

Institutionalizing Community Engagement: A Quantitative Approach to Identifying Patterns of Engagement Based on Institutional Characteristics

Natasha Hutson

Clayton State University

Travis York

Association of Public Land-grant Universities

Daesang Kim, Herbert Fiester, and Jamie L. Workman

Valdosta State University

ABSTRACT

Community engagement is recognized as a high-impact practice in higher education. However, while best practices in engagement have been broadly accepted, standard metrics for engagement across institutions have not yet been established. The purpose of this research study was to explore the relationship between community engagement and a variety of institutional characteristics among higher education institutions in a Southeastern state. Findings indicated that a pattern of engagement existed among the 48 participating institutions.

Keywords: higher education, Furco's rubric, institutional-level, multivariate analysis

INTRODUCTION

Considerable discussion has taken place over the past several decades about higher education reaffirming its commitment to the greater community. In the 1980s, observers of higher education condemned colleges and universities for producing students who were narcissistic and disengaged from their communities and their responsibility to the democracy (Gearan, 2005). Community members demanded that colleges and universities return to their mission of developing the social consciousness of students, thereby preparing them to be active and engaged citizens (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Holland, 1997; Moore, 2014; Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009).

Many institutional leaders embrace community engagement as a viable strategy for connecting classroom, campus, and community. Connections like these have been identified as high-impact educational

practices for student success (Kuh, 2012). Still, other administrators are at an impasse between their desire to nurture a culture of learning and service, and the realities of their resources and institutional infrastructures. Because institutional priorities guide the campus's level of engagement, various researchers developed an array of assessment tools ranging from simple checklists to the more complex Carnegie Community Engagement Classification framework for institution leaders to gauge the practical implications of a community agenda (Furco & Miller, 2009). These tools assist institutions in making informed decisions about their strengths and improvement areas toward engagement (Furco & Miller, 2009) but do little to establish a baseline for effective institutionalized engagement efforts. Uniform metrics are needed to assist institutions with identifying appropriate infrastructural priorities such that institutionalized community engagement has consistent and standard meaning across institutions.

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Defining Community Engagement

The term “community engagement” is often used interchangeably with other similar service-related terminologies. Thus, community engagement became widely accepted as an umbrella term to describe the many different agendas for higher education’s campus-community endeavors. However, without consistency of message or outcomes, community engagement took many different meanings from campus to campus. Many campus administrators understood community engagement as a pedagogy initiated by faculty through classroom teaching and learning (Butin, 2010). Other campus administrators viewed community engagement as an economic strategy to develop and prepare students to enter the workforce and maintain the economy (Moore, 2014). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching took the lead in developing an accepted definition of community engagement through their engaged campus classification (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015). This definition espouses many of the tenets of community engagement that are broadly recognized as best practices of community work, including the ideas of scholarship, mutuality and reciprocity, and transformation (Fitzgerald & Primavera, 2013; Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Moore, 2014; Whiteford & Strom, 2013).

Institutional Characteristics as Predictors of Engagement

Limited data exist related to the effects of infrastructural attributes on community engagement outcomes. However, as practitioners continue to collect empirical data on student and institutional outcomes undergirded by community engagement initiatives, there is increasing evidence and acknowledgement that some institutional structures may positively correlate with community engagement practices. Community engagement has been cited as contributing to higher retention rates in higher edu-

cation (Butin, 2010; Buys & Bursnall, 2007; Cress, Burack, Giles, Elkins & Stevens, 2010; Kellogg Commission, 2001). Bureau, Cole, and McCormick (2014) found overwhelmingly that private institutions provide greater opportunities for service learning than do public institutions. Similarly, other studies showed that smaller faculty-student ratios that permit for increased faculty-student interactions are critical to the successful incorporation of a community learning strategy (Furco et al., 2009; Holland, 2009). Additionally, regional setting has a strong positive relationship with community engagement, specifically land-grant institutions, which were founded to directly engage with the community to teach, learn, and develop agricultural knowledge in their regional locations (Fitzgerald et al., 2012).

Current State of Community Engagement

The national community engagement agenda continues to gain momentum through the work of associations that provide higher education institutions with guidance, research, and recognition for best strategies for implementing a community engagement framework. Organizations and associations such as the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE), the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the National Association of Student Personnel Administration (NASPA), and The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN) have adopted missions to streamline community engagement practices and share knowledge such that all institutions can work toward scholarship, mission alignment, and the tenets of reciprocity and mutuality (Fitzgerald & Primavera, 2013).

