carnegie definition of community engagement. The statement guiding faculty self-evaluation of their work reads as follows:
For community engaged scholarship, demonstrate how work was conducted in partnership with the community and characterized by mutuality, reciprocity, sustainability, and shared goals.

Similarly, Gwen University’s policy states:

The key feature of the scholarship of engagement is that the university and faculty engage with a community organization or public entity in a mutually beneficial partnership that evidences a collaborative and reciprocal relationship. Products from scholarship of engagement have a social action component. The outcome and or knowledge gained through the inquiry process enhance the well-being of a community and its constituents and demonstrate social responsibility.

A number of institutions listed specific products to demonstrate their capacious view of scholarship which would be inclusive of CE efforts:

In addition to the refereed publications, monographs, and other creative works that typically comprise tenure and promotion dossiers, dossiers may include such items as policy reports, patents and licensing documentation, etc. There is an expectation that this scholarship—much like “traditional” scholarship—be a part of a rigorous, coherent body of work aimed at extending knowledge, engaging and informing others, and transforming the community. (Felix University)

Wenceslas University recognized a variety of scholarly research that would fulfill the scholarship criteria for RPT portfolios, including applied research in which knowledge is brought to bear in new or particularly effective ways on...physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural, or moral problems or conditions to produce new understandings, solutions, technologies, models, materials, or inventions.

The policy language in this latter example could be construed as being less precise than other descriptions, but it does still carry an inclusive tone for work that addresses contemporary problems, seeks solutions to common challenges or
moral issues, and is impactful to the broader society. Further examples of the
“broad, but inclusive” condition are evident in the following examples.

Margaret University’s faculty handbook accepts faculty activity such as
“community service drawing directly upon scholarship such as state and local
educational services.” The applicant maintained that this statement defined civic-
based scholarship as a qualifier for promotion and tenure.

At the College of St. Julia, application of knowledge is “demonstrated
through community engaged scholarship, public programming, [and]
collaboration with other institutions and groups.” Seraphina College’s faculty
handbook displayed almost identical language, and also included the

“[t]ransformation of knowledge through pedagogical and curricular
development: museum catalogues and exhibits, film and radio
presentations, other public programs, research and writing designed to
improve teaching at the college or K-12 levels, development of assessment
tools, education of faculty.

Felix University’s faculty policy speaks of the University’s commitment to
research in the following terms:

In fulfillment of its mission to render public service, the university offers
its physical and human resources to support the research needs of the public and private sectors of our society. It encourages the establishment
of team- oriented, multidisciplinary research programs which are
responsive to the complex problems facing contemporary society.

This broad statement about commitment to research doesn’t necessarily say that
the external community should be involved in projects. It could be interpreted as
leaning more heavily towards faculty "doing for" rather than "with"; however, ultimately I interpreted this as sufficiently open-ended to be inclusive.

Another indicator of CE-inclusive policy language occurs when institutions emphasize the integration and overlap of responsibilities across faculty roles and disciplines in keeping with Boyer's conception of a continuum of scholarship as in the following two examples:

Scholarship encompasses four separate but overlapping functions. (Boniface University)

The Scholarship of Engagement incorporates the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching to understand and solve pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. (Gwen University)

In Gerard College’s application, the narrative response states that “the lines between scholarship and service are often times quite blurred because of our expansive definition of scholarship.” Additionally, integration of knowledge across the disciplines was seen as a necessary condition to perform the following faculty tasks stated in their RPT document:

Sharing of expertise to address a local or global challenge; offering substantial consultation that affects professional approaches.

Again, these latter statements do not necessarily demonstrate the quality of reciprocity with the community in as a clear a way as the Carnegie definition for CE suggests it should, but they do indicate an expectation for scholarship to have an application and impact beyond the institution or the disciplinary field.
Service grounded in a faculty member's expertise. Earlier in this paper, I established that the defining features of the faculty service role using an engagement orientation included public or professional service and outreach where faculty employ their particular expertise to address community-based needs. A number of institutions use just this sort of language in their RPT guidelines to describe how community engagement should be documented and rewarded in the service category. This is another form of CE-inclusive policy design. For example, at Boniface University,

Community service consists of activities that require the faculty member’s expertise, either the specialized expertise in the faculty member’s field or the general skills possessed by all members of the faculty, and that contribute to the public welfare outside the institution, consistent with the Vincentian tradition.

Gerard College cites faculty contributions to

the cultural, intellectual, and residential life of the community;
membership on boards and committees; leadership and other significant contributions to specific organizations, and presentations to churches, community organizations, area schools, and businesses, etc. as rewarded forms of service. When this kind of community engagement is related to the faculty member’s area of expertise it is credited as service.

Felix University’s policy requires that

Faculty members submitting documentation in support of their community and professional service achievements for tenure and promotion should clearly demonstrate the relationship between their professional abilities or development and the roles they have played in service or criticism.
Felix’s RPT document clearly includes community engagement as a service activity and expects candidates to describe their

application of knowledge, skills, and expertise to pressing social, moral, and civic issues and problems, by forming and maintaining sustainable working relationships (characterized by mutual benefits and shared goals) with community partners.

Similar expressions of service connected to a faculty member’s specialized knowledge are worded as follows:

- [F]aculty use their academic expertise to promote the public welfare. (Gregory University)
- Services by members of the faculty to the University, community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities, should likewise be recognized. (University of St. Teresa)
- Voluntary involvement in the activities of religious, community, government, or other public or private sector institutions that is related to one’s academic position or expertise. (Valentine University)
- Faculty members submitting documentation in support of their community and professional service achievements for tenure and promotion should clearly demonstrate the relationship between their professional abilities or development and the roles they have played in service. (St. Demetria University)

Policy statements such as the ones above indicated in clear terms that community-engagement activity was valued in the service category when connected to the faculty member’s expertise, thus sending a message of inclusion for the reward of CE efforts.
Mission connection. Earlier, I discussed the importance of mission alignment with RPT policies, and specifically, the connection between an institution’s Catholic identity, charism of the founding sponsor, and faculty roles as public scholars and community engagement professionals. Several Carnegie applicants emphasized how these connections were explicitly represented in their RPT policies. In the following three examples, the connection was made clear between the service mission of the institution and faculty roles:

The University mission encompasses service to the community around it. Faculty members are therefore encouraged to participate in community projects and organizations, helping to carry out the programs of community service that are appropriate to the mission of the University and the professional identity of the faculty member. (St. Hilarius University)

The University mission helps to define faculty roles. The University's mission in turn is defined by the faculty members' work as teachers and scholars, as colleagues, as mentors to the students, and as servants to the community. (Gwen University)

[The faculty] participates in activities that promote the mission, vision, and visibility of the college to the community beyond the campus through service. (Gerard College)

Examples of connection to mission in association with the institution’s founding sponsor and charism were also expressed as part of the faculty service role:

Service takes many forms… Providing opportunities for students to use their energy and talents in the interests of others is an important dimension of education in the Jesuit tradition. (Leo College)

Service can also include (but is not limited to) the following activities: …service to the larger community in keeping with the College’s Lasallian traditions and concern for social justice. (St. Marie Rose College)
There were also numerous examples of mission connection offered in anecdotal form as opposed to direct quotes from the RPT policy itself:

Leadership, in the Jesuit tradition, especially includes work in service of others, and generally, in service of the world. Although a great deal of service is less immediately beneficial, community engagement is among the purest and most obvious form of service within the Catholic and Jesuit tradition. (Gregory University)

[Community involvement as a factor for faculty evaluation] reflect[s] the University’s Mission Statement’s ‘commitment to dignity of the human person, social justice, diversity, intercultural competence, global engagement, solidarity with the poor and vulnerable, and care for the planet.’ (Helena University)

Community-based service is recognized and rewarded as service. A faculty member’s ability to serve our local and global communities is woven into the fabric of the tenure and promotion process through our focus on the… University mission and our founders’ calling to ‘address the needs of the time.’ (St. Cecilia University)

These latter three excerpts represent a challenging feature in my analysis of RPT policies because some applicant information was provided in a narrative form rather than through a direct provision of the actual policy language. These interpretations were ostensibly offered to demonstrate what the applicant believed to be a general understanding of a welcoming environment for CE on their campus. Ultimately, in my analysis, a policy was not deemed “CE-inclusive” for a given area of faculty responsibility unless the actual text of the policy demonstrated at least one of the common elements described above (i.e. direct use of CE language, evidence of community input/reciprocity, mission
alignment, or community work grounded in a faculty area of expertise). It should be noted that even within the cohort of institutions deemed as having inclusive CE policies, the language they employed ranged from clear and explicit to broad or generalized support for CE.

The faculty service role deserves particular attention in my findings section as this is the area where community engagement most often appeared to be explicitly acknowledged and rewarded. All of the RPT policies I examined made reference to traditional interpretations of faculty service as might be expected (i.e. service to one's institution or department through participation in chair duties, internal committees, and special projects for the college, or service to one’s disciplinary field by planning conferences and so forth). For the purposes of this study, though, I was most interested in detecting support for an engagement orientation towards faculty service (defined as service performed for and with the broader public and communities external to the college). For example, does the policy pertaining to the faculty service role make room for the sharing of one’s knowledge and gifts beyond the institutional or professional academic audience as is displayed in the following policy excerpt?

Faculty members are encouraged to provide service to the community by working with people and organizations outside the faculty member's profession. Such service may include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: 1. Lectures to non-professional community groups; 2. Leadership positions in political, church, or community activities; 3. Participation in non-profit organizations designed to serve the general public. (Gwen University)
In my analysis of the service role, it soon became apparent that a broad array of activity designed to benefit the external community fit into the faculty service category, and that the inclusion of certain activities here might have more appropriately fit under a different category using Moore & Ward's (2010) definitions as a guide. For example, an activity such as service-learning is viewed by many engagement experts as an academic endeavor. When educators integrate community-based projects into their courses to achieve specific learning objectives, they are using an intentional pedagogical tool. In a number of policies, however, service-learning was placed under the service category instead of the teaching/learning category of faculty responsibility. This situation is captured in the following policy outlining acceptable “service” activity for faculty:

The...University Faculty Handbook uses the descriptor “community service” as one form of collegiate service for promotion and tenure. The “community service” designation includes personal volunteerism with a recognized nonprofit agency, service-learning projects with students, involvement on community boards devoted to social service. (Margaret University)

Similarly, activities such as the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) could potentially fit both under research activity and teaching/learning when viewed as integrated scholarly activity. In some cases, this sort of work did appear under the teaching or scholarship expectations. At other institutions, however, it appeared under the service category as in the following case:
Faculty may also be indirectly supporting community engagement through *pedagogical workshops on service learning* and *community-based research presentations* to their professional colleagues at the regional and national levels. (Gwen University)

The placement of faculty instruction and community-based research into the service category calls into question whether certain types of professional activity are truly valued as legitimate scholarly work or teaching. This situation was detected in other RPT policies, as well. “[P]roducing research, reports or giving presentations to community organizations” and doing “research of direct relevance to the external community” were cited as acceptable activity for promotion and tenure; however, they were presented under the faculty service category.

The above examples highlight that community outreach tied to the faculty member’s expertise as a teacher or scholar were counted as part of the service category in some RPT policies. I also found many examples of community service activities being rewarded that may or may not have been expected to connect to a faculty member’s area of study. In fact, a majority of policies encouraged faculty to engage in this type of activity. The following excerpts demonstrate the types of service to the broader community typically cited under the faculty service role.

[Community Service consists of] **membership on a city or municipal planning commission, membership on a school board, or holding office in a regional artistic or social welfare organization.** (St. David University)
Community service includes a **wide range of activities directed toward local, state, or national groups**. Examples of such service include lectures, panel discussions, radio and television appearances, membership on advisory boards or civic committees; involvement in community, political, or charitable organizations, service to religious bodies, or to the government, and involvement in youth and citizen recreation programs. (Urban University)

One institution noted that the purpose of faculty engaging in community service activity was to “contribute to the improvement of their community and add to the prestige of the University.”

**Summary of CE-inclusive RPT policies.** The above findings demonstrate various characteristics of CE-inclusive policies. These features included specific use of CE terminology which mirrors the language used in the community engagement field; attention to the input of and impact on communities external to the college; alignment with the institutional mission; and expectations that community work be connected to the faculty member’s area of disciplinary expertise. As my content analysis proceeded, I discovered that some policies presented a more neutral or open-ended tone towards CE efforts as part of faculty responsibilities. Thus, a second category emerged which I labeled “ambiguous.”

**Characteristics of CE-Ambiguous RPT Policies**

Policy statements pertaining to each of the three faculty roles were deemed ambiguous if the policy language regarding community engagement
was too broad or open for interpretation. Thirteen institutions (41.9%) had ambiguous policies towards CE in the teaching/learning realm of faculty responsibilities. In the scholarship area of responsibility, five institutions (16.1%) presented ambiguous or neutral language in support of CE. In the service area of responsibility, only one institution (3.2%) appeared to offer ambiguous support of CE. I describe some of the common characteristics of those policies here.

**Mission connection used as a proxy for community engagement.** In my content analysis for evaluating whether a RPT policy employed inclusive and enabling language for community-engagement, I took into account how the policy made use of the institutional mission. In the prior section on inclusive CE policies, I provided examples of the ways in which the institutional mission strengthened and clarified faculty priorities for community engagement. In those cases, the policy clearly identified service and concern for the wider community as important aspects of the mission, and therefore, faculty roles. We know from the first set of findings in this paper (Theme 1) that mission priorities of Catholic colleges and universities may comprise many factors (e.g. goals for community engagement, Catholic Intellectual Tradition, Catholic Social Teaching, leadership, professional preparation, diversity and inclusion, global competence, and so forth.) A number of Carnegie applicants suggested that policies calling for faculty to demonstrate their commitment to the mission of the institution was the equivalent of support for community engagement activity.
However, they did not identify which aspects of the mission were being referred to nor used specific CE terminology. Put another way, “mission” and “community engagement” were occasionally presented as synonymous or interchangeable concepts as in the following example:

Community engagement is not rewarded specifically as a form of teaching and learning. However, in the Portfolio for Promotion Guidelines, faculty members must demonstrate how, through teaching, they contribute to the fulfillment of the University Mission. (Brigid University)

This applicant then included an excerpt from the institution’s mission statement that suggested a favorable view towards educational practices oriented towards community-engagement:

In the Catholic intellectual tradition, integration of study, reflection and action inform the intellectual life. Faithful to this tradition, a [Brigid University] education and university experience foster individual and communal transformation where learning leads to knowledge and truth, reflection leads to informed action, and a commitment to social justice leads to collaborative service.

It is supposed here that if a faculty member has an understanding of the mission, then his or her activity geared towards service is desirable and to be rewarded. I ultimately labeled the policy “ambiguous” because the mission was being used as a proxy for CE. In St. Natalia’s University’s Faculty Handbook, the "Criteria for Faculty Performance" is presented as follows:

Faculty member's [sic] performances should reflect the commitment to the contents of the mission and educational visions and to the improvement of its intellectual and practical effectiveness.
The broad language used here does not appear to constrain faculty members from engaging in community-engagement activity as part of their teaching responsibilities, but neither does it explicitly cite CE as a mission-driven activity. The assumption that a faculty member’s commitment to the mission of the institution would be interpreted as community engagement prompted me to label this section of the RPT policy as ambiguous.

**Implied support.** Support for CE as a part of faculty expectations for teaching and learning was often expressed through the use of umbrella terms within the RPT policy. The use of such terms suggested favorable inclusion of CE practices but did not state so specifically. Umbrella terms revealed themselves in rewarded teaching practices such as "alternate methods of content delivery," "innovative pedagogies," "experiential learning," and "contributions to the core curriculum." In these examples, it is assumed that faculty know or agree that CE fits under these broad expectations. As one applicant explained "experiential learning and community engagement are synonymous within the academic culture" of the institution. Likewise, another applicant claimed, CE is featured "prominently" in our core curriculum. Since their core curriculum has CE embedded in it, it is assumed that CE is rewarded for those teaching in the core. A third policy indicated that one "indicator of teaching excellence is identified as 'relating subject matter to human values, issues of peace and justice and other dimensions of the human experience.'" The applicant implied that this
statement provides incentive for those choosing to use community engaged approaches and methods. Similarly broad policy language was found in the following statements:

“Membership in the academic profession carries with it individualized responsibilities...towards improvement of society.” (St. Natalia University)

“[F]aculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to their...community.” (Innocent University)

Applicants often paired these narratives of implied support for CE with examples of specific campus initiatives for community engagement or generally-understood campus culture. These presumably send faculty a positive message outside the instruction offered by the RPT policy. The challenge with broad statements and umbrella terms such as those cited in this section is that they leave the definition of community-engagement open for interpretation and do not identify any kind of active or reciprocal work with the community as part of one’s teaching.

In the scholarship area of responsibility, only five institutions (16.1%) came across as having ambiguous or neutral language in support of CE. Much as in the teaching/learning category, ambiguity resulted from overly general language that did not acknowledge the place of community input in research work or give examples of what might be deemed acceptable. In most of the “ambiguous” cases, applicants acknowledged that their definition of scholarship
was broad, yet they advanced the belief that “guidelines have been interpreted to include community engaged scholarship.” One applicant who did not provide any policy excerpt offered that the institutional definition for scholarship used Boyer's model, thus implying that public scholarship was included. Other examples of policy statements using broad interpretations of scholarship which would ostensibly be inclusive of CE took the following forms:

[S]cholarship should ‘make worthy contributions to knowledge, or contribute to their instructional programs, or otherwise make a positive contribution to the University or the community.’ (St. Natalia University)

[T]he definition of scholarship is necessarily imprecise…scholarship…communicates unique connections between existing knowledge and practical applications. (Nicholas University)

Next, I look at ambiguity in the service category. Earlier, when discussing characteristics of CE-inclusive policies, I noted that most of the institutions in this study appear to have policy language that clearly supports community engagement in the service category of faculty responsibility. I also stated that there were many faculty activities placed in the service category that could or should be rewarded in another category of responsibility. I will not repeat that analysis here; however, I will reiterate that the practice of relegating community-oriented teaching and scholarship into the service category may result in the de-legitimization or undervaluing of certain faculty activities and practices. In this way, an institution’s commitment to CE activities could be seen as ambiguous,
especially when a teaching or research practice is only acknowledged in the service category, yet the policy states that priority is given to teaching or research in the faculty rewards process.

Since most RPT policies in this study did indicate one or more forms of community engagement activity being rewarded in the service category, those policy segments were ultimately categorized as “inclusive.” I found only one institution’s policy in the service role category to be ambiguous. Lando University said that community engagement is generally defined under the service role; however, the wording of the policy was not CE specific:

Criteria for the granting of promotion and tenure at [Lando University] are based on excellence in teaching, research/scholarship (including artistic accomplishment), professional practice (if applicable), service to students and [the University], and other relevant professional contributions.

This policy emphasizes service to the institution and to the school, not necessarily the community. Thus the applicant sought a connection to community-engagement in the latter part of the statement which is expressed only in the broadest terms as "other relevant professional contributions." This phrase could potentially be equated to what is known as professional service in the community-engagement orientation of faculty service activity; however, the intentions and interpretation are not clear.
A final characteristic of the ambiguous category is that in lieu of concrete support for CE, applicants often cited specific evidence of how faculty had been rewarded for their efforts regardless of policy language. This was their way of making a case for the policy’s benign nature towards CE, its open-endedness, or its inclusiveness. Also, a few institutions cited department or college RPT guidelines in place of institutional guidelines so I coded these responses as being ambiguous for institution-wide support.

**Characteristics of RPT Policies That Do Not Support CE**

Nine institutions (29%) plainly stated that there was no explicit institution-wide RPT policy supporting community engagement as a form of teaching and learning or they did not supply any quoted policy language. Several did not attempt to address RPT policy at all in their response. As with the ambiguous category, there were instances of implied support for CE. In those cases, when applicants reasoned that implied support came from *within* the policy, I considered the policy to be ambiguous. However, when applicants offered evidence for CE support derived from a source of *other than* the RPT policy, I categorized the policy itself as lacking supportive language. Such examples abound. Applicants cited faculty awards bestowed by the institution, successful bids for RPT on the basis of CE work, the prevalence of faculty development for CE, the existence of community engagement offices, and formal course designation processes for CE. Although such evidence contributes to a
compelling picture that faculty reward policies may not discourage CE, I did not allow outside evidence to influence the categorization of the policy itself. I labeled a policy as non-supportive if no evidence for CE support was offered or found within the policy itself.

In the research/scholarship realm of faculty responsibility, a high percentage of institutions (45.2%) did not or could not provide policy language supporting scholarship using a community engagement orientation. Some policies provided traditional interpretations of research, but made no attempt to demonstrate how this might include community engagement work. The following is a fairly typical definition of traditional scholarship offered by Marcus University:

Published research or creative works of quality, significant research in new areas and methods of instruction, and other marks of scholarship, such as respect of competent colleagues, professional recognition, direction of and significant participation in research and in scholarly symposia, and being at home in the scholarly publications of one's field.

One narrative simply said that “faculty work is rewarded when it is evaluated.” No criteria for evaluation was provided and there was nothing to indicate that scholarship performed with or for the community was valued. Where policy failed to indicate support for CE, applicants often offered proxies: An anecdote about a fellowship that was awarded for applied research; a list of faculty publications of public scholarship; faculty members who gained promotion based on community-based scholarship; faculty awards given by the institution;
and college-specific policies allowing "publishable writing on teaching methodology." One institution shared that the “Office of Provost holds the definitions for when CE is considered teaching, and when it is considered scholarship.” The absence of evidence of support within the policy itself calls into question whether acknowledgement or evaluation of CE would be applied consistently.