In addition, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) offer opportunities for institutions to be recognized for their engagement efforts. In 2006, The Carnegie Foundation announced a new elective classifica-

tion in community engagement in which it provided a framework for institutions to assess themselves for evidence of integrated engagement (NERCHE, 2015; Sandmann, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009). The new elective classification was based on self-report and allowed institutions to document their impact in the community. The classification was intended to affirm that community learning and partnership had been infused in the institution's identity, culture, and commitments and was aligned with institutional priorities (Driscoll, 2009). Similarly, the CNCS established the Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll in 2006. The Honor Roll recognizes colleges and universities for their active role in finding meaningful solutions to community problems through student engagement and involvement in the community (CNCS, 2014). Since the inception of the award, CNCS has recognized over 600 institutions of higher education in one of three levels: Presidential Awardees, Honor Roll with Distinction, and Honor Roll (CNCS, 2014).

Measuring Institutionalized Community Engagement

The research was grounded by Furco, Weerts, Burton, and Kent's (2009) assessment rubric for institutionalizing community engagement in higher education, one of the most commonly used and accepted tools to assess institutionalized community engagement. The rubric identifies five major dimensions of community engagement in higher education: (a) mission and philosophy, (b) faculty support, (c) student support, (d) community partnership, and (e) institutional support (Furco et al., 2009). Furco (2002) argues that all of the dimensions do not have to be fully operationalized for a campus to institutionalize campus engagement. However, engagement priorities must be identified, cultivated, and integrated such that the entire campus is aware of the priority and works toward the effort of connecting engagement experiences in meaningful ways.

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore patterns of community engagement among state higher education institutions. Although rubrics, checklists, and other frameworks outline existing practices that lead to sustained integration of community initiatives, there is a scarce amount of work that quantitatively studied the impact of unique institutional characteristics on engagement infrastructural priorities. The following research questions were asked:

1. Is there a pattern of engagement among colleges and universities?
2. Is there a difference in the dimensions of community engagement based on institution type and control?
3. Are institutional characteristics predictors of institutionalized community engagement?
4. Are the dimensions of community engagement predictors of national recognition?

To answer the research questions, a quantitative research design was employed to correlate the institution's current level of commitment to community engagement to institutional characteristic variables. Additional correlations were made between community engagement and national distinction. Participants completed a web-based survey on community engagement at their respective college or university. Then, regression modeling was conducted to establish a relationship between survey responses and institutional data collected from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Database System (IPEDS).

Sample

A total of 84 institutions in a Southeastern state were invited to participate in this study. This total represents the complete listing of institutions in the researched state as identified in the IPEDS Database of Institutions. Responses to the survey were collected from 48 institutions. This is an overall response rate of 57%. Of the survey

respondents, 32 institutions were public and 16 were private; 37 institutions were baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, and 11 were associate or technical degree-granting institutions. Personal identifiers about each respondent was neither requested nor collected for this investigation. Institutional identifiers were not published in the findings; all data collected were reported and disseminated in aggregate form to conceal the identity of the participating institutions and survey respondents.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument adapted from Furco et al.'s (2009) rubric for institutionalizing community engagement in higher education was employed for this research study. The rubric design was converted into an electronic survey platform using Qualtrics survey software. The survey was tested for internal reliability and validity with two faculty members who had integrated community projects into their class curriculum and two staff members whose work is specifically to build community connections. Based on the feedback received, several adjustments were made to the final survey layout.

Institution respondents were asked to rate the current status of community engagement at their institution in each of the five dimensions. Respondents rated the institution's engagement efforts on 22 individual items on a continuum ranging from critical mass building to sustained institutionalization. Critical mass building is the stage in which a university develops campus and community support for establishing engagement as an institutional concern, and the lowest level of engagement. At the midpoint of the rubric is quality building, purposeful institutionalization of community engagement in which institution administrators are intentional about developing quality opportunities for engagement initiatives to integrate into the campus community culture. Sustained institutionalization is successful and full integration of community engagement into the structural framework

of the institution as evidenced by full campus and community support, understanding, implementation, and leadership (2009).