In the service category of responsibilities, all of the policies I examined prominently included service to the university or the profession as might be expected. Most also included service to external constituencies. However, four institutions (12.9%) did not include any forms of service external to the college as part of what is rewarded in the service category. In these cases, the policy was labeled “absent” or unsupportive. Take for example the following policy excerpts from faculty handbooks that employ a largely traditional view of the faculty service role:

[The General Criteria for Promotion and Appointment in the service category includes] initiative and responsibility in achieving the objectives of the department, college or school, and the University; service on college or university committees or active participation in special academic projects. (Marcus University)

Summary of Department and College Service to include a description of advising, committee work, administrative work, and involvement with student activities. (Clement College)
There is no mention in these policies of service to external constituencies, either local or global. This does not necessarily mean that CE is not rewarded at the institution. It simply means that it is not stated in the RPT policy.

**Cautions, caveats, and priorities.** A handful of policies cautioned or counseled faculty about the appropriate role of service within their overall responsibilities.

The tenure and promotion standards at the Law Center recognize a faculty member’s ‘service to the profession, community, and the nation’ but reminds candidates that ‘these activities should not detract from the commitment to teaching and scholarship as the faculty member’s principal responsibilities.’ (Gregory University)

In decisions on tenure and promotion, an applicant’s achievements will be evaluated in three areas. Ordinaril_y teaching will have the first priority, scholarship second and service third. Each case will, however, be considered within the context of the needs of the relevant department and the College....If a candidate intends to make a case that greater weight should be attached to service, evidence of extraordinary commitment to service must be provided. (Leo College)

These examples suggest that service to the external community may not be viewed as being integrated with the other categories of faculty responsibility or are judged as peripheral to those responsibilities. Such caveats and admonishments may be interpreted as communicating mixed messages about the institution’s commitment to public scholarship and the needs of the external community. It is possible that this sort of policy language may even be construed as a deterrent to faculty pursuing community engagement in their professional or personal lives. At the very least, it appears that the policy
employs a rather narrow definition of service, or uses one that does not include the engagement orientation where service is understood as an extension of a faculty member’s professional expertise.

**Summary of RPT Policy Characteristics**

Only three institutions stood out for clear inclusiveness of CE across all three generally accepted areas of faculty responsibilities: Gerard, Felix, and Gwen. Three more institutions (Alexander, St. Hilarius, and St. Demetria) were identified as also being generally inclusive across the three areas of faculty responsibilities; however, this representation wasn't as strong or clear for a variety of reasons. In most cases, it may have been because the evidence consisted of a mixture of quoted material from the policy along with inferences about the policy. Inclusion might have seemed narrow or applicable to specific situations, departments, or colleges--rather than the institution as a whole. Three institutions lacked policies that explicitly rewarded CE in any of the 3 areas: Marcus University, College of St. Julia, and Sylvester College. Three institutions did not have CE-supportive policies in 2 out of 3 faculty areas of responsibility and were weak in the third area: Gregory, St. Marie Rose, and University of St. Edmund. The remaining institutions represented a mixture of inclusive, ambiguous, or non-supportive CE language across three areas of faculty roles.
Table 18: Number of Institutions Supporting Community Engagement in RPT Policies by Faculty Role Category and Quality of RPT Policy Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inclusive</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching/Learning</strong></td>
<td>9 (29%)</td>
<td>13 (41.9%)</td>
<td>9 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
<td>5 (16.1%)</td>
<td>14 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td>26 (83.9%)</td>
<td>1 (3.22%)</td>
<td>4 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, how does actual coverage/representation across the three areas of faculty responsibility compare to what institutions claimed was represented within their RPT policies? Tables 18 and 19 reveal that the distribution for supportive CE language within the 3 faculty role categories looks different than what was claimed when based only on quoted material from the RPT policy where support for CE was deemed inclusive and unambiguous. These findings suggest two things: 1) Institutional aspirations and policy are not aligned with each other as well or consistently as one might hope, and 2) many institutions rely on ambiguous policies and a general sense that CE work will be rewarded even if the policy does not explicitly say so. The prevalence of anecdotal evidence (rather than evidence within the RPT policies) for institutional CE support suggests that perhaps applicants’ believe policy doesn’t matter as much as the shadow culture.
Table 19: Distribution of Institutions Supporting Community Engagement in RPT Policies by Faculty Role Category: Claims vs. Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning Only</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
<th>Service Only</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning and Research</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning and Service</th>
<th>Research and Service</th>
<th>Teaching/ Learning, Research, and Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Summary of Claims vs. Actual Policy Language that Clearly/Unambiguously Supports CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Claim- Yes</th>
<th>Content Analysis Shows-Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College, School, and Departmental Level RPT Policies

The Carnegie application asks applicants about RPT policies at the college, school, and departmental levels. Twelve institutions (38.7%) reported that they did not have specific college, school, or departmental level policies to support faculty scholarly work that uses CE approaches and methods. Of these, nine noted that their institutional policies apply across all schools or departments because individual schools/departments do not have their own separate policies. For those institutions which did offer college, school, or departmental policies in the Carnegie application, the language used to support faculty CE appears to be
more specific and clear than at the institutional level. A second finding was that support for CE is not confined only to certain disciplines, departments, or schools across the cohort of cases. I did not find any pattern of support for CE particularly skewed towards one disciplinary area such as pre-professional, STEM, or social science programs, though the humanities were slightly less represented. Furthermore, applicant responses revealed that support for faculty CE is happening in a wide variety of settings and disciplines. The schools, colleges, or departments highlighted by each applicant likely represent the areas where the most robust CE activity takes place for that institution because of the specific examples offered.

Collectively, institutions cited RPT policies for CE in the following schools and colleges: nursing, business, law, theater, health and natural sciences, education, counseling psychology, engineering, liberal arts, math and sciences, osteopathic medicine, hospitality and tourism, and peace studies. Examples at the departmental level included departments of sociology, religious studies, law, history, education, physical/occupational therapy, radiography, library science, criminology, mathematics, music, geography, and environmental science. Seraphina College characterized the state of affairs regarding institutional versus departmental support for faculty CE in this way:

As I think it will become clearer and clearer from data around the country, it is at the department level that [the] ‘rubber meets the road’ when it comes to institutionalizing support on an everyday/every case basis. In
other words, while many institutions are doing what we are [doing]—looking at best practices, attending workshops and developing language for engagement in tenure and promotion, the ways in which this filters down on the departmental level will explain a lot about how individual faculty find their engagement valued on an everyday basis.

**Theme 6: Reciprocal Partnerships and Attention to Community Context in Policy Design**

Among the elements of best practice for supportive CE policy identified by Ellison & Eatman (2008) is that the policy demonstrates how it is informed by the context and culture of the community. How is community defined and what is its relationship to the college and to faculty professional work? Likewise, a key characteristic and core value of the Carnegie definition for community engagement is collaborative, reciprocal partnerships. Additionally, practicing solidarity with others and enabling community participation are distinguishing tenets of Catholic social teaching. Saltmarsh et al. (2009) found in their study of Carnegie applicants that "[p]romotion and tenure materials revealed little evidence that reciprocity is valued, assessed, or even authentically understood" (p. 20).

Of the definitions of CE used and provided by the institutions in my study, more than half included expressions of partnership, reciprocity, or mutual benefit in their understanding of CE. However, it does not appear that such expressions are extended or made as equally clear within their RPT policy documents. Only four institutions were found to be using the language of
collaboration and reciprocity in response to faculty roles and rewards questions about institutional policies. And only two were explicit about the criteria for faculty evaluation requiring evidence of reciprocity and collaboration. Felix University cited directly from their Faculty handbook’s RPT guidelines giving the following guidance to faculty:

For community engaged scholarship, demonstrate how work was conducted in partnership with the community and characterized by mutuality, reciprocity, sustainability, and shared goals.

And from Gwen University:

[T]he Scholarship of Engagement was added to the Institutional Policy Manual to more fully define and officially recognize the University’s strategic commitment to institutional community engagement. Our definition recognizes and incorporates our original 4 scholarship categories stating, ‘The Scholarship of Engagement incorporates the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching to understand and solve pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. The key feature is that the University and faculty engage with a community organization or public entity in a mutually beneficial partnership that evidences a collaborative and reciprocal relationship.’

Some institutions refer to the features of reciprocity and community collaboration indirectly. For example, a policy document might say that a form of engagement is rewarded as teaching, research, or service but does not explicitly delineate the expectation for reciprocity. Rather, the applicant explains that the definition used for CE can be found on the website or at the college's center for community engagement. The College of St. Julia’s Faculty Handbook section on promotion in rank, delineates the faculty role as “[a]cting as a representative of the College to the larger regional, national or international...
community” and “[a]pplication of knowledge as demonstrated through community engaged scholarship, public programming, collaboration with other institutions and groups.”

At Alexander University, evidence of reciprocity and collaboration are part of faculty awards for service-learning. St. David and Lando universities provided anecdotal evidence of faculty scholarship completed through a community partnership. At Gerard College, Nicholas University, and Wenceslas, their policies refer to a general expectation of “sharing” whether it be “one's gifts and educational advantages” or “sharing of expertise to address a local or global challenge.”

I also conducted a similar text search query about collaboration, partnership, and reciprocity within college or departmental policies. This search revealed no examples of policy language attending to expectations for faculty collaboration with the community.

**Mission-Policy Alignment: A Cross-Case Comparison**

Throughout this study, each individual case has been evaluated for policies which encourage or discourage faculty use of community-engaged teaching and scholarship. To aid in conducting a cross-case analysis, I constructed a master data display based on the themes and attributes described in the first 5 themes presented in this findings section. The display summarized the 31 cases by tracking each institution’s attention to community engagement.
across five areas of concern: 1) institutional commitment to community
ingagement embedded within mission and vision statements; 2) recruitment
policies for CE; 3) how RPT policies acknowledge and reward CE in the 3 areas
of faculty responsibility; 4) use of motivational policy tools; and 5) use of
institutional definitions for community engagement and public scholarship.

Each cell in the grid represented the intersection of a case and an attribute
within a theme or sub-theme. To indicate how each institution performed on a
given attribute, I might have used an ordinal approach as I often did in my
analysis of the themes (e.g. inclusive, ambiguous, absent). These were useful in
explaining the variables and conditions found in the text of policies and helped
me identify “degrees of membership” for the attributes in my coding scheme
(Vogt, Vogt, Gardner, & Haeffelle, 2014). For the data display, however, I chose
to use a dichotomous method in order to distinguish which institutions were
doing the most effective job of demonstrating the attribute under examination.
For some attributes, it was sufficient to use a “Y” (yes) to indicate the presence of
a given attribute in text that was analyzed. For example, under the Catholic
mission theme, a case received a “Y” under the charism sub-theme if the
institution’s founding charism was named in its mission statement. For other
attributes, I only assigned a “Y” when an institution met the highest level of
attribute membership. For example, under the RPT policy theme, an institution
only received a “Y” in one of the faculty role sub-themes if the RPT policy in that
area was deemed to exhibit clear and inclusive language supporting CE. It did not receive a “Y” if the policy language was ambiguous on this subject.

The data display pertaining to mission reveals that the majority of institutions in this study exhibit strong Catholic identities and goals characterized by an affiliation to their charism, the Catholic intellectual tradition, moral tradition, and Catholic Social Teaching. Furthermore, most institutions claimed that a priority for community engagement was part of its mission and vision. Table 21 illustrates the pervasiveness of Catholic themes appearing in the narratives about mission statements provided on the Carnegie application.
Table 21: Cross-Case Comparison of Catholic Themes and Priority for Community Engagement Expressed in Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission:</th>
<th>Catholic Themes</th>
<th>Charism</th>
<th>CIT</th>
<th>CMT</th>
<th>CST</th>
<th>CE Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigid University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement College</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. David University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard College</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo College</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lando University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Natalia University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Julia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hilarius University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marie Rose College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pius University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester College</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cecilia University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphina College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Demetria University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Teresa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Edmund</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenceslas University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that this institution’s mission or vision statements demonstrated alignment with Carnegie’s definition of community engagement to include features such as partnership, reciprocity, and shared resources. All others used the term community-engagement or one of its variants within their mission/vision statement.
A quick glimpse at the entire data display reveals that there is not as much consistency in the other areas of the display as there is in the mission theme. Put another way, for most of the institutions in this study, the commitment to community engagement expressed in their mission statements does not extend to the policies used for recruitment and RPT. Having first established each institution’s priority for community engagement within their mission, the next step was to determine whether the information submitted about recruitment, promotion, and tenure on the Carnegie applications represented enabling attributes.

For the recruitment theme, institutions received a “Y” only if they provided evidence of faculty recruitment policy or practice which exhibited explicit support for CE, institutional mission, or both and assessed candidate interest and expertise in CE. The strongest cases were those who cited a formal document (such as a hiring for mission guide) that guides search committees to assess a candidate's understanding and commitment to mission and CE. Ten institutions met the above criteria.

For the RPT policy evaluation, I considered support for CE in each of the faculty roles of teaching, research, and service. An institution only received a “Y” in that area if the RPT policy was deemed to include clear and inclusive language in its CE-orientation. Only 6 met the criteria across all 3 areas, and of these cases, only 3 did so strongly as was explained in Theme 4. The matrix
visually reveals that support for CE is heavily represented in the service
category, but not in the teaching and research categories.

I used a case-ordered display to determine which institutions
demonstrated the most consistent and explicit support for CE in their
recruitment protocols and RPT policies. Case-ordered displays are a way to see
differences across cases. Data are ordered from high to low based on one or
more variables of interest to reveal a hierarchy among the cases (Miles &
Huberman, 1994). In Table 22, the institutions are ordered by the number of
attributes each institution could claim based on my content analysis. The focus
was on recruitment and RPT policies. Those institutions exhibiting clear and
unambiguous support for CE across the most number of attributes appear at the
top of the display and those with the least number of attributes (or none at all)
appear at the bottom of the display.
Table 22: Case-ordered Display of 31 Catholic Institutions by Recruitment and RPT Policy Attributes Supporting Community Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Policy/Practice</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerard College</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cecilia University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Demetria University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hilarius University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. David University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphina College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Natalia University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigid University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lando University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Julia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marie Rose College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pius University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Teresa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Edmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenceslas University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Those areas marked with a “Y” in a lighter shade indicate the presence of support for CE, but was not as complete or strong as the evidence provided by other institutions.
The table illustrates that Gerard College, Gwen University, and Felix University excel in all four areas. Each has strong recruitment protocols and RPT policies for CE that address each of the three commonly recognized areas of faculty roles and responsibilities.

Regarding the leveraging of policy tools such as symbolic, incentives, authority, capacity-building, and learning in support of CE, I again used a case-ordered data display to compare institutions. Table 23 reveals that the University of St. Edmund’s was the only institution to demonstrate attention to all 5 policy tools in support of CE. The remaining institutions in this study exhibited attention to between 1-3 of the tools at their disposal.
Table 23: Case-ordered Display of 31 Catholic Institutions by Use of Policy Tools to Enable Community Engagement in RPT

| University of St. Edmund | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Clement College | Y | Y | Y |
| Felix University | Y | Y | Y |
| St. Natalia University | Y | Y | n/a | Y |
| St. Hilarius University | Y | Y | n/a | Y |
| Seraphina College | Y | Y | Y |
| St. Demetria University | Y | Y | n/a | Y |
| University of St. Teresa | Y | Y | Y |
| Alexander University | Y | Y |
| Brigid University | Y | Y | n/a | Y |
| Boniface University | Y | Y |
| Innocent University | Y | Y |
| Gerard College | Y | Y | n/a |
| Gwen University | Y | Y | n/a |
| Leo College | Y | Y | n/a |
| Lando University | Y | Y |
| Margaret University | Y | n/a | Y |
| Marcus University | Y | n/a | Y |
| Nicholas University | Y | Y |
| St. Cecilia University | Y | Y | n/a |
| St. David University | Y | |
| Gregory University | |
| Helena University | Y | n/a |
| Madeleine University | Y | |
| College of St. Julia | n/a | Y |
| St. Marie Rose College | Y |
| Sylvester College | n/a | Y |
| Urban University | Y |
| Valentine University | Y |
| Wenceslas University | Y |
| St. Pius University | |

Given that virtually all institutions express Catholic themes and a priority for CE in their mission statements, it appears that the symbolic policy tool is not
used as pervasively as it might be within the RPT policy itself. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that references to mission may appear in a different section of a faculty handbook, rather than embedded in the RPT guidelines. Such analysis was beyond the scope of this study.

All RPT policies represent a form of authority. They are most often shaped and approved by faculty councils made up of senior or tenured faculty members and administrators, and are enforced by the same. In this way, every institution in this study employs the authority policy tool as part of their strategy to encourage or discourage certain forms of faculty behavior and professional activity. The institutions marked “Y” on the chart represent only the institutions that offered information about how the RPT policy language supporting CE came into being or identified those in positions of authority at the institution who encouraged or sanctioned the changes. For example, several institutions recounted a RPT revision process that was set into motion by a dean or faculty council. Some cited excerpts from their faculty handbook that declared the administration’s support of faculty efforts that involved community engaged approaches and methods.

The case-ordered data display reveals that capacity-building may be an area of weakness for many of the institutions in this study. Capacity building has to do with the intent to train people so that they have the skills and abilities necessary to meet the desired behavior established in a policy. The behavioral
assumption is that people will choose the preferred behavior stated in a policy if they are adequately informed and trained for that preferred behavior. Capacity-building related to faculty rewards means providing professional development for faculty and administrators advising faculty and reviewing RPT dossiers. There was little evidence of this happening across the cases. Overall, it should be noted that institutions in this study were not specifically asked to provide evidence of use of the five policy tools as outlined by Schneider & Ingram (1990). This was an evaluation construct that I applied to the text supplied by each applicant. Giving institutions the chance to respond to the use of particular policy tools would have likely yielded more robust information about how institutions view the design and impact of their RPT policies. From the above cross-case analysis, I selected one institution, Gwen University, to focus on as an exemplar in the next section.

**Exemplar of Mission-Policy Alignment: Gwen University**

At the outset of this dissertation, I stated that a key goal and research question was to identify one or more exemplars that might provide guidance to other institutions on how to enable and validate professional community engagement work in reward policies. This section presents a policy exemplar that serves to inform those interested in strengthening the alignment between institutional mission, Catholic identity, and faculty roles and rewards at Catholic institutions of higher education. The exemplar I review here was chosen because
the institution exhibited alignment across its mission priorities, recruitment approaches, and RPT policies. Additionally, the applicant offered direct quotations from its institutional RPT policy.

I propose that Gwen University not only has an exemplary RPT policy that supports CE, but that its policy aligns very clearly with its institutional values and aspirations as a Catholic university. Gwen University is a medium-sized, Master’s I level university situated in the northeast of the United States. The school was a first-time applicant for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015. In my cross-case analysis, I indicated that most of the institutions in this study demonstrated a strong commitment to their Catholic identities as expressed within their mission and vision statements. Gwen University was no different. Its mission clearly states a values-centered education inspired by the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. This adherence to mission carries over into its faculty recruitment efforts as the following excerpt from their Carnegie application revealed:

**Search committees are charged with ensuring that candidates be able to support and promote the University’s Mission and Catholic identity and to facilitate the integration of the learning environment of the campus community with the local and regional community.** The following is a typical sample text from a faculty search ad.

Join [Gwen] University, a Catholic university, and collaborate with a dynamic faculty that prepares motivated students intellectually, professionally and personally for leadership roles in their careers, society and church...The University’s excellent faculty also advises
students and engages in creative scholarly activities and in professional, University and community service activities and partnerships.

In the faculty search advertisement above, one can readily perceive Gwen’s commitment to the community that surrounds the university. This signals to prospective faculty members during one of their earliest encounters with the University that the institution expects its faculty to forge partnerships with the community. When asked about how the university defines community engagement, Gwen presented one of the most robust explanations out of all applicants for the role its faculty members are asked to play in promoting community engagement:

We can bring the importance of our Catholic Intellectual Tradition to life through increased focus on experiential learning and scholarly work in the local and regional community. University-community partnerships provide a fertile and accessible environment for application of knowledge and skills acquired in the classroom. Faculty, staff and students will integrate active learning into curricular and co-curricular programming. As a result, the faculty-student learning partnership will deepen as well as meet essential needs of the community members and organizations in our urban center and across our diocese and the region. The faculty will determine appropriate best-practice approaches to be utilized across disciplines, such that each student gains direct exposure to pressing societal issues and prepares them for successful personal and professional lives after graduation. This community connection will also be effective in facilitating faculty scholarly work and engaging our talented faculty and staff in creating solutions to important regional challenges.

Again, we see in this description the connection between Gwen’s Catholic identity and its responsibility as an educational institution to apply its
knowledge and scholarship to addressing community challenges. Now that I have taken a look at Gwen’s mission, recruitment practices, and definitions, the next area of concern is how Gwen defined faculty roles and responsibilities within its RPT policies which is the area of primary concern in this study.

Gwen University noted that selections from their Institutional Policy Manual apply to all faculty who annually complete a self-evaluation as well as to those who are applying for tenure and/or promotion. I include the full language of Gwen’s RPT policy as it is was provided in the Carnegie application. I do this in the body of my dissertation because it is important to see the extent to which this institution offers clear and unambiguous support for faculty scholarly work that uses community engagement methods and approaches. Gwen University’s RPT policy was a stark contrast to what was offered by most institutions in this study, thus marking it as an atypical case. I present the next set of characteristics as a side-by-side comparison between Gwen University and Marcus University and so those differences are revealed more plainly. I chose Marcus because its institutional-level RPT policies are fairly traditional in their description of faculty roles and responsibilities. Some would argue that it represents the fragmented and narrowly defined approach to scholarship that concerned Ernest Boyer (1990) or an overly singular focus on serving one’s discipline and department that troubled Checkoway (2001). In this way, I seek to not only illustrate the similarities and differences between individual characteristics of the RPT
policies, but also to demonstrate what it looks like when an alignment between mission and policy for community engagement is lacking or ambiguous.