In addition to Furco et al.'s (2009) three stages of development, two additional stages of development were created in response to feedback provided during internal validity testing of the survey instrument. The development stage between critical mass building and quality building was titled awareness building. At this stage, institutions take inventory of current institutional practices and recognize opportunities to strengthen internal support mechanisms. The stage between quality building and sustained institutionalization was labeled integration. At this stage, the institution develops an organization change strategy to institutionalize community engagement as a university priority. Therefore, the survey provided respondents with five stages of development instead of only three, as prescribed by the original Furco et al. (2009) rubric. The additional options allowed for clearer and more pointed descriptions for each rating on the scale.

Measures

The dependent variable for this study was institutionalized community engagement on the college campus measured as five separate variables derived from the Furco et al.'s (2009) dimensions of community engagement rubric. The independent variables for this study were 12 institutional characteristic variables that were included in the final regression model. These variables were compiled from the IPEDS dataset and included the following variables: Institution type (level of degree granted), control (public/private), and size; faculty ratio; retention rate; Pell Grant awards; campus settings of rural, town, and suburb; and student demographics of male, nontraditional, and students of color. The variables are presented in Table 1.

Lastly, to determine a relationship between the dimensions of community engagement and national recognition, the five dimensions of community engagement were

used as the independent variables and distinction (whether or not the institution received the Carnegie Engaged Campus designation, the President’s Higher Education Honor Roll, or both distinctions) was the dependent variable in a logistic regression model.

Analytic Procedure

Once data were cleaned, descriptive statistical analyses were conducted on each

independent and dependent variable to summarize the data. Next, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) statistical procedure was conducted to test the hypothesis that the community engagement subcategories would load together on the appropriate dimension. EFA was further conducted to explore the factor structures of 21 of 22 (faculty support: rewards and recognition was eliminated due to its high “unable to respond” rate) retained items in the model

Variable Label	Description	Measure	Value
Control	Classification of the institution as either Public or Private	Nominal	0 = Public; 1 = Private
Campus Setting	Classification of the institutional regional setting as either Rural, Town, Suburb, or City	Nominal	Dummy coded; City = 0
Cost	Published in-district tuition and fees	Scale	1 = < 1500; 2 = 1501-4999; 3 = 5000-9999; 4 = 10,000-19,999; 5 = > 20,000
Pell Grant	Percent of full-time first-time undergraduates receiving Pell grants	Scale	Total percentage
Selectivity	Percent of students admitted	Scale	Total percentage
Size	Undergraduate enrollment	Scale	1 = < 1500; 2 = 1501-4999; 3 = 5000-9999; 4 = 10,000-19,999; 5 = > 20,000
Institutional Type	Classification of the institution as either a 2-year or 4-year institution	Nominal	0 = 4-year; 1 = 2-year
Faculty Ratio	Percentage of Instructional staff on 9, 10, 11 or 12 month contract per total undergraduate enrollment	Scale	Total percentage
Graduation Rate	Percentage of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 150% of normal time to program completion, Fall 2013	Scale	Total percentage
Retention Rate	Percentage of first to second year retention of first-time bachelor's degree-seeking undergraduates, Fall 2013	Scale	Total percentage
SAT Read/SAT Math	SAT Critical Reading and Math 25th percentile score	Scale	Average score on Reading and Math sections
Students of Color	Percent of undergraduate enrollment whose ethnicity is non-White	Scale	Total percentage
Male	Percent of undergraduate enrollment that are male students	Scale	Total percentage
Nontraditional	Percent of undergraduate enrollment ages 25-64	Scale	Total percentage

Table 1: Descriptions of Institutional Characteristics Variables

across the dimensions of community engagement, thereby identifying any latent constructs that may have existed related to community engagement. Principal components analysis extraction method was chosen to observe all sources of variance for each variable. Because there was not significant intercorrelation between the variables, a varimax orthogonal rotation was used to compute the loading matrix. Three criteria were used to determine retained factors: Kaiser's criterion in which eigenvalues are greater than one, observation of the scree plot at the point of inflection, and at least 70% variance explained by the factors. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) statistical procedure was used to test the difference in means among the five dimensions of community engagement based on institution type and control, and a logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine if the dimensions of community engagement were predictors of national recognition.