To set the scene, I briefly return to a review of mission and vision statements. Marcus’s and Gwen’s statements share many similar traits. Marcus University is a large, doctoral/research institution in the Midwest with Jesuit sponsorship. Both universities reference their Catholic tradition and promote professional or scholarly excellence. They both seek to nurture students who will grow in faith, leadership, and service, and they both express a concern for the well-being of others in the world. Table 24 illustrates these shared aspirations.

Table 24: Side-by-Side Comparison of Mission and Vision at Marcus University and Gwen University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marcus University</th>
<th>Gwen University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Marcus] University is a Catholic, Jesuit university dedicated to serving God by serving our students and contributing to the advancement of knowledge. Our mission, therefore, is the search for truth, the discovery and sharing of knowledge, the fostering of personal and professional excellence, the promotion of a life of faith, and the development of leadership expressed in service to others. All this we pursue for the greater glory of God and the common benefit of the human community.</td>
<td>[Gwen] is a Catholic, Diocesan university dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service. Our faculty and staff prepare students to be global citizens through programs grounded in the liberal arts and sciences and professional specializations. Inspired by the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, we offer a comprehensive, values-centered learning experience that emphasizes faith, leadership, inclusiveness and social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Marcus] University aspires to be, and to be recognized, among the most innovative and accomplished Catholic and Jesuit universities in the world, promoting the greater glory of God and the well-being of humankind. We must reach beyond traditional academic boundaries and embrace new and collaborative methods of teaching, learning, research and</td>
<td>[Gwen] will be nationally recognized for educating socially responsible world citizens through engagement and innovation. [Gwen] will be known as a leader in: • offering innovative academic programs that are connected to community needs and focused on creating public impact; • promoting student learning such that graduates embrace their roles and responsibilities as world citizens; and • fostering a culture of creativity and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
service in an inclusive environment that supports all of our members in reaching their fullest potential.

[Marcus] graduates will be problem-solvers and agents for change in a complex world so in the spirit of St. Ignatius...they are ready in every way "to go and set the world on fire."

Continuous improvement to ensure excellence, efficiency and financial sustainability.

When one turns to a review of Gwen’s and Marcus’s reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies, we find marked differences between the degree of specificity in each institution’s expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service concerning community engagement and institutional mission. In its RPT document, Gwen makes explicit the connection between the institutional mission and faculty roles. It states that “The University's mission helps define the faculty members' roles. The University's mission in turn is defined by the faculty members' work as teachers and scholars, as colleagues, as mentors to the students, and as servants to the community. These varying roles have helped to form the several principles underlying faculty evaluation.”

Table 25 illustrates how these expectations are represented within Gwen’s RPT policy while explicit mention of responsibility to community, public concerns, or institutional mission is conspicuously absent in Marcus’s criteria for appointment and promotion.
Table 25: Side-by-Side Comparison of Faculty Roles and Responsibilities in RPT Policies at Marcus University and Gwen University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marcus University Faculty Handbook</th>
<th>Gwen University Institutional Policy Manual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria for Appointment and Promotion</td>
<td>Rank and Tenure Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In public domain)</td>
<td>(From Carnegie Application)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching

(1) Essential Criteria
The central task of the faculty is to keep knowledge living, and therefore growing, in their students and themselves. Excellence in teaching and scholarship constitutes the essential criteria for appointment and promotion.

(a) Teaching
Since excellent teaching is creative, both in teacher and student, there can be a variety of signs of excellence in teaching, such as: presenting subject matter with the clarity that arises from a deepening grasp of the central facts and their vital interplay; exhibiting enthusiastic commitment to seeking, possessing, and sharing knowledge; bringing subject matter, when appropriate, to bear on the human situation; consciously creating the atmosphere that will draw students on to development and use of their powers of invention and discovery; creating the desire in students for further education.

From Section 4.5.7.1.0.0.0
All faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Such excellence shall be accomplished in a spirit of balance conducive to an equitable and respectful learning environment.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall address the following:
1. Skill in communicating with students, showing balance by treating each with dignity and respect;
2. Commitment to students and their development, encouraging them to take responsibility for their intellectual and personal growth;
7. Demonstrated commitment to the Mission.

Optional evidence of teaching effectiveness.
1. Evidence of teaching and supervising activities outside the classroom;
2. Evidence of effort to integrate new informational technologies, service learning or experiential learning in the classroom.

Scholarship

(b) Scholarship
Beyond advanced degrees earned, there must be other evidence of scholarship, such as: published research or creative works of quality, significant research in new areas and methods of instruction, and other marks of scholarship, such as respect of competent colleagues, professional recognition, direction of and significant participation in research and in scholarly symposia, and being at home in the scholarly publications of one's field.

Scholarship of Engagement in section 4.5.7.3.1.5.0:

The Scholarship of Engagement incorporates the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching to understand and solve pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. The key feature is that the university and faculty engage with a community organization or public entity in a mutually beneficial partnership that evidences a collaborative and reciprocal relationship. Products from scholarship of engagement have a social action component. The outcome and or knowledge gained through the inquiry process enhance the well-being of a community and its constituents and demonstrate social responsibility.

Examples of the scholarship of engagement can include, but are not limited to:
1. Peer-reviewed/invited publications or professional presentations related to the
development of community-based interventions, or curriculum development;
2. Policy papers, presentations, or reports compiling and analyzing community program outcomes that include analysis and interpretation of data collected and leads to an outcome or action plan;
3. Consultation reports;
4. Peer-review of public and community policy papers, technical reports, and presentation developed through a systematic inquiry process;
5. Invited presentations to a community organization, governmental body or policy maker or other public entity, related to one’s area(s) of expertise;
6. Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments;
7. Public art projects coordinated with a public entity or government;
8. Creation of a public performance that involves working with community constituents;
9. Grants in support of community-based interventions or programs;
10. Reports of collaborative partnerships involving faculty, community members and organizational representatives; and
11. Peer reviewed/invited publications and professional presentations related to service-learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following criteria shall also be considered in determining appointments and promotions. These criteria will not substitute for deficiencies in teaching and scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Participative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Active involvement in learned societies in the field of one’s competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Initiative and responsibility in achieving the objectives of the department, college or school, and the University; service on college or University committees or active participation in special academic projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Personal Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Character and personality which assure a contribution to the missions of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. A respectful attitude toward the religious beliefs of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Observance of the rule of law as the basis of constitutional government, and the fundamental human and political rights of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service requirement recognizes two important facets of a faculty member’s status: a. That universities function most effectively when faculty members participate in University governance and administration; and b. That society rightfully expects persons affiliated with higher education to play a significant role in public life.

Service in section 4.5.7.4.0.0.0:
Service includes service to the University and to the community or one’s profession. The University recognizes that educators are not only professionals in a given field who function within the University but also citizens of a larger community.

As members of the [Gwen] community, all full-time faculty members are expected to participate in University committees and activities. Committees include University and ad hoc committees at the departmental/program, college, or University levels. Activities include enhancement of academic programs, student recruitment and retention, alumni relations and career placement and development. Faculty are expected to attend open
house programs, convocations, and commencement exercises.”

Service to the Community in section 4.5.7.4.2.0.0 states: “Faculty members are encouraged to provide service to the community by working with people and organizations outside the faculty member’s profession. Such service may include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

1. Lectures to non-professional community groups;
2. Leadership positions in political, church, or community activities;
3. Participation in non-profit organizations designed to serve the general public; and
4. Service to community groups in a professional capacity.”

Service to the Profession in section 4.5.7.4.3.0.0 states: “Faculty members may participate in service to their respective professional organizations through activities including, but not limited, to the following:

1. Serving as a panel discussant or presider;
2. Reviewer of scholarly or creative work;
3. Serving as an officer for a professional organization; and
4. Serving as an accreditation consultant.”

Faculty may also be indirectly supporting community engagement through pedagogical workshop[s] on service learning and community-based research presentations to their professional colleagues at the regional and national levels.

Both Marcus and Gwen, along with all of the institutions in this study, have demonstrated an institutional commitment to community engagement; otherwise, they would not have received the Carnegie Community Engagement classification. However, Marcus’s dedication to the service and community engagement aspect of its mission does not seem to carry over into a clear statement of faculty evaluation and rewards. In the comparison above, Marcus University’s mission and vision regarding community engagement is
aspirational, even inspirational, but it does not appear to be operational—at least not in its faculty rewards policy. The only mention of mission is related solely to a faculty member’s character and personality, rather than to his or her scholarly activities. Gwen’s RPT policy, on the other hand, demonstrates very clearly that community engaged scholarship is not only desired, but is a key part of faculty evaluation and will be rewarded. The policy is informed by and uses Boyer’s enlarged understanding of scholarship. These various forms of scholarship are delineated within the RPT document and accompanied by a detailed list of community-engaged products and activities. Gwen’s policy not only addresses many of the traditional areas of responsibilities that one finds in most RPT policies (e.g. excellent teaching, peer-reviewed research, and service to the institution or profession), but also makes ample room for community engagement in all realms of faculty responsibility. It established the faculty member’s responsibility to the public and identifies audiences outside the faculty member’s profession with which faculty might share their expertise. In sum, the policy does an exemplary job in clarifying institutional and faculty priorities by defining, describing, and differentiating forms of community-engaged scholarship.

Earlier in the findings section, I noted that a number of institutions in this study had college or departmental level policies that clearly support CE. The literature on RPT suggests that departmental guidelines can be even more
important than institutional guidelines for faculty advancement, and therefore should be more specific (Diamond, 1999). In their Carnegie application, Marcus University indicated that their institution does not currently have departmental or college level policies that reward community-engaged approaches and methods. Rather, the institution considers this type of faculty work within a “holistic review of scholarship.” Gwen University, on the other hand, cited a number of departmental statements that clearly set an expectation for and endorsed community-engagement. In the physical therapy program, faculty are seen not only as “members of the University and physical therapy profession, but also citizens of a global community.” The following excerpt clarifies these community-centered expectations for faculty scholarship:

Scholarship: Recognizes and utilizes the **five categories of Boyer’s scholarship paradigm** as defined in [Gwen] University’s Institutional Policy Manual, Volume IV, which are also recognized by the Commission on Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education.

Scholarship and Service: Supports and encourages **community engagement and community-based research that is collaborative and utilizes shared expertise** in which **learning is multidirectional and not necessarily university centered or campus-bound**.

Similarly, Gwen’s School of Education, establishes that “faculty should seek and accept regular opportunities to utilize their expertise in the field of education to enhance the quality and effectiveness of community-based organizations and the quality of life” in the region where the college resides. Such activities may include the following types of work:
1. Planning and delivering professional development programs (i.e., workshops, seminars, discussion groups) for public and private schools.

2. Serving on committees, working groups, or advisory boards of education-related agencies.

3. Participating in professional partnership activities with public and private schools.

4. Obtaining and implementing grants in collaboration with schools and other education-related agencies.

Gwen notes that work in which faculty apply their knowledge and skills to practical problems in educational environments (what is known as the “Scholarship of Application” or “Scholarship of Teaching”) would fit under the service role of faculty; however, they also say that “these activities can move into the realm of scholarship when faculty demonstrate three critical features: (a) generation of new ideas, (b) critical evaluation by peers, and (c) communication.” Products might include new curriculum programs for schools, instructional strategies for classroom teachers, or professional development opportunities for practicing educators. These departmental policy exemplars from Gwen demonstrate that program expectations align with their institutional faculty policies in the same way that their institutional policies align with their university-wide vision for connecting academic work to community needs and creating public impact.
Summary of Findings

In my content analysis of the 31 institutions, it became clear that in many recruitment and RPT policies, institutions find much overlap between mission and community engagement. Community engagement is often seen as a concrete expression of mission or the mission is used as a proxy for community engagement. Overall, there does not appear to be a consensus on the use or meaning of community engagement terminology across the institutions in this study cohort or even within each individual institution. This lack of consistency in the understanding of public service and scholarship in higher education has been noted by other scholars (Holland, 1999; Ward, 2003). I found that the definitions and understandings about CE might reside in any number of sites on campus such as an office that supports CE, a faculty committee responsible for advancing CE on campus, or the public domain such as a college’s website. There were indications of this throughout my analysis of the Carnegie application. One specific example is Alexander University’s definition of public scholarship. Service-learning is the term they chose to use to answer this question. The definition was developed by a Service-Learning Action Committee which included representation by faculty from seven different disciplines across campus. The definition is located on Alexander’s service-learning webpage, rather than in the RPT policy. However, they also say that the "The Rank and Tenure Committee developed criteria that clearly mark the scholarship of
community engagement and service-learning as a path toward faculty promotion and tenure." The criteria referred to here were not included in the application, so it is difficult to discern how the RPT committee defines and evaluates faculty work submitted for RPT.

Ambiguity and inconsistency are two characteristics found within and across the cases in this study. Just as certain instructional activities do not always fit in the teaching category of faculty responsibilities, certain forms of scholarship are not always recognized in the research category. Similarly, public or community service was often placed last in a list of faculty activities that constitute faculty service. Most policies primarily focused on service to the institution. Uses of the word “community” within policies varied as well. This term might variously refer to the campus community, the professional community, or the external community (public). Sometimes it was clear as to which form of community was intended; other times, it was not clear.

It is important to keep in mind that there are many other factors beyond institutional guidelines that are associated with promotion and tenure processes where support for CE may or may not be indicated. Provosts, deans, colleges, departments, and evaluation committees may have their own guidelines and procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. These policies and protocols might reveal a different, more precise, or nuanced interpretation of
faculty roles and responsibilities as well as engaged scholarship than what appears in their institutional guidelines.

A desire by faculty to engage in CE may be prevalent in the culture of the institution through conversations, centers, and programming, but it is not possible to know how pervasive or deep this understanding and culture is only through an examination of targeted documents such as RPT. A thorough study of an institution’s entire Carnegie application would certainly provide additional context, as would different qualitative approaches such as focus groups or interviews of faculty who produced or are affected by RPT policies. One could also conduct document analyses of the instructions and faculty review frameworks for RPT portfolios in use at the institution, college, or department level.
Rewards and punishments emerge from beliefs and values, but they also provide a window on what an organization truly believes and values. The interplay of these components brings culture into view and shapes how an organization lives out its mission.  
(Morey & Piderit, 2006, p. 25)

In this study, I have suggested, as have others (Diamond, 1999; O’Meara, Eatman, & Peterson, 2015), that it is important for espoused mission and faculty policies to be aligned with each other in order to create institutional coherence for those most responsible for advancing the goals of a Catholic college and university: the faculty. The policies and activities of academia give meaning to the institutional mission thereby demonstrating its priorities (Boylan, 2015). In this light, discussion about faculty roles requires serious consideration of recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies as one of many strategies to encourage and enable faculty to enhance the Catholic mission of the college or university. This is why recruitment and RPT policies became a focal point of my study. I sought to understand the extent to which institutional mission is made operational in faculty recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies at Catholic colleges and universities designated with the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification. I wanted to know what existing policies might teach us about the extent to which Catholic institutions of higher education have moved from the aspirational realm to an
operational realm regarding their commitment to community outreach, social justice, and service. How have such policies met the call for clarifying priorities by valuing, defining, and differentiating community-engaged scholarship?

In this final chapter of my dissertation, I return to a discussion of the mission of Catholic higher education and the ways it might be enhanced through greater attention to faculty roles and rewards for community engagement. Along the way, I relate the findings of my study to the literature and previous research on community engagement, RPT policies, and mission in the context of Catholic education. I use these to offer recommendations for institutions seeking greater alignment and to suggest areas of future study.

The Relationship between Mission-Policy Alignment and Espoused vs. Shadow Cultures

One might easily ask, what obligation, if any, do private colleges and universities have to the public? If so, what do those obligations entail and how do they affect expectations for faculty contributions, especially at Catholic institutions? In the first section of my literature review, I established that Ex corde Ecclesiae emphasized Catholic higher education’s mission of service to society and exhorted university educators to assist students’ formation in the moral and social teachings of the Church (Pope John Paul II, 1990). The document further called faculty members, in their role as researchers, to devote their energies to studying urgent contemporary challenges related to the dignity
of human life, promotion of justice, protection of nature, political stability, and fair distribution of the world’s resources.

I also referenced the more recent document *Instrumentum laboris* (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2014) which recognized that universities serve a function in informing social, political, and economic decision makers, thus playing a crucial role in shaping policies that affect people’s quality of life both locally and worldwide. That document reminds us that “teaching is not only a process through which knowledge or training are provided, but also guidance for everyone to discover their talents, develop professional skills and take important intellectual, social and political responsibilities in local communities” (“Conclusion,” para. 2).

Even more recently, Pope Francis (2015) directed the world’s attention towards the problems of climate change and growing global inequality in his encyclical2 entitled *Laudato Si’: On Care for Our Common Home*. In the opening of his letter, he clearly states that his message is addressed to “every person living on this planet” (p. 10). The encyclical not only deals with the challenge of responding to environmental degradation and its effects on humans, but also with virtually every aspect of human life and responsibility. He calls attention to the deleterious effects of modern anthropocentrism, the loss of biodiversity, our

---

2 Papal encyclicals are letters written by the Pope and primarily geared to clergy, bishops, and members of the Catholic Church. They are meant to provide, among other things, guidance on social teaching.
inadequate modes of dealing with waste, the decline in access to safe water, the
rise in unsustainable development, and the consumption habits of the rich as
well as those habits’ devastating effects on the poor. He highlights the social
exclusion experienced by so many as a result of the aforementioned conditions.

Towards the end of his encyclical, Pope Francis declares that educators
play a vital role in addressing the greatest challenges of our day. In his view,
environmental education must do more than present scientific information; it
must also address the moral dimensions of our actions by examining the beliefs
and norms that are driving modern life. Instrumentum laboris and Ex corde
similarly acknowledged the need for scholars to take into account the ethical
consequences of human activity as well as the methods they use and the
discoveries they make in their own research. Pope Francis further asserts that
environmental, economic, and social ecology are interconnected. We cannot
address one element without addressing the others. Because we have the same
origins and share a common home, caring for each other and the earth are
equivalent undertakings. Education needs to promote action that nurtures our
relationship with nature and protects it for the common good. Thus,
environmental education “needs educators capable of developing an ethics of
ecology, and helping people, through effective pedagogy, to grow in solidarity,
responsibility, and compassionate care” (p. 129).
This dissertation has explored the identity, culture, and mission of Catholic higher education in light of the above declarations, each of which provides guidance for Catholic institutions of higher education and its faculty to engage with the problems of the world. The cohort of institutions in this study affirmed that the Catholic intellectual and moral tradition, sponsoring charisms, Catholic social teaching, and community engagement are priorities in their educational missions. In the quote at the beginning of this chapter, we are reminded that institutional identity and culture emerge from beliefs, shared assumptions, values, and norms. These are, in turn, expressed in institutional mission statements which ostensibly guide the work of an institution. Morey & Piderit (2006) caution, however, that, “the more noble beliefs of an organization are publicly stated, and the more ignoble, while obvious, are seldom touted” (p. 24). Here they are referring to the difference between the “espoused realm” of culture (i.e. the ideals which are publicly spoken and written) and the “shadow realm” of culture which is represented by the unspoken rules and what actually occurs in organizations. They suggest that the shadow realm is “where the real structures operate and drive behavior” (p. 25). For example, a college might claim a goal of serving under-represented/financially needy students, but then set a tuition policy above what that population can afford and/or only offers merit aid.
Neither espoused nor shadow cultures are inherently good or bad. Both can be beneficial as reinforcements to each other when the two cultures are in alignment. Or, they might serve as correctives to each other when the two cultures are in mis-alignment. However, when they are in opposition to each other (when rhetoric does not match reality), the organization is not served well. It creates a disjointed culture or an environment fraught with mixed messages where individuals are uncertain about which rules to follow. The chances for misalignment are increased when shadow cultures are at odds with espoused cultures. This situation is exacerbated when official pronouncements and policy documents meant to provide direction to those within an organization lack clarity.

The Challenge of Ambiguity

For those seeking guidance about campus priorities through institutional documents, ambiguity can present challenges within mission statements and policies alike. Those who find mission statements to be overly vague or general criticize them as being ineffectual for utilitarian purposes such as providing direction for strategic planning, prioritizing institutional activities, and policy-making (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). However, the difference between mission statements and policies is that policies carry more direct consequences for individuals, at least in the higher education context. A vague mission statement might fail to send a message of institutional distinction, organizational focus, or
visionary appeal to its internal and external constituents. The consequences of such ambiguity might be viewed as positive or negative, depending on what other forces are at play to define the institution. These factors might include the direction provided by those in leadership, external rankings, or public perception of the institutions’ activities. An ambiguous RPT policy, however, has a tangible impact on a faculty member’s professional life and career. It determines specifically what kind of activity gets rewarded or punished. It legitimizes or delegitimates one’s place in academia. And it affects one’s chances for advancement.