FINDINGS

Factor Analysis

An EFA was conducted to identify patterns of engagement in the sample of 48 institutions. All 21 items that were retained in the model produced positive loadings on the rotated component matrix. The results of the EFA generally confirmed the pattern of community engagement in higher education as specified by the Furco et al. (2009) model. An unexpected construct titled leadership was formed; however, with only two factor loadings, the leadership construct did not significantly explain the model. Components with four or more loadings above $|.60|$ are considered reliable (Habing, 2003; Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). The rotated components factor loadings are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of Variance

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of institutional type and institutional control on the de-

pendent variables of dimensions of community engagement. MANOVA results indicated a significant main effect for institutional type, [Wilks' $\Lambda = .765$, $F(5, 40) = 2.46$, $p \leq .05$, $\eta^2 = .24$] but did not reveal a main effect for institutional control, [Wilks' $\Lambda = .874$, $F(5, 40) = 1.15$, $p \leq .05$, $\eta^2 = .13$], meaning that there was a statistically significant difference in community engagement based on institution type; however, this difference was not significant based on an institution being public or private. Multivariate effect sizes were small, and there were no significant interaction effects between the independent variables institution type and control. Given the significance of the institution type effect, a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted as a follow-up test. ANOVA results indicated that the dimensions of community engagement did not significantly differ for institutional type. While the institutional type variable had an effect on community engagement as a whole, there were no significant differences in the mean between institution type on each of the dimensions of community engagement separately.

Logistic Regression

A logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine which dimensions of community engagement were predictors of national recognition. The five factor scores for the dimensions of community engagement were entered into the model using the Enter method to predict the probability of an institution receiving national recognition (National Recognition = 1, No National Recognition = 0) for community engagement. The variables institution control and type were also entered into the model to determine if these characteristics had a relationship with receipt of awards and distinctions. The statistical significance of the model was reliable using the chi-square criteria, $\chi^2=25.841$, $p \leq .001$, and model good fit was established with a small -2Log likelihood value (-2Log likelihood=39.362). The model accurately predicted 85.4% of the cases correctly. Results

	Loading
Component 1: Mission and Philosophy	
Mission and Philosophy: Strategic Planning	.775
Mission and Philosophy: Educational Reform	.757
Mission and Philosophy: Mission Alignment	.729
Mission and Philosophy: Definition of CE	.664
Institutional Support: Evaluation and Assessment	.606
Institutional Support: Policy-Making Entity	.587
Component 2: Student Support	
Student Support: Awareness	.830
Student Support: Rewards and Incentives	.784
Student Support: Opportunities	.724
Student Support: Leadership	.646
Community Participation: Mutual Understanding	.486
Component 3: Faculty Support	
Institutional Support: Department Support	.741
Faculty Support: Knowledge and Awareness	.688
Faculty Support: Leadership	.687
Faculty Support: Involvement and Support	.607
Community Participation: Voice and Leadership	.541
Component 4: Leadership	
Institutional Support: Administrative Support	.713
Community Participation: Awareness	.695
Component 5: Institutional Support	
Institutional Support: Funding	.872
Institutional Support: Staffing	.653
Institutional Support: Coordinating Entity	.553

Table 2: Factor Loadings for Rotated Components Sorted by Loading Size

indicated that type (B=-2.487) had a moderate predictive value ($p \leq .10$), but whether or not the institution is public or private had no predictive significance. Faculty support (B=.624) was a significant ($p \leq .05$) predictor of national recognition and institutional

support (B=.267) had moderate significance ($p \leq .10$).

The model indicated that the likelihood of an institution receiving national recognition for institutionalized faculty support and institutional support was increased

by 1.87 and 1.31 times respectively than those that did not prioritize engagement in these areas. However, the odds of receiving national recognition were decreased by 8.3% if the institution was an associate or technical degree-granting institution. These findings suggest that the likelihood of an institution receiving the Carnegie Engaged Campus designation, the President’s Higher Education Honor Roll distinction, or both were increased when the institution operationalized the faculty and institutional support dimensions of community engagement. These odds were additionally increased when the institution was baccalaureate degree-granting. The results of the full model are reported in Table 3.