A broad RPT policy may on the surface appear to be all-inclusive and, therefore, appealing to many faculty professionals for its flexibility. Some may even argue that ambiguity and generality in policy design is desirable because it provides an unrestrictive environment in which a variety of interpretations and actions are possible. Certainly, this understanding has been applied to mission statements where vagary might be viewed as supporting a desirable flexibility for its activities and even as a way to release institutions from accountability (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). However, where hidden meanings exist and implicit expectations are effectively set by those in positions of power, ambiguity in policies can be perilous. When faculty come up against unwritten expectations, they may find themselves facing barriers and resistance that inhibit their chances for advancement. Checkoway (2001) alerted us to the ways faculty
are socialized into an academic culture that emphasizes a devotion to the discipline and the department rather than the community; that discourages interdisciplinary work and the scholarship of integration; and that favors traditional, discovery forms of scholarship (i.e. positivist) over the scholarships of application, engagement, and teaching.

My study demonstrated the wide range of conditions that exist, from very explicit support of CE to no mention of it whatsoever within RPT policies. Quite a few institutions fell somewhere in between. That is, many policies had ambiguous or absent language in support of CE, especially in the reward areas of faculty teaching or research. This situation might suggest a few possibilities. Either an institution-wide conversation to consider revisions to RPT in support of CE or expanded definitions of scholarship is of little interest or it has not happened at all. If a conversation has happened, then it would appear that a consensus could not be reached about the need for inclusion of CE language or expanded meanings of scholarship in the institutional policy. A third interpretation might be that the institution has intentionally left it up to departments or colleges to decide what is appropriate teaching, research, and service in their discipline. About 60% of the institutions in my study had departmental or college-wide RPT policies that supported CE. Regardless of the reason for the absence of clear support for CE in institutional policies, it seems very possible that the (shadow) culture of the institution does not support
community engagement or is in disagreement about its value and legitimacy as scholarly activity.

Clear and specific policies that define and name what is meant by community-engagement signals to faculty not only what is allowed, but what is desirable and encouraged. If faculty members are to embrace the espoused mission, they need to know that their efforts will not be undermined by a “shadow culture.” Given that my study focused on document analysis and narrative explanations, it is impossible to know what the “shadow” culture looks like at each of the 31 institutions. How do the unwritten rules and the subtle (or even overt) messages sent by ones’ peers and superiors within an organization affect those within the organization?

For some insight on this question, one can turn to qualitative studies that have investigated faculty experience with community-based professional activity. These reveal the tensions that arise when rhetoric does not meet reality (Bloomgarden, 2008; O’Meara, 2002). In interviewing tenured faculty who had pursued various forms of community-engaged scholarship during their careers in higher education, Bloomgarden (2008) found that faculty often cited the misalignment between institutional rhetoric, policy, and reality as a challenge, even a deterrent, to pursuing community engagement activity. For example, one faculty member spoke about how teaching might be claimed as a faculty member’s first priority, but the reality was that faculty experienced teaching and
research expectations as equal commitments based on the messages they received from department chairs and administrators. Additionally, community-engaged scholarship was seen as competing with expectations for research productivity rather than as a part of their research productivity. Half of the participants in Bloomgarden’s study pursued community-based practice before tenure and half deliberately pursued it post-tenure. Those who engaged in this work before tenure felt they had to do double the work, adopting an “overload” strategy where they completed traditional research alongside engaged scholarship in order to protect themselves from colleagues who might think their priorities were not in line with expectations for traditional forms of scholarship. Those who engaged in community-based work after tenure did so because they wanted to wait until they had the security of freedom in their choices. That is, they were unwilling to risk their academic careers to engage in work that they saw as vital to their own professional identities as engaged citizens or as an obligation to their communities. Many faculty were torn between compartmentalizing their engaged work and attempting to integrate it across their teaching, research, and service responsibilities.

If a campus culture is engulfed in the pursuit of prestige as described by Bloomgarden, then a RPT policy which is ambiguous about the place of community engagement in one’s scholarly agenda does little to encourage or safe-guard faculty, especially if the culture in which one exists sees certain forms
of scholarship as second-rate or less rigorous (e.g. community-based research, service-learning, pedagogical research, etc.). Previous studies have documented how ambiguity in RPT policies can deter faculty from pursuing service-learning (McKay & Rozee, 2004). Having an appropriate level of specificity within an RPT document at once educates the academic community within an institution about what is accepted and valued and provides “cover” for those choosing to pursue engaged work. In this way, institutional mission and rhetoric that promotes community engagement is followed through where it often counts most for faculty, in their prospects for receiving advancement, promotion, and tenure.

Instead of using mission as a proxy for community engagement, institutions can be more direct about which aspects of the mission apply to faculty expectations in institutional documents meant to guide faculty activity. This includes inserting more inclusive and clear language that recognizes how the different forms of community engagement fit within the three areas of faculty roles and evaluation teaching, scholarship, and service. Many studies have pointed to the need for defining what is meant by engagement and community-based work so that it is clear to faculty and administrators precisely what is being supported (Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer, 2010; Moore & Ward, 2010; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010; Wade & Demb, 2009). Consulting and drawing upon these resources as well as the RPT policies of institutions such as
Gwen University, Edgewood College, and Felix University can aid in this endeavor.

**Recruitment Strategies**

My study suggests that Catholic colleges and universities do not have consistent, pervasive, or robust enough policies or practices in place to leverage recruitment as a site to attract CE faculty and enhance their institutional commitment to CE in the curriculum and other forms of scholarship. The relatively widespread use of implicit methods indicates a weaker form of commitment than explicit methods, in the same way that merely informing candidates is less powerful than assessing candidates for their interest or expertise in community engagement. If only passive approaches are employed, how will prospective candidates know that CE is not only a priority at the institution, but is also sought after and viewed favorably in the selection (and eventually the rewards) process?

A strong set of institutional recruitment, search, and hiring practices and policies would entail applying greater intention in the following areas:

1. Informing candidates about institutional mission (and specifically the commitment to CE) both at various stages of the recruitment process. This should be included at the outset in position advertisements, during interviews, and in other recruitment materials that make priorities clear.
2. Assessing candidates for their understanding, expertise, and commitment to mission and to community engagement.

3. Having explicit guidelines for search committees to make CE a priority in hiring processes providing training about what to ask, what to look for, and how to evaluate.

A number of institutions in this study indicated that they have the above protocols in place including manuals that guide search materials and suggest specific questions to ask candidates. Such models could be useful resources for other institutions.

**Recommendations for the Use of Policy Tools**

In the context of faculty reward policies in higher education, institutional mission and values statements serve as symbolic and hortatory motivators with the intent of inspiring the professional activities of faculty. My findings suggest that there is considerable room to infuse the symbolic elements of Catholic mission into RPT policies by making more explicit the connections between faculty roles and responsibilities, Catholic social teaching, and forms of community engagement.

In addition to the symbolic policy tool, the use of the capacity-building tool appears to be an opportunity as well. Very few of the institutions in this study had training directed specifically at RPT reviewers or potential reviewers such as academic deans, department chairs, or senior faculty. Furthermore, the
content of the training, when it did exist, did not necessarily address how to evaluate scholarly work using CE approaches and methods. This means that there is little consistency across institutions regarding the process, delivery mechanisms, content, and audience for professional development geared toward understanding RPT portfolios that include CE. In some cases the target audience is clear, but the training content was not specific to CE. In other cases the training did focus on a particular evaluation model, but the training itself was optional or the target audience was limited. Content might emphasize understanding of CE, but not the evaluation of such work. To make gains in increasing capacity for rewarding and sustaining engaged faculty, an institution would do well to focus on formulating intentional training programs directed at the individuals holding critical positions for assessing faculty portfolios and making decisions about reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Rather than relying predominately on outmoded socialization, observational, or implied practices to prepare and review RPT portfolios that include CE, institutions can invest in more purposeful training. Such training should make use of the latest literature and models for revising RPT rules, defining community-engaged scholarship, expanding who serves as peer reviewers, and designing useful evaluation frameworks. The work of Ellison & Eatman (2008); Gelmon, Jordan, & Seifer (2013); Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone (2011); and O’Meara & Rice (2005) serve as useful resources.
Areas for Future Research

As pointed out above, this study was primarily focused on examining what is represented in official statements; therefore, it revealed little about the “shadow” aspects of institutional or departmental culture which shows us what people believe and value by virtue of what they do. An institution-wide RPT policy might establish a particular norm or belief about acceptable faculty scholarship, yet the decision-makers may choose to ignore these and not grant tenure or send a different sort of message to faculty about what is legitimate and valued. Additionally, departmental or disciplinary norms may differ from or bring an alternate interpretation than the institution-wide policies intended. Thus, changing policy may not be the only (or even the most persuasive) way of bringing about coherence in an organization. It must be coupled with actions aimed at altering assumptions and embedded cultural norms, one individual and one department at a time. Indeed, Hutchins, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) acknowledged that despite the many gains in recent years made with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) being accepted as an important part of faculty productivity in higher education, it still faces challenges being accepted as research. They claim that much of this has to with interpretation and implementation rather than an absence of inclusive policy language. I would note, however, that my study showed there were inconsistencies in which area of faculty responsibility SoTL is recognized. I found it variously captured in the
research, teaching, and service categories. To me, this means there is still work to be done on the policy side as well.

Extensions of my research might involve taking a closer look at those institutions that have brought about CE-inclusive policy change. Has there been a parallel cultural change regarding the use of teaching and scholarship that uses community engagement methods and approaches? What kind of training and support helped to bring about these changes? How was the policy language arrived at? Since being put in place, how have the revised policies been interpreted and implemented by faculty and administrators? What effects have revised policies had on faculty behavior, faculty outputs, and faculty ability to gain reappointment, promotion, and tenure? All of these factors regarding context and impact will be of interest to those seeking to institute policy changes to reward CE work and, therefore, present opportunities for further study.

The Promise of Catholic Higher Education to Meet the Challenges of the 21st Century

Higher education is currently under fire from many directions, from parents to students and from industry to the public at large. People want to know the value of an increasingly costly post-secondary education. How does higher education meet its obligations to the public and stay true to its mission which is defined differently from institution to institution? Higher education is caught in a tug-of-war between maintaining education as an end in itself and
preparing students for the job market; between faculty pursuing basic research that is valuable to a disciplinary field and faculty pursuing scholarly work that attempts to address the most critical environmental and social problems of our times. It does not need to be an either-or proposition. Perhaps what higher education needs at this moment is its own “Vatican II”---a national convening about what college and universities need to be doing to meet the moral, economic, and environmental challenges of the modern world. This certainly seems to be what is meant by Boyte (2015), Christensen & Eyring (2011), and Plante (2013) who affirmed that there are multiple public purposes to higher education, including positioning students for successful careers and preparing them for lives of engaged citizenship in the same way that institutions can play the dual roles of being knowledge bearers and community liaisons, thereby strengthening their connections with the community with the purpose of enhancing its well-being.

How might we counteract the trend in higher education towards a highly competitive and individual achievement culture which influences both students and faculty as well as modes of learning and research? What does it tell us when a university student in the humanities says, “‘I find that the University is no place for humanity’” (Boyte, 2015, p. 258)? Catholic colleges and universities purport that contributing to other’s well-being, caring for the most vulnerable among us, securing the right of participation in democratic processes, and
upholding human dignity is the special purpose of their institutions. This means that civic and community engagement is not simply about doing good to feel good. It is about the application of one’s education and expertise to serve a larger purpose beyond mere individual gain. The type of society we build either increases our chances for individual and collective success or decreases it. In this light, the principles associated with the Catholic intellectual tradition (including social teaching) coupled with the founding ideals of higher education have more relevance than ever in a world that desperately needs healing.
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# APPENDIX A: Progression of Selected Carnegie “Community Engagement” Classification Application Questions 2008-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Indicators</th>
<th>Application Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Identity &amp; Culture: Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)? Quote the mission (vision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>Same as 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 First-time Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)? Quote the mission or vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Re-classification</strong></td>
<td>How is community engagement currently specified as a priority in the institution’s mission, vision statement, strategic plan, and accreditation/reaffirmation documents? Provide excerpts from the relevant documents and a web link to the full document if it exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefly discuss any significant changes in mission, planning, organizational structure, personnel, resource allocation, etc. related to community engagement etc., since the last classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement? Yes/No. Describe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>Same as 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 First-time Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in commitment to community engagement? Yes/No. Describe the specific search/recruitment policies or practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Re-classification</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution have search/recruitment policies or practices designed specifically to encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in commitment to community engagement? Yes/No. Describe the specific search/recruitment policies or practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Roles and Rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>REQUIRED (previously an optional question in 2006):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Do the institutional policies for promotion and tenure reward scholarship of community engagement? Describe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>If yes, how does the institution classify community-engaged scholarship? (Service, Scholarship of Application, other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>Same as 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If no, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 First-time Classification</th>
<th>2015 Re-classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED:</strong> Are there institutional level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If needed...describe the context for policies rewarding community engaged scholarly work.</td>
<td><strong>REQUIRED:</strong> In the period since your successful classification, what, if anything, has changed in terms of institutional policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? Is there an institution-wide definition of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? Please describe and identify the policy (or other) document(s) where this appears and provide the definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of teaching and learning?</td>
<td>All questions from the 2015 first-time classification in the column directly to the left also apply here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of scholarship?</td>
<td>For work in progress, describe the process and its current status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is community engagement rewarded as one form of service?</td>
<td>Is there professional development for faculty and administrators who review candidate’s dossiers (e.g. Deans, Department Chairs, senior faculty, etc.) on how to evaluate faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the above, applicants were directed to cite text from the faculty handbook (or similar policy document).

Are there college/school and/or departmental level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that used community-engaged approaches and methods?

Which colleges/school and/or departments? List Colleges or Departments.

What percentage of total colleges/schools and/or departments at the institution is represented by the list above?

Please cite three examples of colleges/school and/or department-level policies taken directly from policy documents, that specifically reward faculty scholarly work using community-engaged approaches and methods.

If current policies do not specifically reward community engagement, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If yes, describe the current work in progress.

Describe the process, content, and audience for this professional development and which unit(s) on campus provides the professional development.
**APPENDIX B: MASTER CODING GUIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/THEME: <strong>INSTITUTIONAL MISSION</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE priority</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with Carnegie definition</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charism</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Intellectual Tradition</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Moral Tradition</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Teaching</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other priorities</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/THEME: <strong>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DEFINITIONS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent/substitute terms</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with Carnegie definition of CE</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/THEME: <strong>RECRUITMENT</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit methods</td>
<td>emergent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implicit methods | emergent | Implied rather than plainly expressed or documented practices/policies for encouraging faculty expertise and commitment to CE (as in—our mission, which is shared with applicants/available for viewing, indicates that we value service...)  
Inform | emergent | Efforts consist of NOTIFYING candidates of the institution's mission and/or commitment to CE  
Assess | emergent | Efforts are concerned with EVALUATING a candidate's understanding of the college's mission and/or expertise and interest in CE (through dialogue and interview, for example, or application procedures—cover letter)  
Involvement of CE staff in hiring | emergent | CE staff informing the process is an indication that all resources are being used to attract, inform, and evaluate potential candidates for a commitment to CE  
Training for search committee | emergent | Training demonstrates institutional support for search committees to understand CE and be prepared to evaluate candidates for understanding and commitment  
Orientation to CE | emergent | Information showing that the institution’s dedication to CE continues after a hire has been made  
Evidence of outcomes | emergent | Indications that methods have been effective in successfully attracting and hiring faculty with CE interest and expertise  

**CATEGORY/THEME:** PROMOTION AND TENURE  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition/Attributes/Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Tools (Schneider &amp; Ingram)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic/hortatory</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
<td>Policy uses slogans to “associate the preferred activities with positively valued symbols” (p. 520). Symbolic policy tools assume that the targets of the policy will find alignment between an organization's values and the personal beliefs of those for whom the policy is intended, and that these individuals will take action based on their internal motivation and a sense of alignment with larger institutional goals. In the context of faculty reward policies, the connection to institutional mission and values statements serve as symbolic motivation that might direct the professional lives of the faculty. <strong>Behavioral assumption:</strong> People favor activities which align their personal values with the cultural values of the organization they are joining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
<td>Tangible rewards designed to motivate faculty (e.g. secure position at the university (tenure), pay raises, titles (promotions), prestige, awards, and recognition. <strong>Behavioral assumption:</strong> people are motivated by a positive payoff and will respond to economic rewards, status recognition, or following socially acceptable behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of faculty success</td>
<td>emergent</td>
<td>Applicants used examples of faculty being rewarded and recognized for their CE work to demonstrate that it is accepted in the culture and that policies do not prohibit faculty from doing CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td><em>a priori</em></td>
<td>Indicates by whose authority faculty are granted permission or encouraged to pursue activities outlined in policy, including who will conduct reviews that lead to rewards. <strong>Behavioral Assumption:</strong> people are motivated by those in leadership; they are inherently prone to obey authority and respond to hierarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Capacity-building | *a priori* | The intent to train people so that they have the skills and abilities necessary to meet the desired behavior established in a policy. **Behavioral assumption:** People will choose the preferred behavior stated in a policy if they are adequately informed and trained for that preferred behavior. Responses coded at this theme indicate the presence of professional development for faculty and administrators advising faculty and reviewing RPT dossiers. Also included is evidence of CE training provided to faculty which would meet the definition of training individuals. Direction for providing these types of training may not be included directly in RPT policies, but if Carnegie application indicates
that faculty development for CE is happening at the institution, it is an important indicator of support for CE

| No CB | emergent | Answered ‘no’ to the question "Is there professional development for faculty and administrators who review candidate’s dossiers?"
|-------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------
| Audience: For faculty | emergent | General training to any and all faculty to encourage understanding about CE practice or preparation of CE portfolios for RPT
| Audience: For reviewers | emergent | Specific training about CE practice and evaluation of CE dossiers for administrators, Deans, senior faculty, or others involved in review processes/RPT decisions
| Both | emergent | Institution offers training to both faculty and reviewers
| Content: General CE | emergent | Content of training directed at understanding and practicing CE or how to build a CE dossier
| Content Evaluating CE | emergent | Content of training directed at how to evaluate CE

Learning *a priori* Refers to work in progress to revise or change policies. Who is involved and what is being considered? Behavioral assumption: People can learn about their own behavior, increase their knowledge/skills, and select better tools for getting people to participate or follow a policy

Institutional conditions which inform RPT policies

CE Definition *a priori* Does the institution have a definition of community-engagement and/or of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods? If yes, what do applicants provide for a working definition? Qualities of definitions: Student, faculty, community, or institution-focused? Relationship to CST? Relationship to Carnegie definition? Academic or non-academic?

Campus context/Mission connection *a priori* Institutional context and culture of the campus. For this study, college/university’s mission and Catholic identity

Community context *a priori* Institutional views towards the context and culture of the broader community. How is community defined and what is its relationship to the college and to faculty professional work? (Feature of reciprocity in CE demands attention to, orientation towards, and respect of both community needs and capabilities.)

RPT policy recommendations for Public Scholarship—“Best practices” according to Ellison & Eatman

Define public scholarship *a priori* What are the features of public scholarship and how does that compare with Ellison & Eatman’s recommendations?

Continuum of scholarship/Faculty Roles *a priori* Does RPT policy support a continuum of scholarship? Does policy embrace a range of approaches and many professional pathways, running from traditional field-centered scholarship to reciprocal scholarship and public engagement? Does policy acknowledge work that builds on collaborations with community and is interpreted so that a broader public can understand it? Does policy recognize the particular and unique features of community-based work and support the blending of pedagogy, research, creative activity, and publication? See E&E p. 6.

Teaching & Learning

Clear/inclusive *a priori* Respondent supplied quoted material from the policy and those excerpts directly named characteristics of CE or used CE terminology in the teaching category. Does the policy demonstrate a commitment to working with a community in ways that benefit the community, the faculty member’s teaching, and student learning? Look for indications of application of knowledge through Service-Learning, Community-Based Research, Civic Engagement, Community-Engaged Learning, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) (Based on Moore & Ward’s definition)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous/neutral</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>Excerpts from the policy were included or referenced in the response but only implied that the policy could be interpreted as inclusive of CE. Neutral: policy neither explicitly promoted nor excluded CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent/non-supportive</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>No quoted material from the faculty rewards policy was supplied, no RPT document was referenced, or the provided RPT statements clearly did not support CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear/inclusive</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>Respondent supplied quoted material from the policy and those excerpts directly named characteristics of CE or used CE terminology in the research/scholarship category. Does the policy demonstrate a commitment for faculty members to incorporate a community orientation into their research agenda? Look for indications of Engaged (or Public) Scholarship which involves public or community entities in the development of research questions or creative projects as well as the dissemination or use of the results. Applied research, community-based research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous/neutral</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>Excerpts from the policy were included or referenced in the response but only implied that the policy could be interpreted as inclusive of CE. Neutral: policy neither explicitly promoted nor excluded CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent/non-supportive</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>No quoted material from the faculty rewards policy was supplied, no RPT document was referenced, or the provided RPT statements clearly did not support CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear/inclusive</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>Respondent supplied quoted material from the policy and those excerpts directly named characteristics of CE or used CE terminology in the research/scholarship category. Does the policy demonstrate a commitment for faculty members to lend their expertise to address community-based issues? Public/professional service, community service, or public outreach that makes use of a faculty member’s disciplinary knowledge and methodologies to inform and benefit the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous/neutral</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>Excerpts from the policy were included or referenced in the response but only implied that the policy could be interpreted as inclusive of CE. Neutral: policy neither explicitly promoted nor excluded CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent/non-supportive</td>
<td>a priori</td>
<td>No quoted material from the faculty rewards policy was supplied, no RPT document was referenced, or the provided RPT statements clearly did not support CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>