LIMITATIONS

Data collection for this research study was dependent upon the willingness of the respondent to complete and submit survey responses. The data collection period for this study was during the summer months, and many professionals at each institution who could have significantly contributed to the survey responses, such as faculty, were difficult to reach due to vacation schedules. Additionally, this research study relied on the identification of appro-

priate institutional personnel to complete a survey on the institution’s current levels of community engagement. Each participant was asked to submit only one completed survey for the college or university. Several respondents were unable to rate items in the faculty support dimension, indicating that participants may not have connected with their division of academic affairs to provide an accurate response for their respective institution related to the work of faculty. This limitation may have resulted in faculty support items being underestimated.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study showed significant engagement efforts in public and private colleges and universities in the researched state. The findings showed that institutions’ community engagement priorities were fairly aligned with the Furco et al. (2009) model for institutionalized community engagement. It could be argued that based on these results, many institutions have already evolved their community engagement efforts into sustained institutionalization; however, the interquartile ranges of the community engagement items hovered between two and four. Rather, this range suggests that institutional respondents

	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>
<i>Mission and Philosophy</i>	-.295	1.763	1	.184	.744
<i>Faculty Support</i>	.624	5.503	1	.019*	1.867
<i>Student Support</i>	-.193	.813	1	.367	.824
<i>Community Participation</i>	-.202	.329	1	.566	.817
<i>Institutional Support</i>	.267	3.041	1	.081**	1.306
<i>Type</i>	-2.487	3.194	1	.074**	.083
<i>Control</i>	.053	.003	1	.957	1.054
<i>Constant</i>	-1.833	1.495	1	.221	.160

*Significant at $p \leq .05$

**Significant at $p \leq .10$

Table 3: Results of Logistic Regression Predicting Receipt of National Recognition for Community Engagement with Control and Type Variables

to the survey perceived their institution's engagement efforts as still progressing rather than institutionalized. A number of institutional challenges can contribute to this perception.

First, institutions are challenged to develop a community engagement model that is inclusive of all stakeholders: faculty, students, and community. Community engagement among these constituents is often done in silos rather than together and cooperatively. This study found that all of the dimensions of community engagement emerged from the model except for the community participation dimension in which each item loaded with a different construct (student support, faculty support, and leadership). Often, student groups are conductors of community partnerships through their volunteer and philanthropic efforts (Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). Similarly, faculty members are instrumental in developing community partnerships through research and publication (Dubb, 2007). Administrative leaders, as the face and voice of the institution, develop partnerships with local businesses, organizations, and potential donors to the institution. As such, community participation efforts are often conducted by disparate groups of institutional constituents. In order to institutionalize community engagement, community efforts must be coordinated with clear policies and procedures for establishing relationships and partnerships in the community, tracking and assessing those partnerships, and fostering their continued development (Furco, 2002; Holland, 1997).

Organizational change cannot be accomplished as the priority of a singular department or unit within the institution. Commitment to community engagement and the implementation of engagement practices must extend to all areas of the institution and include collaborative efforts from both academic affairs and student affairs units (Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). Integration of community learning efforts on a campus should include a centralized community engagement department housed nei-

ther in the division of academic affairs nor student affairs that promotes institution-wide commitment and engagement through both curricular and co-curricular experiences (Holland, 1997; Harkavy, 2005). This unit would not only promote engagement efforts to internal and external constituents but would also advance community partnership through sponsored programs that connect students, faculty, and community members. These programs join all constituencies together to address a community need and impact positive change through true collaboration and partnership.

Second, support from institutional administrative leaders is vital to institutional community commitment (Horgan & Scire, 2007; Holland, 1997; Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004). Support from administrative leaders is necessary to institutionalized community engagement as leadership drives the vision, mission, and goals of the organization (Moore & Mendez, 2014; Kezar, 2005). The findings of this study indicated that the institutional support dimension of community engagement was the only significant dimension predicted by institutional characteristics. This dimension of engagement includes administrative leadership, funding, staffing, and assessment (Furco et al., 2009). Thus, in order for organizational change to occur in a transformative way, institutional leaders must be explicit in commitment to and communicating engagement priorities. This includes verbal support as well as providing tangible support through the allocation of resources, incentivizing faculty through tenure and promotion considerations, incentivizing students through rewards and recognition, and inviting community partners to have an active voice in decisions about institutional engagement efforts. Institutional leaders must be committed to ensuring that engagement occurs holistically and that systems are established to promote and encourage those efforts. This can be done through the funding of specific engagement projects or the establishment of a campus endowment for engagement efforts that are includ-

ed in the university's advancement initiatives (Weerts & Hudson, 2009). Further, Long (2002) recommended that university administrators integrate service with academics through the creation of outreach themed dormitories, service scholarships, and opportunities for the student voice to be included in decisions about engagement and community involvement.

Institution leaders could advance community engagement as a higher education priority through the establishment of a state Campus Compact coalition. Campus Compact was established in 1985 by the presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford universities in cooperation with the President of the Education Commission of the States. The mission of Campus Compact is to advance the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility (Campus Compact, 2014). Since its founding, this body has grown to include over 1,100 college presidents in 34 states. Campus Compact colleges and universities range in size, type, and funding, but all share a common philosophy that community engagement is an important strategy for student learning, community partnership, faculty engagement, and institutional success (Gearan, 2005).

The Campus Compact coalition provides education and training, including grants for research on best practices in engagement (Campus Compact, 2014; Heffernan, 2001). The establishment of a Campus Compact would provide institutions with additional resources, strategies, and support for organizational change efforts to incorporate community engagement into the campus infrastructure. In addition, as a consortium of university presidents, Campus Compact is uniquely positioned to promote engagement across the state and assist institutions with their engagement efforts. Such a consortium could possibly assist in the development of a metric for institutionalized community engagement that is gener-

alizable to institutions of similar qualities and characteristics.

Lastly, institution leaders are challenged with assessing their institution's sustained institutionalization of community engagement. There are many rubrics, checklists, and models for engaged infrastructures; however, these tools are only suggested practices and are not generalizable to specific types of institutions. The tools do not provide concrete steps or guidelines for how institutionalized engagement is to occur (Butin, 2010). Thus, using these tools can be an overwhelming experience for institutional leaders. This study found that significant differences existed between baccalaureate granting and associates or technical degree-granting institutions' overall community engagement scores.

Assessment of community engagement efforts is beneficial for higher education institutions for strategic reasons. The results of this research indicated that some of the dimensions of community engagement presented a strong model for attaining distinction and recognition nationally. Although over 40% of this study sample has already achieved the Carnegie Engaged Campus designation, the National President's Honor Roll, or both distinctions, institution leaders should be cautioned that receipt of these designations does not necessarily translate to infused engagement. Whiteford and Strom (2013) wrote that university-wide engagement efforts at one university commenced several years after the institution had achieved the Carnegie Engaged Campus designation. As such, standard and consistent metrics for engagement based broadly on institutional characteristics support organizational change that will create a pervasive campus culture of community engagement that is systemic in nature, understood, and recognizable across institutions. It would further provide institutional leadership with clear evaluation guidelines in their pursuit of true institutionalized engagement and recognition for their efforts.

This study was a cross-sectional study, thus only the current and immediate levels of engagement of responding institutions were considered in the findings. To better understand how each institution sustains engagement priorities, a longitudinal study across a span of time would be beneficial to observe how institutions progress from critical mass building to sustained institutionalization over time. Additionally, as this study did not find institutional characteristics a determining factor in its level of engagement, further research on the topic could be beneficial, as a different sample could prove the counter to be true.

Moreover, it would be beneficial to observe institutional growth toward sustained integration based on the length of time it takes an institution to completely infuse engagement into the campus culture; such data would provide institution leaders with realistic goals and expectations of their organization change model and engaged campus development.

Finally, a qualitative component consisting of interviews with staff, students, and community members of institutions that have reported sustained institutionalization of community engagement would increase our understanding of how strategies for organization change are cultivated and implemented at different types of institutions. This could lead to the identification of specific community engagement practices for institutions based on their institutional characteristics.

CONCLUSION

Despite the abundance of research on best practices and strategies of engagement, research remains limited on institutionalized community engagement by institutional characteristics. Currently, the research on engagement is broad and general such that institutions develop frameworks based on the individual campus. This gap in the research limits our ability to replicate the outcomes of community engagement in similarly placed institutions. The credibility

of community engagement as a high-impact practice in teaching and learning is potentially jeopardized when common standards of engagement are neither defined nor implemented universally. While this research did not find that institutional characteristics had a significant impact on any of the dimensions of community engagement except for the institutional support dimension, a larger sample size may yield more variance among the variables. Additional research is necessary to assist higher education leaders with decisions about resources and priorities when considering a community-based learning environment. Institutionalizing community engagement will continue to pose a challenge for campus leaders until a universal metric for defining, measuring, and assessing engagement is developed.

REFERENCES

- Brukardt, M. J., Holland, B., Percy, S. L., & Zimpher, N. (2004). *Calling the question: Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement?* Retrieved from <https://www4.uwm.edu/milwaukeeidea/elements/wingspread.pdf>
- Bureau, D. A., Cole, J. S., & McCormick, A. C. (2014). Frequent participation in service learning: Examining institutional differences and individual benefits. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 162, 17-27.
- Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-Learning in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: Processes and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(1), 73-86.
- Campus Compact. (2014). *General information on Campus Compact*. Retrieved from www.campuscompact.com

- Corporation for National and Community Service. (2006). *College students helping America*. Washington, DC, Author.
- Corporation for National and Community Service. (2014). *National President's Higher Education Honor Roll in Community Service*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalservice.gov>
- Cress, C. M., Burack, C., Giles, D. E., Elkins, J., & Stevens, M. C. (2010). *A promising connection: Increasing college access and success through civic engagement*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Driscoll, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 5-12. doi:10.1002/he.353
- Dubb, S. (2007). *Linking colleges to communities: Engaging the university for community development*. College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative.
- Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(3), 7-27.
- Fitzgerald, H. E., & Primavera, J. (2013). *Going public: Civic and community engagement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Furco, A. (2002). *Revisions to the self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service learning in higher education*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Furco, A., & Miller, W. (2009). Issues in benchmarking and assessing institutional engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 47-54. doi:10.1002/he.357
- Furco, A., Weerts, D., Burton, L., & Kent, K. (2009). *Assessment rubric for institutionalizing community engagement in higher education*. University of Minnesota.
- Gearan, M. D. (2005). Engaging communities: The campus compact model. *National Civic Review*, 32-40.
- Habing, B. (2003). Exploratory factor analysis. University of South Carolina. Retrieved from <http://people.stat.sc.edu/habing/courses/530EFA.pdf>
- Harkavy, I. (2005). Higher education collaborative for community engagement and improvement: Faculty and researchers' perspectives. *National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good*. [Monograph].
- Heffernan, K. (2001). Campus Compact: Developing partnerships for community service. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 10(2), 55-59.
- Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4(1), 30-41.
- Holland, B. (2009). Will it last? Evidence of institutionalization at Carnegie Classified Community Engagement Institutions. In L. R. Sandmann, C. H. Thornton, & A. J. Jaeger (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions* (pp. 85-98). (New Directions for Higher Education, no. 147). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/he.361
- Kellogg Commission. (2001). *Returning to our roots*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kezar, A. (2005). What campuses need to know about organizational learning and the learning organization. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 131, 7-22.
- Kuh, G. D. (2012). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Peer Review*, 14(3), 29.

- Long, S. E. (2002). The new student politics: The wingspread statement on student civic engagement. Retrieved from <http://www.campusactivism.org/uploads/wingspread-web.pdf>
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (4th Ed). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Moore, T. L. (2014). Community-university engagement: A process for building democratic communities. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 40(2). doi:10.1002/aehe.20014
- Moore, T. L., & Mendez, J. P. (2014). Civic engagement and organizational learning strategies for student success. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 65, 31-40. doi:10.1002/he
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (2015). Integrated post-secondary education database (IPED). Retrieved from <http://www.nerche.org>
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Democratic engagement white paper. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 1-4. doi:10.1002/he.352
- Sponsler, L. E., & Hartley, M. (2013). *Five things student affairs professionals can do to institutionalize civic engagement*. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).
- Weerts, D., & Hudson, E. (2009). Engagement and institutional advancement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 65-74. doi:10.1002/he.359
- Whiteford, L., & Strom, E. (2013). Building community engagement and public scholarship into the university. *Annals of Anthropological Practice*, 37(1), 72-89. doi:10.1111/napa.12018

AUTHOR NOTE

Natasha Hutson, Department of Campus Life, Clayton State University; Travis York, Office of Academic and Student Affairs, Association of Public Land-grant Universities; Daesang Kim, Herbert Fiester, and Jamie L. Workman, Department of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology, Valdosta State University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Jamie Workman, 2050 Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology, 1500 N. Patterson St., Valdosta, GA 31698